



- 🔍 SIGs
- 🔍 Open NIR
- 🔍 Program
- 🔍 AMM
- 🔍 EC election
- 🔍 HM consultation
- 🔍 Sponsorship
- 🔍 Minutes
- 🔍 Past meetings
- 🔍 Meeting home
- 🔍 APNIC home

13th APNIC Open Policy Meeting

APNIC Member Meeting

Friday 7 March, Queen Sirikit National Convention Center, Bangkok

Minutes

Meeting commenced: 09:15

Chair: Che-Hoo Cheng

The Director General (DG), Paul Wilson, introduced the meeting and thanked the sponsor for this meeting, TWNIC. The DG explained the agenda and outlined the procedure and times for the Executive Council election.

Contents

1. [APNIC Annual Report](#)
2. [Executive Council report](#)
3. [APNIC forward plan and budget](#)
4. [MyAPNIC project update](#)
5. [Questions and discussions about APNIC reports](#)
6. [EC election preparations and candidate speeches](#)

SIG & NIR Meeting reports

7. [Database SIG](#)
8. [Reverse DNS SIG](#)
9. [Routing SIG](#)
10. [IX SIG](#)
11. [IPv6 SIG](#)
12. [Address policy](#)
13. [NIR Meeting](#)
14. [Address Council elections](#)

RIR reports

15. [ARIN status report](#)
16. [RIPE NCC status report](#)
17. [LACNIC status report](#)
18. [AfriNIC status report](#)
19. [EC election result](#)
20. [Next meeting](#)
21. [Closing words](#)

Presentations

1. APNIC Annual Report

[\[Presentation\]](#)

Paul Wilson

- This presentation provided a summary of the main issues in the Annual Report for 2001.
- It was noted that membership growth has slowed down, to a large extent due to mergers and acquisitions. Factors which may influence growth rates in 2002 were discussed.
- There was an overview of resource allocation rates, including the fact that APNIC allocated more IPv4 addresses than RIPE NCC in 2001; a review of the distribution of allocations; and the observation that ASN requests have slowed down.

- There was also a suggestion to implement the proposal but allow ISPs who are currently in the business of providing ASNs to their customers to continue doing so.
- There was an argument that the proposed amendment should not be made, as the nature of ASNs is that they are a portable resource.
- It was clarified that the intention of the amendment would be to allow users to request an ASN either from their provider (on a non-portable basis) or to apply directly from APNIC.
- There was a suggestion to create a working group to deal with this issue; however, it was argued that the issue may be too specific for a dedicated working group. It was decided to deal with this issue by continuing the normal review process and contributing comments to the mailing list.

Cable/DSL proposal

- It was suggested that there are rapid developments in this area and it is important to not make policies that are too technology-specific. However, it was noted that the proposal in question was intended to be made part of a guideline document, not a policy, to allow for greater responsiveness.

There was a presentation of gifts to the SIG Chairs. It was also noted that significant progress had been made in the development of global IPv6 policy and that thanks were due to the group which worked hard to achieve that, led by Arano-san.

[Top](#)

13. NIR Meeting

[\[Presentation\]](#)

Akinori Maemura, Equant

- The presenter described the background to the NIR meeting, noted that this meeting was very well attended, and reviewed the topics which were discussed. The increased cooperation between NIRs and APNIC was noted.
- It was noted that the meeting had resolved to form a working group to progress the development of the NIR document and that the NIR Chair will propose a schedule for this task shortly.
- It was noted that the NIR meeting is open to all, as are the nir-discuss and wg-nir mailing lists.

Questions and discussion

No further discussions.

[Top](#)

14. Address Council elections

Che-Hoo Cheng

- This presentation summarised concerns that the current AC election procedures give too much advantage to the meeting host country. Concerns were also reported regarding the need to ensure that nominees are properly qualified.
- The presentation raised two possibilities:
 - Form a nominations committee to nominate appropriately qualified AC candidates
 - Extend the APNIC membership structure to allow individual members and then require APNIC membership vote only.
- There was a suggestion of disqualifying the host country from voting, but this was rejected as being unfair.
- It was suggested that individual memberships raise the problems of "At Large" memberships. However, it was also suggested that the nominating committee also raises some political problems.
- There was also a suggestion of establishing some form of web-based pre-registration system.
- It was noted that another suggestion made previously was to open a new APNIC individual membership at a low fee, with voting rights restricted to AC elections only.
- There was also a suggestion of allowing votes only to those who had attended two of the previous two meetings. There was a counter suggestion of making the requirement attendance at one previous APNIC meeting.
- There was a discussion about the validity of a nominating committee.
- There was discussion about whether an individual membership category should attract a fee. It was noted that it would be destructive to allow the perception that APNIC could use such a category for revenue raising. However, it was argued that there should be some fee, although it may be on a strictly cost-recovery basis.
- It was suggested that basing the voting eligibility on prior attendance would be very hard to administer.
- The following options were put to the AMM for consideration:

Nominations

- a. Maintain the current system (open nominations by anyone)
- b. Use a nominations committee (similar to the IETF structure)

There was consensus to maintain the status quo for nominations

Voting

- a. Maintain the status quo (Anyone at meeting can vote)
 - b. Base criteria on meeting attendance (People can vote if they have attended APNIC meetings, or are an APNIC member)
 - c. Restrict to APNIC membership (But implement a low-cost individual membership; which could allow for proxy votes)
 - d. None of the above (The issue needs work, but more thought is required)
- The discussion was deferred to allow participants time to consider the options.

[Break: 15:45 - 16:00]

- The AMM was asked to provide its opinion on the best AC election option. It was noted that, at this stage, the opinion of the AMM is only intended to inform the EC of the membership preference and not to be considered a binding decision.
- There was roughly equal support for options 2 and 3 (and only limited support for options 1 and 4).
- It was noted that the result of this discussion is unclear. It was noted that the AMM appears to be of the opinion that the process needs change, but more work is required to define the best option.

[Top](#)

RIR reports

15. ARIN status report

[\[Presentation\]](#)

Ray Plzak, ARIN

- This presentation provided an update of recent ARIN activities, membership status, Secretariat status, an update of emerging registries, an overview of the ARIN AC election procedure, and details of the next meeting.
- It was noted that the new ARIN web site is due to be launched on 15 March.
- It was announced that a joint ARIN/NANOG meeting is being planned.
- It was mentioned that return on ARIN's investment of its reserve is likely to be invested in outreach activities.
- It was noted that ARIN will soon be providing a formal letter of support for AfriNIC.

Questions and discussion

No further discussions.

[Top](#)

16. RIPE NCC status report

Axel Pawlik, RIPE NCC

- This presentation provided an update of recent RIPE NCC activities, membership status, Secretariat status, an overview of the ARIN AC election procedure, and details of the next meeting.
- It was noted that the membership growth trends in Europe are very similar to those reported for the Asia Pacific region.

Questions and discussion

No further discussions.

[Top](#)

17. LACNIC status report

German Valdez, LACNIC