

APNIC EC Meeting Minutes

Friday 19 April 2002

Meeting Start: 2:20pm

Minutes

Present:

Che-Hoo Cheng (Chair)
Geoff Huston
Xing Li
Akinori Maemura
Kuo Wei Wu
Qian Hualin

Paul Wilson
Connie Chan
Irene Chan
Gerard Ross (minutes)

Agenda:

1. EC officeholders election
2. Agenda Bashing
3. Minutes from last meeting (4 Mar 2002)
4. Financial reports for Feb and Mar 2002
5. Approval of the new IPv4 document
6. Update of the ICANN contract
7. Next EC meeting in Yokohama, Japan
8. AOB

1. EC officeholders election

Paul Wilson presided over the election of APNIC officeholders. He reported that all nominations received were for reappointment of existing officeholders to the same positions. He called for any additional nominations and none were made. He then proposed that existing officeholders be re-elected to their positions, and asked if there were any objections. No objection was raised.

Paul Wilson announced the re-election of officeholders as follows: Che-Hoo Cheng, Chair; B K Kim, Treasurer; Geoff Huston, Secretary.

From this point Che-Hoo Cheng chaired the meeting.

2. Agenda Bashing

The following items were added to the draft agenda:

- AC election (more urgent than EC election)
- EC election (need a formal proposal to put to members)
- Transfer of NIR members

3. Minutes from last meeting (4 Mar 2002)

The following amendments were suggested:

- It was recommend that the discussion of the ICANN contract should be summarised more simply, with the conclusion noted.
- It was suggested that the minutes of AC election discussion should note as an action item the need to discuss a range of options at the AMM.

The minutes as amended were then approved by consensus of the meeting.

- **Action:** Secretariat to amend the minutes and publish on the web site.

4. Financial reports for Feb and Mar 2002

- It was noted that membership growth remains behind budget so expenses are being limited below budget as well.
- The per allocation fee was discussed and it was explained that a large per allocation fee has recently been received, which now puts this item above budget.
- Paul Wilson reported that he and Irene Chan are working now to produce more detailed financial reports in future.
- It was noted that the number of new membership applications in March rose sharply. It was explained that these applications were received from several different countries, with most from Australia and India.
- Although net membership growth for March is still low, there was actually a large number of new members for that period. It was explained that membership closure is still high but also seasonal.
- It was noted that due to seasonal factors, a clear picture of the membership growth is not normally available until mid-year. It was also explained that by then, more detailed financial reporting will also be available.
- There was a discussion of the use of exchange rates used in the budget and financial reports, and the effect of fluctuations on budget performance.

5. Approval of the new IPv4 document

- Paul Wilson requested that the EC give approval to the latest IPv4 policy document, which includes policy changes approved by members at the last meeting, as well as a variety of editorial changes.
- The document, APNIC-086, was approved by consensus of the meeting.
- **Action:** Secretariat to publish as an official APNIC document.

6. Update of the ICANN contract

- It was noted that the draft agreement available for comment is substantially the same as the one most recently considered by APNIC and the other RIRs.
- It was noted that there have been no substantive public comments received on this draft.
- It was suggested that none of the RIRs are currently willing to sign the agreement until the ICANN change procedure is determined.
- There was a discussion of the summary of principles relating to the RIR opinions on the ICANN restructure. This has been circulated without any amendments suggested.
- It was suggested that the major issue is what course of action the RIRs should now take on the ICANN restructure.
- It was noted that opinions have been expressed that there is no necessity for a single body to carry all the current ICANN functions.
- It was suggested that the RIRs need to determine now what level of support they should now be providing to ICANN, and to consider what effect it would have on the RIRs if this support was not provided.

- There was also a discussion of the proposal from the ITU. It was suggested that the implication of the document is that the ITU is willing to subsume the ICANN functions within their own organisation. It was argued that the RIR policy making structure (namely open consensus-based and bottom-up) is incompatible with the ITU structure (namely government-based with formal voting).
- It was noted that it had also suggested that the IAB could potentially step into the role of global IP management if ICANN ceased.
- The EC were asked to consider whether the RIR should actually express an opinion that the ICANN should continue to global management of IP address issues.
- It was noted that there has been a new proposal has been made, referred to as the Heathrow Proposal. BKK will forward a copy of this proposal.
- It was suggested that the RIRs should publish a joint statement on the preferred outcome, in addition to the principles document which has been discussed so far.
- There was further discussion of the RIRs' draft statement of principles on the ICANN restructure. The proposed principles were outlined. It was suggested that the RIRs should push for either greater autonomy or greater involvement.
- It was noted that if the outcome of the ICANN restructure is not a lightweight body with appropriately constrained activities, then it would not be supported.
- It was also suggested that as soon as the GAR board draft is publicly released, it should be brought to the attention of the APNG's Internet Governance working group.
- It was noted that the RIRs had received an enquiry from Karl Auerbach (ICANN Director) relating to the payment made to ICANN. It was explained that the reply to him, and the RIR's position, is that the payment is regarded as being for past services and is not considered by the RIRs as refundable in the event that ICANN ceases operation.
- **Action:** BKK to circulate a copy of the Heathrow Proposal.
- **Action:** GH to encourage the GAR Board to finalise the statement of principles so that it may be published and discussed.

7. Next EC meeting in Yokohama, Japan

- Sunday 14 and Friday 19 July were suggested as the most convenient days for the meeting.
- The morning of Friday 19 July was agreed.
- It was noted that APNIC has reserved hotel rooms for the EC.
- **Action:** EC members to send travel details to Secretariat as soon as possible.

8. AOB

EC election procedure

- It was noted that currently members are able to split their votes across ballot papers. It was noted that splitting votes across a single ballot form had previously been considered as unworkable.
- It was noted that there had been no complaints received about the current system.
- The EC decided that change was not currently required.

AC election procedure

- There was a review of the suggested options raised at the AMM relating to both nominations and voting.
- It was decided to defer further discussion of this issue until the next EC meeting, so that the AMM minutes can be reviewed in detail.
- **Action:** Secretariat to circulate meeting minutes to the EC.

Movement of members between NIRs and RIR

- The problem of member movement between NIRs and RIRs was discussed.
 - It was explained that this issue arose in the context of an individual problem that arose recently. It was suggested that it is undesirable for the Secretariat to be drawn into resolving individual problems. With this in mind, a statement of general principle has been drafted for discussion.
 - It was suggested that a large number of movements from RIR to NIRs could result in a significant loss of income, and that this issue should be re-examined in future.
 - There was a discussion of the justification of per address fess. It was suggested that it would be artificial to charge a per address fee for address space transfers from the RIR to an NIR.
 - It was suggested that due to the recent increase in mergers and acquisitions, and the number of associated transfers of address space, it may be necessary in future to introduce an address transfer fee.
 - It was argued that renumbering is not relevant in this issue and should not be necessary under any circumstances.
 - The background of the current case was discussed in general. It was noted that a large ISP, which is an NIR member, has now joined APNIC. The problem arises in that the NIR is seeking a continuing contribution from the ISP in relation to the address space they are still using from that NIR. The intention of the principles proposed is to avoid the need for an organisation to return address space to the NIR (which may be required under the NIR-ISP contract in this case), and to receive a replacement allocation from APNIC.
 - It was noted that this reflects the general problems that arise out of the differing policies and fee structures in the NIR model.
 - It was noted that this case raises a need for more study of NIR membership issues.
 - The EC was requested to approve the proposed action in this particular case, but to consider the general issues in the future, possibly within the NIR Working Group.
 - It was also suggested to put NIR issues on the agenda for Yokohama.
 - There were no objections to the Secretariat proceeding with its proposed action in this particular case.
- **Action:** NIR issues to be included on agenda for Yokohama meeting.

Meeting closed: 12:30 pm