



# **ITS Asia-Pacific Board of Directors Meeting**

## **Online (zoom)**

### **Date and Time: May 17, 2023, 15:00-16:00 (Tokyo)**

#### **Draft Minutes**

Chaired by William Sabandar, ITS Indonesia

#### **1. Establishment of the AP-BOD meeting**

With 10 of 11 APBOD members attendance, the meeting was established.

#### **2. Confirmation of Minutes of last AP-BOD meetings**

Draft minutes of the last meeting (April 11, 2023, Suzhou) were approved.

#### **3. Venue selection method of World Congress on ITS in the Asia-Pacific Region**

##### Resolutions:

- ITSAP BOD agreed to adopt the voting method as below:
  - ITS AP member organizations score 1 or 0 to each item of Criteria for candidate cities, according to whether which country has got the BEST compliance with the criteria.
  - "1" should be given to only one candidate city. "0" should be given to the rest candidate cities.
  - The candidate city which gets the highest total score shall obtain one vote by the ITS Organization.
  - The candidate city with the highest number of votes from APBOD is a winner.
  - Scoring sheets are shared with all member organizations. ("Open System")
  - Candidate City ITS Organizations can also have rights to vote.
- ITSAP BOD approved the 7 items of the selection criteria proposed by AP Secretariat.
- ITSAP Secretariat will finalize the Criteria, especially on Item 7 with ITS Australia and ITS New Zealand.
- ITSAP BOD will also adopt the above voting method to Asia Pacific ITS Forum host city selection from APF2027 selection.

##### Discussion details:

Chair William Sabandar introduced the matrix submitted by AP Secretariat on the opinions collected from the member organizations and summarized as below:

##### Summary:

Transparencies were agreed by 10 members,  
Majority preferred to use the criteria, and  
Voting methods "B" and "C" were equally supported.

AP Secretariat Takaaki Segi reminded that if Method "B" was selected, the ITSAP BOD members also needed to decide the detailed voting procedure, which should be reflected to the AP MoU document.

##### Open discussion:

Dean Zabrieszach appreciated AP Secretariat for the matrix and commented that it was clear that the majority favored the transparent arrangement which should not need debate any further, and the majority supported to have the certain number of criteria. About scoring, he wanted to know why the four countries which chose the voting method "B" didn't want to score the criteria even they agreed to have the criteria.



Lee McKenzie agreed to Dean's comments and added that it was confusing that the matrix showed that clear signal from the board that we wanted the transparency but it did not mean that the criteria should be scored. She said it was important for the unsuccessful candidates to understand how the criteria was scored.

Takehiko Barada showed the excel sheet as a scoring example, and said that ITS Japan would agree to have the criteria but it would be just for the internal purpose as the reference for reflection by the unsuccessful candidates, not for scoring.

He said as a personal opinion that scoring would depend on each country's opinion at 100% which could not be so fair. There were no global fairness criteria, or methods to be put down to criteria. But he agreed to have some criteria as the reference for losers even the opinions from each country were different on scoring.

Yoojin Chang said ITS Korea would agree to the criteria with the seven items suggested by ITSAP with 3point scale, however, he said the selection method should not be changed until the bidding date once we decided.

William Sabandar said that ITS Indonesia supported the criteria which would be the useful guidance for the members to come to the conclusion. He said scoring would be an internal process of the members and agreed to have the criteria.

Dean Zabrieszach said there had been a set of the criteria since the first day when he became a member of ITSAP BOD 16-17 years ago. He said in the past there had always been the implied criteria like capacity for exhibition, financial capability, and the country was expected to make a blanket assessment just Yes or No, then the new voting system was suggested 4-5 years ago which was objectively evaluating the criteria. He understood the problem raised by Barada about the scoring this time.

He proposed to abandon 5-1 or 3-1 scale scoring and suggested simply ONE or ZERO scoring, according to whether which country has got the BEST compliance with the criteria, which is very simple but evaluating objectively each criterion. Adding all Ones in vertical column, whichever has the highest gains one vote from a country/area. He said the members might go back to each one-country-one-vote like we did for previous 15 years if they didn't like that.

AP Secretariat and ITS Korea ensured with Dean that One point was given only to one candidate and Zero to the others.

Dean Zabrieszach said this would be the fair, transparent and objective process which should be also difficult to be manipulated.

The scoring process proposed by ITS Australia was agreed by the members.

Murphy Sun asked if the candidate could vote.

William Sabandar confirmed the candidate could vote.

Brian Negus supported the agreed voting method as it prioritized transparency and was consistent with one-country-one-vote principle which ITS Australia talked about for many years and was the powerful point in terms of fairness and equity.

Fred Kalt added that the fairness was the main point here and said that at the end of the day, that was still a decision of the country how to score, so if you really wanted one country to win, it was your decision how to come up with the scoring. He said independence of decision making was still within the country and scoring was a tool which we should use to make it transparent and fair.



ITS AP BOD members agreed to adopt the open voting with 1-0 scoring in “B” voting method proposed by ITS Australia as the selection method for the venue of ITSWC.

William Sabandar appreciated the two criteria proposals by ITS Australia and ITS New Zealand asked AP Secretariat to explain the criteria proposal.

Takaaki Segi explained that the criteria proposed by AP Secretariat which was based on the one from ITS Australia, and No 4,5,6 & 8 in Australian criteria were integrated as one topic since they were flexible at the time of selection.

Brian Negus agreed they were actually very similar and the 7 items would work for us.  
Dean Zabrieszach said ITS Australia could accept it.

Lee McKenzie requested to consider the timing of country hosting ITSWC and ITS AP proximity into the criteria with the right words.

Mike Rudge suggested changing “Student Programs” to “Student and Diversity Programs”.

APBOD members accepted the 7 items criteria proposed by AP Secretariat, and Chair requested AP secretariat to work on item 7 wording with ITS Australia and ITS New Zealand.

Dean Zabrieszach proposed whether ITSAP BOD would adopt the similar system for APF selection.

William Sabandar agreed on the proposal and asked the members if we apply the same selection method to for APF selection instead of having the two different systems.

ITSAPBOD members agreed to apply the same selection method to APF and ITSWC.

Brian Negus congratulated AP Secretariat and all the members on reaching the great outcome.

**Adjourned.**



Participant List:

	APBOD Member	Organization
	Akio Yamamoto	ITS AP Secretary-General
1	William Sabandar	ITS Indonesia - Chair
2	Dean Zabrieszach	ITS Australia
3	Wei Yun Jiao	National ITS Center, China/ China ITS Industry Alliance, substitute for Bin Li
4	Murphy Sun	ITS Taiwan
5	Charles So	ITS Hong Kong
6	Takehiko Barada	ITS Japan
7	Yoo-Jin Chang	ITS Korea
8	Lee McKenzie	ITS New Zealand
9	Fred Kalt	ITS Singapore
10	Sorawit Narupiti	ITS Thailand
	*Siew Mun Leong from ITS Malaysia was absent.	

	Observers	
	Susan Harris	ITS Australia
	Brian Negus	ITS Australia/WCBOD member
	Yang Kou	RIOH, China
	Philip Tseng	ITS Taiwan/WCBOD member
	Zhu Chering Chang	ITS Taiwan
	Nelson Fan	ITS Taiwan
	Muhamad Kamaluddin	ITS Indonesia
	Joo Il Lee	ITS Korea/WCBOD member
	Sue Park	ITS Korea
	Mike Rudge	ITS New Zealand
	Mary Chan	ITS Singapore
	AP Secretariat	
	Takaaki Segi	ITS Japan/AP Secretariat
	Ikuko Okada	ITS Japan/AP Secretariat