

AP* Retreat - 53rd Meeting
08 February 2026
9:00 AM - 16:30 PM (GMT+7)
MR8, Sheraton Grand Jakarta Gandaria City
Co-Chairs: Alban Kwan and Yien Chyn Tan
Coordinated and Supported
by DotAsia Organisation (Edmon Chung, Phyo Thiri Lwin and Rani Retmnono)
Special Thanks to the APRICOT team for the kind support.

In-person Attendees:

1. Achmad Husni Thamrin
2. Akinori Maemura
3. Alban Kwan
4. Boyoung Kim
5. Edmon Chung
6. HIROFUMI HOTTA
7. Jean F. Queralt
8. Jo-Fan Yu
9. Jonathan Brewer
10. Joyce Chen
11. Maureen Hilyard
12. Marcos Sadao Maekawa
13. Noriatsu Kudo
14. Ole Jacobsen
15. Phyo Thiri Lwin
16. Rupesh Shrestha
17. Satish Babu
18. Shaista Zaib
19. Thomas Barrett
20. Thy Boskovic
21. Toshiaki Tateishi
22. Yien Chyn Tan

Online Attendees:

1. Amrita Choudhury
2. Anthony Lee
3. Cheryl Langdon-Orr
4. Hsuping Tang
5. Md Selim Reza
6. Pavel Farhan

AP* Meeting at APRICOT 2026 in Jakarta, Indonesia

I. Welcome and Introduction

The meeting opened with welcome remarks from AP* co-chairs Alban Kwan and Yien Chyn Tan, emphasizing the collaborative spirit of the AP* community and its evolving role in Asia Pacific technical coordination and Internet governance.

II. Technical Coordination- Infrastructure Deployment & Capacity Building

This session, led by Noelle Francesca de Guzman (ISOC) and the AP co-chairs, focused on mapping technical initiatives and bridging resource gaps across the Asia-Pacific region.

The Technical Coordination segment focused on mapping existing technical initiatives across AP* organizations and identifying gaps, overlaps, and coordination opportunities in infrastructure deployment and technical training. The session highlighted confusion around the term “capacity building,” which can be used to describe both infrastructure development (e.g., IXPs, fiber deployment) and human skills training, underscoring the need for clearer definitions.

Participants shared a wide range of activities, including IXP support, advanced technical training, digital badge implementation, curriculum development, and policy engagement with governments.

Key challenges identified included funding constraints, regulatory barriers preventing infrastructure deployment, limited manpower and scalability, talent retention issues, fragmented information sharing, and lack of standardized or updated curricula. The group also emphasized the importance of integrating technical training with policy awareness, as enabling regulatory environments are essential for deployment success. A major strategic concern was impact measurement, with participants

questioning whether current efforts focus too heavily on activity-based KPIs rather than long-term outcomes.

Overall, the discussion positioned AP* as a coordination and dialogue platform to strengthen ecosystem alignment, reduce inefficiencies, and move toward outcome-driven technical initiative deployment .

III. AP* Community Coordination- Sponsorship Alignment

The session, led by the AP* co-chairs Yien Chyn and Alban, introduced the central problem statement: whether the AP* community should serve as a platform to share data regarding regional sponsorship requests. The discussion aimed to address the visibility gap between various funding bodies in the Asia-Pacific region.

The conversation was prompted by historical coordination efforts such as APASA, which initially helped align sponsorship support for Schools of Internet Governance and NRIs but later lost relevance due to opacity concerns and evolving institutional processes. While multi-stakeholder support is a cornerstone of Internet governance projects, a lack of transparency between funders can lead to an inefficient allocation of limited resources. By identifying these overlaps, the community can ensure that funds are stretched further to support a broader range of regional initiatives.

The session transitioned into a practical sharing of fund management strategies, anchored by Shaista Zaib from the APNIC Foundation. She detailed the specific workflows and approval processes currently used to vet and manage sponsorship intakes. This was followed by an open floor discussion where participants shared their own experiences.

The dialogue revealed a common struggle: most organizations rely heavily on the "good faith" of applicants, as there is currently no standardized way to verify if a project has already secured sufficient funding from other AP* partners.

Participants highlighted recurring challenges, including duplication of funding requests, lack of transparency in decision-making, inconsistent sponsorship practices, and administrative burden on applicants. While some fund providers expressed concern about duplication and risk management, fund recipients emphasized that multiple sponsorships are often necessary for grassroots initiatives to survive.

Separately, the conversation also called for a clear distinction between sponsorships (smaller, faster, less formal funding) and grants (larger, highly structured, compliance-heavy processes).

The discussion leaned toward a “light-touch coordination” approach, where AP* could improve transparency and accessibility—such as maintaining updated funding links, sharing application guidance, or offering mentorship—without centralizing funding decisions or restricting autonomy. Overall, the session positioned AP* as a facilitator of information sharing and process improvement rather than a centralized sponsorship coordination body.

IV. Updates & Next Steps from Previous AP* Discussions

WSIS+20 Review: Updates from Review process and potential impacts to the technical community + what's next

Amrita Choudhury (representing the Informal Multistakeholder Sounding Board, IMSB) highlighted that the WSIS+20 review process stood out for its openness and transparency, enabling meaningful participation from non-governmental stakeholders and introducing the IMSB as a pioneering effort to integrate multistakeholder input into UN processes. She noted that the outcome document reflects both compromise and progress, reaffirming a people-centred, inclusive, and development-oriented information society, strengthening multistakeholder cooperation, and granting the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) a permanent mandate with sustainable support for its secretariat and continued work through intersessional activities and National and Regional Initiatives (NRIs), while stressing that inclusive implementation—particularly involving the technical community and stakeholders from the Global South—remains critical.

Complementing this perspective, Akinori Maemura (representing the Technical Community Coalition for multistakeholderism, TCCM) emphasised that WSIS+20 was the result of careful multistakeholder consultations and welcomed the permanence of the IGF, while noting that it will now face greater scrutiny regarding its effectiveness. Drawing from his work with Japan IGF, he underlined the need for NRIs and the broader technical community to deliver tangible impact and maintain trust in Internet infrastructure coordination, especially in light of governance challenges such as those faced by AFRINIC. He also suggested that multistakeholderism should be understood not only as

equal participation but as shared responsibility, where different stakeholders actively address digital challenges through their respective capabilities.

The session emphasized that the technical community plays a critical role in implementing WSIS+20 outcomes. With the IGF now permanent and NRIs gaining greater recognition, initiatives such as national IGFs will be expected to demonstrate greater impact and effectiveness. Speakers also highlighted the need to reconsider the interpretation of multistakeholderism. While often framed as equal participation rights, it should also be understood as shared responsibility, where each stakeholder group contributes according to its expertise and capability to address digital governance challenges.

Capacity Building Program Coordination-- Updates from previous AP* Meeting

This discussion revisited an earlier proposal to create a shared fellowship information sharing system to improve coordination across capacity-building programs. The primary objective was to exchange information informally regarding fellows to facilitate application reviews when these fellows apply for other programs with partner organizations across the AP* community. However, legal concerns were raised, particularly around cross-border data sharing, consent requirements, and privacy laws. Participants also expressed concerns about subjectivity in review of fellows, which may potentially create the risk of soft blacklisting, and the potential to unfairly limit growth opportunities for fellows who may need time to develop.

While the shared database proposal will not proceed at this stage, there was broad agreement to continue coordination through alternative mechanisms such as sharing best practices on fellowship selection (e.g. how AI generated applications are reviewed), aligning codes of conduct, improving evaluation frameworks, and exploring positive recognition tools like digital badges. AP* will remain a platform for dialogue and structured knowledge exchange rather than a centralized fellowship data authority.

Wrap Up from Task Force Work

The session shared final updates from the AP* Task Force discussions. The Task Force (consisting of representatives from APNOG, ISOC, ICANN, APNIC, APNG, APIX, APAN) worked through May-Nov 2025 to revamp and align on the AP* community's objective and structure.

This segment shared updates on final topics including roles of AP* co-chairs, local hosts, and secretariat. Updated aspects for the AP* The community can be found on the [website](#).