APrIGF Multi-Stakeholder Steering Group (MSG) Meeting
30 Apr 2015 (Thursday)
Adobe Connect
05:00 – 06:00 (UTC)

Attendees(9):
Chester Soong, ISOC Hong Kong (Civil Society) – Vice Chair
Edmon Chung, DotAsia Organisation
Hiro Hotta, JPRS (Technical/Private Sector)
Hong Xue, Beijing Normal University (Academia)
Jia-Rong Low, ICANN (Technical)
Noelle de Guzman, ISOC (Civil Society)
Paul Wilson, APNIC (Technical) - Chair
Pablo Hinojosa, APNIC (Technical)
Connie Chan, APNIC

APrIGF Secretariat:
Yannis Li, DotAsia Organisation

Local Host of 2015:
Kary Fong, HNET.Asia
Holmes Leong, HNET.Asia

Agenda:
1. Minutes and Action Items Review
2. Preparation for APrIGF Macao 2015
   • Local Host & Secretariat Updates
   • Selection of workshop proposals & Program
3. Election Voting Rules and Procedure
4. A.O.B
Proceedings:

1. Minutes and Actions Items Review
   • The minutes of 31 Mar 2015 has been revised and adopted.

Action Items:
   ▪ Secretariat to circulate the minutes of 16 Apr meeting to the MSG for review and to be adopted in the next meeting.

2. Preparation for APrIGF Macao 2015
   • Local Host Updates –
     ▪ The local host updated that due to the budget consideration and the low registration rate who have uploaded the requested documents for the government funding, there is a venue change suggestion to the Macau University of Science & Technology.
     ▪ Chung added that the suggested accommodation will remain the same and shuttle will likely be provided to-and-from the meeting venue. The meeting venue is around 8-10 minutes walking distance from the accommodation.
     ▪ There is no comments or objection from the MSG. The local host will start to arrange for the new venue to save cost and in the mean time continue to try applying for the government funding.

Comments:
   ▪ Low raised that the minutes from 31 Mar noted that the deadline for registration to confirm funding is 20 May instead of the currently newly suggested deadline 10 May for the relocation decision which therefore not much effort has been put to push the registration number. Leong replied that the University could provide better facilities and also Internet requirement. The charge for the University venue is about MOP60,000 while the hotel costs about MOP400,000 which is comparatively higher.

   • Selection of Workshop Proposals & Program -
     ▪ The secretariat is working with the local host on the venue capacity to finalize the number of proposals to be accepted.

Action Items:
   ▪ Secretariat to circulate the finalized list of workshops to be accepted for comments and approval.

3. Election Voting Rules and Procedure
   • The short survey about the Election Voting Rules and Procedure has been circulated to the MSG earlier with 10 questions in total. A total of 15 responses have been received.
   • Survey Results:
     1) Who can vote in an MSG leadership position election?
        a. (5) □ Anyone volunteered to be on the MSG
        b. (10) □ Active members of the MSG
     2) Definition of an "Active member"
a. (2) □ No need to define “Active member” (Select this if chosen (a) in 1.)
b. (5) □ Have participated on the MSG (meeting, teleconference, mailing list, voted, etc.) at least once in the preceding year (since last election)
c. (2) □ Have contributed to the APrIGF (helped promote APrIGF, coordinated in outreach, etc.) at least once in the preceding year (since last election)
d. (1) □ Have joined the MSG for at least 1 year
e. (4) □ (b) OR (c) OR (d) (Members fulfill either of it)
f. □ Other: (c and d)

3) Should proxy votes be administered?
   a. (10) □ No (not necessary given online voting accepted over a reasonable length of time)
   b. (3) □ Yes (any eligible voter can hold or delegate his/her vote)
   c. □ Yes, but proxy holder cannot be a candidate
   d. (2) □ Yes, but proxy holder cannot be a candidate or on the Elections Committee

4) Should a minimum participation (quorum: number/percentage of voters voted) be required?
   a. (4) □ >50% of eligible voters: 80/60/51%
   b. (2) □ 50% of eligible voters
   c. (4) □ 15% of eligible voters
   d. (3) □ At least 10 votes casted
   e. (2) □ No minimum should be required
   f. □ Other:

5) Option to abstain
   a. (9) □ There should be an option to “abstain” on a ballot
   b. (5) □ No “abstain” option but MSG members could forfeit/surrender its voting rights ahead of voting period (so they will not be counted for quorum calculation)
   c. (1) □ Other: We need only avail ‘abstain’ obtain if voting is made compulsory

6) Should an Election Committee be formed, if so how should it be formed?
   a. (5) □ No Election Committee should be formed
   b. □ By self-nomination
   c. □ By random selection
   d. (6) □ By self-nomination and then by random selection if more self-nominations are received than number of seats (3 persons) in the Election Committee
   e. (3) □ Appointment by Chair
   f. □ Other:

7) Election format (counting of votes / declaring the winner):
   a. (9) □ One vote per ballot – One Round, simple majoritarian principle, candidate with most votes win
   b. (3) □ One vote per ballot – Two Rounds, leading candidate must obtain >50% votes or >25% lead (against 2nd place) or top 2 (or tied) candidates enter a 2nd round of voting
   c. (3) □ Multiple votes per ballot – Ranked Preference System: candidate most preferred wins
   d. □ Mutiple votes per ballot – Multiple Votes (no weighting on ranking/preference): candidate with most votes wins
   e. □ Other:

8) Should there be a term limit for the Chair and Vice-Chairs?
   a. (1) □ No
b. (13) □ Yes, 2 terms (4 years)
c. (1) □ Yes, 3 terms (6 years)
d. □ Yes, 4 terms (8 years)

9) How long after reaching such limit should a candidate be eligible to run again as a candidate?
   a. (14) □ 2 years
   b. □ 3 years
   c. (1) □ 4 years

10) How long should the voting period be?
    a. (1) □ 3 days
    b. (7) □ 1 week
    c. (6) □ 2 weeks
    d. (1) □ 4 weeks

Comments:
- Wilson commented that the conclusion needs to be written in coherence with the procedure and suggested the Sub-Committee to continue to work on that as soon as possible.
- Chung raised that most of the results are actionable but Q4 about the quorum requirement which showed a tie. Due to the big spread over choices of 15% and 50%, he suggested a percentage in the range between these 2 numbers to strike a balance and workable average.
- Low mentioned that apart from Q4, Q2 and Q6 shall also be looked into due to the small differences between the top 2 preferences.

Action Item:
- The Sub-Committee to finalize the voting rules and procedure based on the survey results and provide recommendations.

4. A.O.B
   • Next meeting date.

Action Item:
- The secretariat to send out the doodle poll for the next 2 bi-weekly meetings in May.

Summary of Actions Items
1. Adopted the revised minutes of 31 Mar 2015 meeting
2. Secretariat to circulate the minutes of 16 Apr meeting to the MSG for review and to be adopted in the next meeting.
3. Secretariat to circulate the finalized list of workshops to be accepted for comments and approval
4. The Sub-Committee to finalize the voting rules and procedure based on the survey results and provide recommendations.
5. The secretariat to send out the doodle poll for the next 2 bi-weekly meetings in May.

The next meeting date and time is to be determined by doodle poll.