

**APrIGF Program Committee Meeting**

**7 June 2013 (Fri)**

04:00 – 05:30 a.m. (UTC)

Teleconference Call

**Attendees(12):**

Paul Wilson, APNIC

Pablo Hinojosa, APNIC

Sylvia Cadena, ISIF Asia

Cheryl Langdon Orr, Australia

Kenny Huang, TWNIC

Izumi Aizu, Japan

Jian Zhang, APTLD

Shreedeep Rayamajhi, Nepal

KeeChang Kim, South Korea

Adam Peake, GLOCOM

Hong Xue, China

Sana Shams, Pakistan

**Local Host & Secretariat(2):**

Ji-young Lee, KISA

Dongman Lee, KIGA

**APrIGF Secretariat(1):**

Yannis Li, DotAsia Organisation

**Apologies(2):**

Keith Davidson, Internet NZ

Edmon, DotAsia Organisation

**Agenda:**

1. Review of Minutes and Action Items

2. Workshops Proposals Evaluation

3. Updates from Local Host

4. Implementation of MSG Operating Principles

5. National/Regional IGF Session in Bali

6. A.O.B

**Proceedings:**

1. Review of Minutes and Action Items

* No amendment was suggested to the minutes and it was adopted.
* Secretariat has made the announcement on extension of workshop submission deadline
* Paul has circulated the workshop evaluation criteria
* The program skeleton has been circulated
* Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Keith Davidson, Sylvia Cadera, Adam Peak, Izumi Aizu, Shreedeep Rayamajhi, Duangthip Chomprang and the Secretariat formed the subcommittee to discuss the regional inputs to IGF Bali. Cheryl will be taking the lead and act as the rapporteur to the MSG.

2. Workshop Proposals Evaluation

* Paul proposed the below criteria for the evaluation which is adopted by the MSG:
* Relevance
Is the proposal relevant to the themes of this APrIGF meeting?  Are the themes clearly stated and/or evident in the proposal?  Are the specific issues to be addressed by the proposal also clear and relevant?
* Completeness
Does the proposal provide all information as requested in the CFP, specifically:  discussion theme and issues, format and approach, and panelists.  Is this information clear and complete enough to properly describe an acceptable proposal?  Does it appear than panellists are actually confirmed, or are they just invited, or only proposed?
* Diversity
Will the proposed session represent viewpoints from multiple stakeholder, geographic, economic and/or cultural perspectives?  Are listed panelists properly qualified to represent one or more distinct stakeholder groups?  Will the session contribute to the overall diversity and multi-stakeholder representation of the APrIGF event?
* Action:
Paul to send out a Call for volunteers to be the evaluating committee. Affiliation of stakeholder groups must be stated to ensure a balance of viewpoints while the committee is serving on their individual capacity. (1. Civil Society, 2. Technical and Academic, 3. Business, 4. Governmental)
* The top 19 proposals will be selected and further identify which one could be the plenary sessions and be proposed in the next meeting to the MSG.
* All the MSG members are encouraged to outreach to their network and invite people to submit proposals before the deadline and join APrIGF.

3. Updates from Local Host

* Dongman Lee of KIGA raised the question of whether the Korean government, MISP could be co-host of the APrIGF 2013. Consensus has been reached among MSG members on having the Korean Government to be the co-host of APrIGF 2013 whereas the below are considered:
* Better outreach to other governments
* Better engagement of Government Stakeholder Group in the planning process
* Maintaining good relationship with and support from the Korean government
* Meeting Venues & Accomodation:
* Exact Room numbers to be confirmed depending on the school schedule
* Cafeteria are ready for lunch
* Hotel Rate is still under negotiation. MSG advised to have some mid-range option as well.

4. MSG Operating Principles

* Secretariat to call for suggestion on the implementation issues.

5. National/Regional IGF Session in Bali

* The sub-committee will host a call meeting next week to further discuss and report back to the MSG in the next meeting.

6. A.O.B

* None

The next meeting is scheduled to be on 21th Jun (Fri) 04:00-05:30am (UTC).