

**ASO AC Working Session**  
**Tuesday 13 July 2021**  
**9:00 AM UTC**  
**Notes**

<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Observers</b>	<b>Apologies</b>
<p><b>AFRINIC</b>  Mike Silber (MS) – Vice Chair  Saul Stein (SSt)  Wafa Dahmani Zaafour (WD)</p> <p><b>APNIC</b>  Nicole Chan (NC)  Shubham Saran (SSa)</p> <p><b>ARIN</b>  Kevin Blumberg (KB) – Chair  Louie Lee (LL)</p> <p><b>LACNIC</b>  Ricardo Patara (RP)  Jorge Villa (JV)  Esteban Lescano (EL)</p> <p><b>RIPE NCC</b>  Hervé Clément (HC) – Vice Chair</p> <p><b>Secretariat</b>  Germán Valdez (GV)  Laureana Pavón (LP) – Minutes</p>	<p><b>ARIN Staff</b>  Sean Hopkins (SH)</p>	<p>Martin Hannigan (MH) – ARIN</p> <p>Aftab Siddiqui (AS) – APNIC</p> <p>Nurani Nimpuno (NN) – RIPE NCC  James Kennedy (JK) – RIPE NCC</p>

KB welcomed everyone and opened the meeting at 12:03 UTC.

KB explained that no roll call would be taken because this was not a special meeting of the ASO AC but a working session with no formality.

KV explained that unfortunately HPH had informed the AC that he would not be able to attend this call. He added that instead of postponing the call, it would be useful to do some work today, particularly considering the timeline. They can invite HPH to a future meeting to share his experience in the NomCom.

KB mentioned that today's session would include a public part to discuss generic suggestions for the procedures and a closed session to discuss things that had specifically come up during the past ICANN Board election considered confidential or private.

**Review ASO Procedures on ICANN Board Election Open Session**

KB said they would be looking at two options: either do some minor changes/retouches or a full rewrite of the procedures.

KB started discussing the second option. He said he noticed that the IC had done a lot of work and that the output had been more related to what the IC did, not the AC. When there are few candidates, it seems reasonable, but when there are many candidates, the RC and the IC should be the entire AC.

In a completely new environment, KB said that the idea was that the initial nomination phase could be until 31<sup>st</sup> December, come January 1<sup>st</sup> we would have time for the written answers, the entire AC could work through that process, then a short window for the audio or video conferences with the candidates, the entire ASO AC would be a part of that. There should be a very set understanding of how to reduce a large number of candidates after the written interview and bring that down to just three or four. The end result is we would be able to finish in February / March, within what we've been asked by the NomCom. It's a much more radical approach: everyone participates, and we have clearly defined procedures on how we move forward.

MS said that the critical thing in the current environment was that the AC had seen the process grow and some people had done a lot of heavy lifting, especially RP, who MS thanked for his outstanding job. He added that he suspects the AC will not be in person for at least another year, so they really need to see how to improve the process. Some of the elements that KB mentioned seem reasonable, but we should unpack them and consider the timeline, the whole AC rather than a committee, and clear process.

MS recommended reading the page on the ASO wiki, which was started by RP and already contained comments by NN and MH.

KB said he would like to use this call as a sounding board for future work.

HC said that KB and MS had been very complete in their summary, he thanked the members of the IC and the RC for the work during the last election, the report and the comments from RP were really impressive. In HC's opinion, many things should be considered, some parts of the procedure were not very clear and some sentences may require rewriting.

KB asked if there were any further questions.

RP said he appreciated the suggestions made by KB, MS and HC, adding that most of the complaints received during the last election process were more specific to the preparation of the questions and the report, not specifically on the performing of the interviews. The interviews were open to anyone who wished to participate, but the most important observations were regarding the preparation of the interview questions and so on. He added that, in his opinion, making everyone part of the IC would not change participation very much, but that they might make a suggestion in the sense that "everyone can collaborate with preparing the questionnaire / report."

KB agreed, you can lead a horse to water but that doesn't mean it will drink. The entire AC requires points where they are contributing their observations, if that's not well-defined, you're not going to get good participation. He noted that, in other NomComs on which he served, there were very specific questions that were asked from the IC, then the entire group starts seeing metrics and talking about the differences. KB noted that here is where he would like to hear HPH's experience from the NomCom.

KB noted that the NomCom and ICANN Board nominations are critical things the AC does and asked whether they should we go back to having everybody involved in the process and, if so, how do we best do that.

SSt noted that not everybody has the time and that it is difficult when everybody is involved in making each decision. He added that if he had had access to the recordings, he would have watched them.

KB said that the privacy issue is a time issue, specifying their desire to record the interviews with enough anticipation so that the legal team can work with it and approve it in an appropriate manner. The sooner the AC can decide on this, the better.

KB mentioned that another thing that might be helpful was to reserve some hours during a couple of days for the interview six months in advance.

KB added that they would discuss the question of the recordings regardless of the approach we adopt.

He noted that privacy/confidentiality is also something the AC needs to address, as ASO AC procedures were written before GDPR and other privacy regulations. Now, this should be written by the ASO AC procedures and vetted by legal.

JV said it was definitely easier and more effective to work with a small group of people who are really involved with the task, instead of the entire AC. In his opinion, they should keep the IC scheme but have frequent feedback sessions involving the whole AC along the process

KB commented that, by the whole ASO AC not being involved in the process, they were actually creating more work (additional meetings, special meetings). If AC members could watch the videos, is there much else that is specific to the IC?

SSt observed that having the recordings would be very useful, as body language and other elements are very important, and don't come through in a summary.

MS said that having the recordings would void the need to have multiple feedback sessions.

MS shared a thought: have everyone subscribe to the list, we can designate certain people for certain responsibilities, but having everyone subscribed, the expectation should be "if you have a question, please raise it, it's better that questions are raised during the process and not after the fact."

MS said he is quite happy to have small group working on the review, but everybody should be subscribed and contributing to the process.

KB said that if everybody is subscribed and watching the videos, the expectation is that everybody is involved in the process, then it isn't an IC but an AC responsibility.

MS explained that his suggestion was that things like the qualification review and drafting the questions are better done in a small group, so the AC might designate people as leads, not a separate committee, but subject leads.

SSa agreed with MS, saying that the AC could give a subject to one of the sub-groups to be drafted within the committed timelines. This would involve everyone.

KB agreed: having the subject leads pushes things forward, someone or some group needs to take responsibility for certain actions. Then the onus should be on everybody to participate in reviewing the interviews.

JV agreed with MS, adding that the election process is heavy but needs to be taken step by step and that it can be very difficult to have the whole AC trying to do it as a whole, except if each of us have specific tasks during the process.

After confirming that only ASO AC members and the Secretariat were present on the call, KB then moved on to the closed session.

There being nothing further to discuss after the closed session, the meeting ended at 11:58 UTC