DotAsia Board Community Projects Committee (BCC) Meeting Minutes

Date(s) & Time:	May 19, 2026 (Tue) 12:00 PM – 13:05 PM (HKT)
Location:	DotAsia Zoom Meeting Room: http://aji.asia/zoomboardcommunity
Attendees:	Edmon CHUNG Rose JAMIESON Maureen HILYARD Boyoung KIM Akinori MAEMURA Rupesh SHRESTHA Jennifer CHUNG (DotAsia Team) Amina MEIRASBEK (DotAsia Team) Apologies: Jo-Fan YU

No.	Action Items:	Owner	Remarks
C2026.03.A02	Develop a proposed timeline and consultation process for the 2027–2030 Strategic Plan	BoardSec	In Progress.
C2026.05.A01	Revisit the SCP rule and legal framing around sponsor-member-related projects, and seek further legal advice if needed.	Edmon CHUNG	To be discussed at next BCC meeting.
C2026.05.A02	Bring the APIGA SCP application to the AC, BFC, and full Board for consideration.	Edmon CHUNG	Completed.

Discussions:

1. Roll Call

1.1. Boyoung KIM chaired the Board Community Project Committee (BCC) meeting on May 19, 2026.

1.2. Roll call. Those present for all or part of the meeting are included in the Attendees section.

2. Adoption of Last BCC Meeting Minutes (Mar 31, 2026)

2.1. Draft 1 of BCC meeting minutes on Mar 31, 2026 was presented.

2.2. Maureen HILYARD moved to adopt the minutes, Rupesh SHRESTHA seconded the motion.

2.3. The BCC meeting minutes Mar 31, 2026 were adopted.

3. Community Project Quarterly Scorecard

3.1. The Quarterly Community Projects Scorecard was circulated and presented. It was reported that core projects are progressing well overall, and that the status of APrIGF has been moved from red to yellow with the confirmation of the host and venue in Kathmandu.

3.1.1. It was noted that the overall status of APrIGF remains as yellow due the condensed preparation timeline, and that the backup venue in Hong Kong remains penciled in.

3.1.2. A question was raised about the backup venue in Hong Kong. It was explained that the concept is to have a rolling backup into the future each year and that a longer-term plan is being discussed with the HKCSS (venue in Hong Kong).

3.2. It was also noted that Rani had returned from maternity leave, and will pick up on leading the APrIGF Secretariat work. Appreciation is expressed for Yannis Li in helping out during Rani's leave of absence.

3.3. It was reported that Member engagement work and semiannual outreach to Members was underway again.

3.4. It was shared that Jennifer CHUNG was officially appointed as the IGF MAG Chair. The BFC congratulated Jennifer on the appointment.

3.5. APIGA 2026 will be held in Busan in July, and it was reported that preparation work is progressing well.

3.6. It was noted that the status for IGFSA is yellow because of its funding challenges.

3.7. Some background information about IGFSA was shared, including that it was establish to fill funding gaps both for the IGF Secretariat as well as for NRIs and that the latter has become more important as the number of NRIs has grown.

3.7.1. It was noted that the big donors have gradually withdrawn, including ICANN, ISOC, the NROS, leaving IGFSA short of funds. A number of the grants and disbursements were being paused while fundraising ideas were explored.

3.7.2. A discussion then followed on possible fundraising approaches, including gala dinners at events and other event-based fundraising activities. Online fundraising was described as less effective because of the difficulty of reaching the right audience.

3.7.3. A question was raised as to why the donors had withdrawn their support. In response, it was explained that each organization appeared to have its own reasons, including a shift in donor strategy, leadership changes, the creation of internal grant mechanisms, and a desire for more control or exposure in how funding was allocated.

3.7.4. Another question was raised on the distinction between the IGF Trust Fund and IGFSA. It was responded that the trust fund is as a UN-managed fund with strict eligibility and due diligence requirements, while IGFSA is a more flexible mechanism that could support recognized initiatives as well as fund the IGF Secretariat activities which cannot be supported by the IGF Trust Fund.

3.7.5. A concern was raised that the situation was not sustainable if all large donors continued to withdraw. It was suggested that the issue be raised further with the AC for broader input on the matter.

4. APrIGF Local Hubs

4.1. The idea of strengthening of APrIGF local hub model was shared. It was noted that workshop proposals would now be asked to explain how they would involve local hubs.

4.2. It was further explained that the key value of a local hub is not only remote viewing, but also local networking and discussion before and after the sessions.

4.3. A comment was made about using DotAsia's membership network more proactively and considering a program design that would encourage members in different countries to local hub activities.

5. SCP Applications

5.1. Two SCP applications were received and presented for consideration. It was noted that while the application from IP Journal received through APNOG is generally acceptable, it is not complete and is awaiting further clarifications.

5.2. The second application received was for APIGA received through KISA, in particular for 10th anniversary of APIGA.

5.2.1. It was reported that based on staff team assessment, the application is a good fit with DotAsia's mission and vision, and that the apiga.asia domain is already actively being used. It was also noted that DotAsia already supports the APIGA initiative by sending staff as mentors and youth leaders from NetMission alumni to the annual event, that the program is generally funded by ICANN and KISA, and that the requested amount is within the available SCP funds and represents a small component of the larger budget for the entire event.

5.2.2. It was also highlighted that the grant recipient is a commercial events management company, and that there had been precedence for such arrangements, including for supporting the ICANN meetings in Beijing and the IGF meetings in Bali.

5.2.3. There was discussion about the nature of the grant recipient company, its role and concerns for the SCP funding a private company. It was clarified that the company is directly involved in the event production of APIGA and is a long-time partner, and that the funds are directly for supporting APIGA as a youth Internet Governance project.

5.2.4. The presentation of the reporting of the project was discussed. Questions about the transparency and appropriate entities to be reported were raised. It was explained that the project name will be APIGA and that that grant recipient cannot be a DotAsia Member.

5.2.5. A further question was raised on whether the rule prohibiting SCP funds from being spent directly on Members should be revisited. It was explained that the existing structure reflects legal advice received for DotAsia's non-profit status, in that income must not be shared to Members. It was agreed that the matter could be discussed and legal advice sought further. (C2026.05.A02)

5.2.6. The BCC supported the SCP application for APIGA to proceed for circulation to the AC, BFC and full Board for the approval process. (C2026.05.A03)

6. Preparations for AC meeting (22 May)

6.1. Proposed agenda for AC meeting on 22 May was shared and circulated.

6.2. It was noted that AC members would also be asked to share their opinion on IGFSA fundraising, SCP applications, and APrIGF local hubs.

7. 20th Anniversary Celebrations & Board F2F Meeting

7.1. Plans for DotAsia's 20th anniversary celebration were discussed, noting that it would be organized around events in both APNIC Mumbai and APTLD90 in Ulaanbaatar, where the Board F2F meeting is being planned.

7.2. It was noted that the venue for APTLD90 hasn't been publicly announced yet, but the team is coordinating with .MN on logistical matters.

7.3. Tentative dates for the Board meeting were shared as September 12-13, with APTLD 90 scheduled for September 14-17.