DotAsia Board Community Projects Committee (BCC) Meeting Minutes	
Date(s) & Time:	Aug 10, 2026 (Mon) 12:30 PM – 13:30 PM (HKT)
Location:	DotAsia Zoom Meeting Room: http://aji.asia/zoomboardcommunity
Attendees:	Edmon CHUNG Rose JAMIESON Boyoung KIM Akinori MAEMURA Rupesh SHRESTHA Amina MEIRASBEK (DotAsia Team) Apologies: Maureen HILYARD 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	Completed. No changes proposed.
C2026.08.A01	Include member engagement discussion as a substantive topic at the F2F meeting.	Edmon CHUNG	Completed.
C2026.08.A02	Report to BGC acceptance of the roles and responsibility description in the updated BGC-001 document by the BCC if no further concerns raised by BCC members on the mailing list	Edmon CHUNG	Completed.

Discussions:

1. Roll Call

1.1. Boyoung KIM chaired the Board Community Project Committee (BCC) meeting on Aug 10, 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 (May 19, 2026)

2.1. Draft 1 of BCC meeting minutes on May 19, 2026 was presented.

2.2. Akinori MAEMURA moved to adopt the minutes, Rupesh SHRESTHA seconded the motion.

2.3. The BCC meeting minutes May 19, 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.

3.1.1. It was highlighted that additional attention was required for APrIGF preparations, and that IGFSA fundraising concepts are being worked out.

3.1.2. A question was raised on which Board members would attend the APNIC meeting in Mumbai and the joint 20th anniversary celebration with APNIC. It was confirmed that Akinori MAEMURA would attend, but the attendance of other Board members had not yet been confirmed.

3.2. NetMission

3.2.1. It was reported that APIGA 2026 had been completed, and that a revamped Model ICANN info-kit developed by the NetMission-led IG InnoLab initiative, had been successfully implemented at APIGA 2026.

3.2.2. Updates were provided on the Asia Pacific Policy Observatory (APPO), which has released its preliminary report on digital public infrastructure and incorporated into this year's APIGA agenda; and, on the NetMission APRALO Study Group, which is working on a public comment response to the DNS Abuse PDP on Associated Domain Checks.

3.2.3. Preparations were underway for the Youth Internet Governance Forum, which is held in conjunction with APrIGF.

3.2.3.1. It was reported that this year's YIGF activities are expected to take place on the two days before the main APrIGF programme. Funding had been confirmed from APNIC and ICANN.

3.2.3.2. A question was raised on the role of NetMission ambassadors in the YIGF. It was explained that the first YIGF was organized by NetMission in 2011, and over the years the model had developed into a coordination effort involving a network of national and regional YIGFs across Asia Pacific.

3.2.4. Recruitment for the next NetMission cohort is scheduled to begin in September. The next academy is expected to take place between December and March as usual.

3.3. APrIGF

3.3.1. It was reported that APrIGF preparations were progressing, although the project remains marked as yellow given the shortened timeline due to the late confirmation from the Kathmandu host.

3.3.2. Two major areas of work were highlighted: coordination of the parliamentary track and outreach to local hubs, including from Taiwan, Japan, Korea, Australia, New Zealand, Hong Kong and Mongolia, along with Bangladesh, the Philippines and India who had also hosted local hubs in previous years.

3.3.3. A question was raised on the parliamentary track and the role being played by DotAsia. It was explained that this year, DotAsia is trying to play a coordination role because the host had been slow to confirm arrangements. For the future years, the team intends to engage earlier with the host and the IGF Secretariat to better clarify the host's capacity and determine at an early stage the level of support required.

3.3.4. A question was raised on the impact of local hubs on the attendance and interaction at the physical meeting in Kathmandu. It was explained that the hubs were intended primarily for people who were unable to travel to Nepal and also new comers who may wish to understand the event better before "investing". Into the time and effort to travel for the APrIGF.

3.3.5. It was reported that AI for supporting APrIGF work has been delayed due to higher than expected costs as well as other technical demands. The project remained as marked in green due to it being an internal initiative and not subject to particular deadlines. Once a viable version is ready, testing will commence.

3.4. Other IG Works

3.4.1. An update was provided on other Internet governance engagements, including preparations for the Nairobi IGF. Several workshop proposals had been submitted, and the work was reported to be progressing as planned.

3.4.2. The status of IGFSA was marked red because the organization had run out of available funds and had paused the distribution of funding to National and Regional Initiatives. As the Secretariat, DotAsia is working with the Executive Council (EC) for fundraising options.

3.4.3. The future of the DIPCC work remained uncertain. The project had been paused following the departure of the individual who had been leading the work at CSC.

3.4.4. Preparations for the AP* meeting in Mumbai were reported to be on track.

3.5. A question was raised on the meaning of the "Board engagement" heading in the scorecard. It was explained that the heading referred to the ways in which the Board could assist with community projects, rather than to a separate project.

4. DotAsia Member Engagement

4.1. The matter of DotAsia Member engagement effort was discussed. It was reported that DotAsia had continued to reach out to Members, however, the ability to identify collaborative projects with Members have proven to be challenging.

4.2. A further question was raised on the purpose of continuing Member engagement activities. It was suggested and agreed that the issue should be considered more fundamentally, including whether the current activities are generating the intended interest and what Members expect DotAsia to provide.

4.3. An observation was shared that the issue involved two related challenges: while DotAsia consider its work in regional and global Internet governance and community development to be important, Members may have a different focus and scope; and, given DotAsia's nature not as a Member benefit organization, Members are sometimes uncertain about their role and obligations.

4.4. It was agreed that member engagement should be included as a substantive topic at the face-to-face meeting. (C2026.08.A01)

5. Review of BGC-001: Roles & Responsibilities of BCC

5.1. An updated description of the BCC's roles and responsibilities under BGC-001 was presented for review. The revised description had been updated to align with the

Articles of Association, DotAsia's strategic plan and the organization's current community engagement work, along with reviewing of the Social Impact Assessment (SIA) reporting and Advisory Council coordination.

5.2. A question was raised on whether there had been significant changes from the previous version and whether the changes could be identified more clearly. It was explained that the document had been substantially revised from the current version which largely referred to the Articles of Association, whereas the revised version incorporates the strategic plan, the SIA framework, etc., which reflects the current scope of the BCC's responsibilities, however the changes had been stable since an earlier draft, and a clean version had previously been circulated.

5.3. A question was raised on whether the BCC needed additional time to consider the document, and whether an additional meeting should be schedueled before the full Board F2F meeting where the adoption of the updated BGC-001 is expected to be considered. It was agreed that no additional BCC meeting need to be convened and that if no concerns were raised by BCC members on the mailing list, the current version would be treated as accepted by the BCC and reported back to the BGC. (C2026.08.A02)

6. Review of BCC-002 and BCC-003

6.1. A review was undertaken of BCC-002 and BCC-003 following from the previous consideration of the APIGA proposal, where the grant recipient was a commercial event-management company.

6.1.1. It was recalled that similar arrangements had previously been used for support related to the ICANN meeting in Beijing and the IGF in Bali. The current application form already allows a commercial company to be identified as the grant recipient, provided that the project itself aligns with DotAsia's vision, mission and community objectives.

6.1.2. There was discussion about whether the documents should include any additional wording on the relationship between the Sponsoring Member, the project and the ultimate grant recipient, or whether the existing provisions were sufficient.

6.1.3. A question was raised on whether the grant recipient should be required to provide documentary evidence of its relationship with the sponsoring DotAsia member and the relevant project. It was clarified that the current process does not require a specific form of documentary proof of the relationship. DotAsia relies on the Sponsoring Member to vet and vouch for the project and the grant recipient, and projects are required to submit a report, including a financial report, explaining how the funds were used, which is not posted publicly.

6.2. It was concluded that the current provisions and reporting requirements were sufficient and that no substantive amendment to BCC-002 or BCC-003 was required at this point.

7. Preparations for AC meeting (22 May)

7.1. Proposed agenda for AC meeting on 14 August was shared and circulated.

7.2. No concerns or amendments were raised on the proposed agenda.