

# APNIC EC Meeting Minutes

Teleconference  
Friday 27 July 2001

*Meeting Start: 11:12am*

## Minutes

### Present:

Geoff Huston  
BK Kim  
Che-Hoo Cheng (Chair)  
Akinori Maemura  
Paul Wilson  
Anne Lord  
Connie Chan  
Irene Chan  
Gerard Ross (minutes)  
Apologies Received:  
Kuo Wei Wu  
Qian Hualin

### Agenda:

1. Agenda bashing
2. APNIC Financial and Investment reports
3. Update on APNIC meeting
4. Update on Member/Stakeholder Survey
5. Membership Structure
6. Document Review Policy
7. Action on ccNIC.NET domains
8. Any Other Business
9. Next meeting

### 1. Agenda bashing

none

### 2. APNIC financial and investment

The Financial Report was summarised. It was noted that revenue is slightly above projections; expenses remain much lower than projected, although there are still some annual expenses due in the second part of the year.

Accounts receivable has increased dramatically, due to a large amount of invoicing during the past month, however the total overdue is the lowest in 4 months.

Membership figures are very close to the projected levels.

It was noted that mergers and acquisitions account for all of the current membership closures.

New growth in the small member category was discussed. It was also noted that despite the fact that all new members can join at the small level and stay there for a whole year, many members still enter at higher levels, including one new very large member who recently joined from Indonesia.

It was noted as an aside that the ID training scheduled for this week was cancelled.

The Investment Report was discussed. It was noted that the total value of APNIC's investments has gone down. All funds except one have depreciated. It was noted that the adviser has suggested that one fund in particular should be changed, but that the overall account is intended to show growth over a 3-5 year period and the current negative movements are not a great concern.

It was noted that the decline in the value of the European Growth fund was nearly as large as the decline in the Asia Growth fund.

There was a general discussion to clarify several items in the report, including the brokerage fee.

It was also noted that the investment report figures are expressed in Australian dollars.

There was discussion of the current movements in the Australian exchange rates and it was noted that the lower Australian dollar accounts for approximately one third of the savings in expenses reported in the financial report.

### **3. Update on APNIC meeting**

It was noted that sponsorship commitments now exceed the sponsorship budget and that, in particular, there has been good support at the Gold sponsor level. The increased cost of Gold sponsorship (from \$3000 at the last meeting to \$5000 at this meeting) does not seem to have limited sponsorship prospects.

It was noted that Kuo Wei Wu's work with TWNIC has been very helpful in terms of securing sponsorship, as approximately half of the sponsorship revenues expected have been committed in Taiwan.

It was noted that it is not currently known how many participants from TW will attend.

It was noted that the budget has been based on an attendance of 200, at an average per head fee of USD200.

It was noted that currently the total expenditure by APNIC would be approximately US\$37,000 (which is well below the EC-approved maximum of US\$50,000).

It was noted that the slow registrations are consistent with recent experience of APNIC's meetings in Brisbane and KL, and APRICOT in KL. Planning is very difficult under the circumstances, however we must assume that adequate numbers will attend.

There was a discussion of the invitations and gifts for the Founding Members.

There was a discussion of the Routing Workshop to be held in the days before the meeting, presented by Philip Smith. It was favourably noted that several APNIC staff will be present.

### **4. Update on Member/Stakeholder Survey**

It was noted that the survey is independent from APNIC but that so far the general reports received from KPMG (regarding meetings so far in CN and AU) have been very positive.

Comment was sought from the EC members regarding the pilot meetings that were held, as well as any further suggestions.

It was noted that the Sydney meeting was poorly and reluctantly attended and that the meeting seemed to be more of an introduction to the survey rather than a survey activity in itself. It was noted that very few feedback notes seemed to be taken during the meeting. There was also concern about the content of the survey in relation to its focus on APNIC policy, rather than practice. However, it was also noted that meeting attended was competently run, presented APNIC well, and that the participants seemed to appreciate the initiative.

It was also explained that the AU and CN meetings were considered as pilot sessions and that there is room for more discussion of the method and content prior to the more important sessions that will take place in Taipei.

The survey budget is running to plan but the EC-approved limit is likely to be reached and possibly exceeded by a small amount. There was no objection to this.

➤ **Action:** The EC were asked to provide feedback before the TW meeting

## 5. Membership structure

It was noted that the membership structure proposal has important links to other proposals for the coming meeting, and also to recent activities underway at APNIC.

It was noted that there may be a proposal from ID to make small allocations to organisations that are unable to receive sufficient space from their upstream providers and that this would fit consistently with the proposed fee structure changes.

It was explained that while it is not proposed to apply fees to the legacy transfers from ARIN and aunic, the proposed new structure does make allowances for possible future charging of more reasonable maintenance fees.

It was also noted that there has been discussion of the NIR per-address fee system. However, it was explained that while this is a reasonable proposal, it would require additional changes to the fee structure to maintain the APNIC revenue stream.

It was explained that it is desirable to present a new fee structure that can be accepted at the TW meeting. However, it was noted that this would not be possible if the per address fees were to be removed, as that would require a lot of further discussion and refinement.

There was a discussion of a proposal to remove the per-address fee and increase the membership fees.

Concerns were expressed regarding the elimination of the per-address fee. It was suggested that there is already a significant cost advantage in the current fee structure in being a large member, but that this is balanced partly by the per-address fee. Therefore, removing the per-address fee would increase the possibility of more organisations seeking to function as "address brokers", which would steadily erode the function and position of the RIR.

As a result of these discussions, it was concluded that a decision on the membership structure as proposed is preferable at the TW meeting, and that the proposal should not attempt to remove the per-address fee. Removal of the per-address fee can be addressed through separate proposals and discussions at any time in future.

There was discussion of whether the current draft for the new fee structure should be published immediately as it currently stands. It was suggested that if this document was published now, it could also be referred to the NIR discussion list prior to the meeting.

There was also a request to publish a document regarding the per-address fee. It was noted that draft documents are currently available on the APNIC web site.

There was consensus to publish the current draft fee structure proposal without reference to removing the per-address fee.

- **Action:** APNIC to publish the current draft for discussion. AM to refer the proposal to the NIR-discuss list.

## 6. Document review policy

The process for approving this document was discussed. It was noted that this was an administrative document that had passed through many public drafts. It was explained that at the last Member Meeting, it was agreed to publish a final draft which would then be presented to the EC for approval before the TW meeting.

Discussion relating to formal approval was deferred to the EC meeting in Taipei.

## 7. Action on ccNIC.NET domains

The general issue of these domain names was discussed in the context of an organisation which has a stated intention to form an NIR, and which has recently requested transfer of a ccNIC.NET domain name from APNIC. It was noted that APNIC cannot currently support this organisation to become an NIR, both because of their limited capacity to function in that role, and because new NIRs are not currently being created. Concern was noted that if the domain name is transferred, then that action may be taken as endorsement of an NIR role.

It was explained that these names were initially taken by APNIC to reserve them for the AP community and to protect the names from cyber-squatters. It was suggested that this

reservation is no longer appropriate and that, therefore, APNIC should let the registration of these names lapse. There was a suggestion to advise the APTLD organisation that APNIC is willing to allow them to take over the names when they lapse.

There was consensus that APNIC should notify all ccTLD registries of its intention to allow the names to lapse, and offer to transfer names if desired. It was also agreed to notify APTLD and the ccTLD secretariat before proceeding.

➤ **Action:** APNIC Secretariat

## **8. Any other business**

There was a discussion of the complaints from a company which is seeking to become an NIR in a country where an APNIC member NIR exists. There was consensus that there is nothing further APNIC should do at this stage to intervene in this issue.

## **9. Next meeting**

2pm Tuesday 28 August, Grand Hotel, Taipei

***Meeting closed: 12:15pm.***