**ASO Procedures Review Core Team Meeting**

**01 July 2022, 12:00 UTC**

**NOTES**

**Attendees:**

Herve Clement (HC) – RIPE NCC

James Kennedy (JK) – RIPE NCC

Esteban Lescano (EL)– LACNIC

Ricardo Patara (RP) – LACNIC

Saul Stein (SStein) – AFRINIC

Mike Silber (SS) – AFRINIC

**Secretariat:**

Laureana Pavón – Notes

================

The meeting began at 12:05 UTC.

HC shared some objectives for the meeting to start the discussion:

* Define the final objective(s) of our work
* How will we fulfill this (these) objective(s)?
* Timeline
* Date of our next working meeting (preferably before the monthly ASO AC August meeting)

Define the final objective(s) of our work

* Cosmetic changes only?
* Rewording specific sections without redesigning the whole document
* Redesigning the document
* About the final text:
	+ Clear and simple
	+ No place to any interpretation (clear guidance)
	+ Reliable (in terms of references, pointers)
	+ No redundancy

HC: We can talk about our objectives, where we want to go exactly, then define what will work best operationally for everyone (work all together, split in groups to address each aspect) and a timeline.

HC invited comments.

SStein: We need to remove ambiguity in things such as voting where there is inconsistency. It’s a rewording, but there are a number of things that are not catered to and need to be accommodated, e.g., remote meetings, remote voting, etc. However, the text should not be too prescriptive, as that might pose problems in the future.

EL: Some issues require only cosmetic changes, while other sections need to be reworded in a specific section. A whole new document is not necessary, instead, different levels of intervention in the different sections.

RP: Agree with EL and SS. We started to do something last year or two years ago, specifically pointed out things that were missing in our documents, pointers to ICANN documents, cosmetic changes where the text was not well written, grammatical mistakes and so on. There was a very good comment from Nurani Nimpuno (available on the wiki)

HC: So, the idea is not to redesign the full document. The work might include:

* Procedures that are clear but not too prescriptive
* Rewording for clarity and consistency
* Think about references to new (ICANN) documents, etc.
* Correcting grammatical errors

All agreed.

JK: I agree with what has been said so far, not a complete overhaul, but in some sections we can consider restructuring some paragraphs, make it clear and simple, some cosmetic changes in some areas. Separately, we should also consider working on things that those of you who have been on the ASO AC for a number of years have identified, lessons learned can be considered regarding what has worked and what has not.

SStein: For example, we need to prevent a scenario where a person votes against but does not provide constructive feedback. I know a vote is a “yes or no” thing, but when we’re voting here, if you object, you should object with a valid reason, something along the lines of rough consensus). These are the type of things we should avoid happening. Not be too prescriptive, but there needs to be some sort of rough consensus built in here.

HC: Is that to be a specific rule or more of a working spirit? Do we have a rule saying that if you oppose you must say why? Or are you talking about the impossibility to abstain? We can discuss this further.

SStein: We can address this later when we go through the list we prepare.

MS: To what extent do we want to work towards consensus vs voting? For example, when dealing with procedures, do we really need to vote or should we work towards rough consensus?

EL: Once we have a modification to the procedures, we need to approve it. Voting is required for that. But that’s a good question MS.

MS: I mean in terms of what we’re trying to achieve, my preference is where possible move away from voting to avoid situations where, for example, if people don’t vote they can hold up a process. See whether we require the majority of the AC or the majority of those who vote.

SStein: Something like rough consensus is appropriate for things like the procedures, not for ICANN Board or NomCom elections.

HC: There are two options right now: we can have a specific session on voting, or there can be 1-2 people of the team working on this issue.

JK: I like the second approach. We need to define what the activities are and then the members to work on each.

HC showed a fourth slide with the **rationale** behind the procedures review:

* Our procedures are failing us more and more
	+ Questions around voting processes
		- Abstentions or non-voting
		- What happens if the ASO is comprised of less than 15 members?
* The ICANN Directors election process
	+ What happens if 20 or only 2 candidates apply?
* In-person meeting impossibilities are not taken into account enough
* Fix pointers to updated documents such as the ASO MoU and ICANN Bylaws

HC then suggested the following next steps:

* A first global reading by everyone with a collection of first remarks
* Echo of us can be responsible for a specific topic? (
	+ Voting
	+ ICANN board procedure elections
	+ Global policy
	+ etc.

EL: I agree with a full reading of the procedures as a first step with suggestions for improvements. Then, it’s important to split this group to work on each of the topics.

HC: We can have a meeting with 1-2 people working on each topic and then connect everyone.

RP: It’s very important to have a reading of the whole document to find cross-references and so on. I also agree on having a specific person or persons working on each topic. Let’s not forget the ICANN board election process, scenarios with few or very many candidates, this issue also needs work.

EL: Idea: allow the people in charge of the interviews and questionnaires for board member candidates to request some external help, perhaps a third party that assists us in order to hold or review the interviews.

JK: This is not specified in the current procedures.

EL: Give the AC more flexibility to decide some procedural aspects. Another example: this idea that we have to meet in person only at ICANN community forums, we can suggest a correction or modification to establish that the AC can meet “at the ICANN community forums or any other meeting decided by the NRO EC.” This will give us the flexibility of considering other options and adapting to unexpected events.

HC: We need a date for our next working group meeting. Way forward: everyone can read the entire document. There will likely be remarks of very different nature, which can be collected on the wiki. Then, prior to our next meeting, we can work via email on the different ideas and decide on which issues we are going to work.

HC: We should not forget to consider RPs suggestion and also KB’s proposal for section § 6 Global policy development.

EL: It’s important that everyone include their comments on the documents in order to continue thinking about it before our next working meeting. This will allow us to see if we need to work on many changes or just a few (elections + voting process).

JK: Another lesson earned: last time, candidate interviews fell on a weekend. This is another small example of those who have experience can share what can be improved.

After some discussion, the following timeline was decided:

* All members of the Procedures Review Core Team to read the procedures in their entirety, including, including Kevin Blumber’s, RP’s and Nurani’s suggestions (see wiki) before 15 July, leaving comments on the wiki as necessary
* To discuss these comments via email from 18 to 26 July.
* To hold the next ASO Procedures Review Team meeting on 26 July at 12:00 UTC.
* The frequency of additional Procedures Review Core Team will be decided once we have defined specific working groups for specific tasks.

HC: I will share the slides I showed you just now via email.

The meeting ended at 12:30 UTC.