

ASO AC Teleconference

4 March 2020
12:00 PM UTC

Draft Minutes

Attendees	Observers	Apologies
AFRINIC Noah Maina (NM) Mike Silber (MS) APNIC Brajesh Jain (BJ) Aftab Siddiqui (AS) - Chair Simon Sohel Baroi (SB) ARIN Kevin Blumberg (KB) – Vice Chair Louie Lee (LL) LACNIC Esteban Lescano (EL) Ricardo Patara (RP) Jorge Villa (JV) – Vice Chair RIPE NCC Hervé Clément (HC) Nurani Nimpuno (NN) Filiz Yilmaz (FY) Secretariat German Valdez Susannah Gray (SG) – Minutes	ARIN Sean Hopkins (SH) LACNIC Gianina Pensky (GP) Oscar Robles Garay (OR) ICANN Staff Carlos Reyes (CR) ICANN Board Akinori Maemura (AM) Ron da Silva (RdS) Community: 0	AFRINIC Wafa Dahmani Zaafouri (WD) ARIN Martin Hannigan (MH)

New Action Items From This Meeting:

- **New Action Item 200304-1: KB/AS/JV to update and circulate the ASO slide deck for each region to update prior to the ICANN 67 (virtual) meeting.**

Agenda

0. Welcome
1. Roll call
2. Agenda Review
3. Review Open Actions
4. Approval Minutes January 2020
5. ICANN 67
6. ASO AC F2F Meeting

- 7. AOB
- 8. Adjourn

0. Welcome

AS welcomed the attendees.

1. Roll Call

GV performed the roll call and declared quorum.

2. Agenda Review

There were no changes or additions to the agenda.

3. Review Open Actions

- **Action Item 191113-2: AS to develop a timeline and process for the items outlined in Action Item 191113-1 > *IN PROGRESS*.**

AS noted that this had been done and had been circulated to the mailing list. The plan had been to discuss it in further detail at the F2F Meeting in Cancun. He suggested that this action item be parked until more details are known about when the ASO AC would be able to meet.

-
- **Action Item 191113-8: Secretariat to set up a Confluence site for the ASO AC > *IN PROGRESS*.**

GV noted that had been some technical difficulties with setting up the Confluence site. He noted that he would make this high priority and make sure it would be implemented as soon as possible.

AS asked what the issue was.

GV noted that there was some debate around whether it would be hosted on the RIPE NCC servers or outsourced.

AS asked GV to flag this action as important. For now the ASO AC had decided to use email to collaborate but that was not the best way. He hoped a solution could be found as soon as possible.

-
- **Action Item 200205-1: Secretariat to implement the approved changes to the ASO**

AC Operating Procedures (update the names of the new mailing lists) > **CLOSED.**

- **Action Item 200205-2: KB/JV to request that the NRO EC briefs the ASO AC on the Inspection Request the ASO [NRO EC] had issued to ICANN regarding the sale of .org before ICANN 67 > **CLOSED.****

JV noted that he and KB had sent a request to Oscar Robles Garay (OR), Chair of the NRO EC and were waiting for a response.

KB added that the email had included information from the previous ASO AC teleconference and had requested that the NRO EC provide any information that may be useful for the ASO AC and for community members.

NN suggested that, as OR was participating in the call, he should be asked directly.

OR confirmed that the NRO EC had received the ASO AC's request. As it was a formal request, the NRO EC would like to provide a formal answer and that was being worked on and would be provided within the next few days.

He continued that he had informally mentioned to the Vice Chairs that the ASO, acting as the Empowered Community Decisional Participant, rather than the NRO had issued the ICANN inspection request. However, as had already been pointed out, this had created confusion both inside and outside the numbers circle. The NRO EC did not consider communicating with the ASO AC prior to sending the request to ICANN's lawyers, as the request was not related to the GPDP process.

NN thanked OR and asked him to explain the background and reasoning as to why the ASO issued the inspection request. She continued that the RIPE community had raised questions, wondering why the ASO had commented on something that was not specifically related to numbers. She asked if this subject would also be on the agenda at the ICANN Board – ASO joint session during ICANN 67.

OR noted that the NRO EC was concerned that the contract reassignment would have a negative effect on ICANN's image. As the ASO/NRO is part of the ICANN structure, the NRO EC did not want to this kind of situation or process to become 'business as usual' and wanted to bring it to the Board's attention. And as the ASO was one of the Supporting Organizations (SOs) that didn't have any conflict or interest in names issues, there would be no problem with making the request. He added that the NRO EC believed that the request would help ICANN by bringing the issue to the table.

OR continued that by issuing the request, the ASO wanted to know more about the process of the sale of .PIR: it did not care about the details of transaction but unfortunately this did seem to be clear enough. In the letter, which is published online, the ASO asked what process the ICANN Board would follow to assess and approve the contract and how the At-Large input would be considered. The ASO received a response from ICANN, noting that the inspection request would not be available for the ASO. The NRO EC had discussed this and was still deciding on the next steps.

AS noted that the NRO EC's response to the ASO AC's request for more information would be beneficial for the AC as well as the wider community.

NN asked if the NRO EC was planning on communicating these details to the community via the RIR mailing lists to explain why the inspection request was issued. The questions raised by the RIPE community had been answered by the RIPE NCC's External Relations Director. NN added that Kaveh Ranjbar (KR), the RIPE NCC's representative on the NRO EC, did not participate in the inspection request process as he sat on the ICANN Board as the liaison for RSAC.

OR noted that the NRO EC had not planned to communicate to the communities and he was not aware of the questions raised on the RIPE mailing list. The NRO EC believed that the inspection request's introductory paragraphs were enough to clarify the ASO's intent. OR continued that KR was not involved in the process but had passed details to the other members of the RIPE NCC's management team for approval: the NRO EC could only act when there was consensus from all five RIRs.

AS noted that, as a member of the APNIC community, BJ had asked the APNIC Board about the background of the inspection request during the recent APRICOT Meeting. The Chair of the Board confirmed that the board was aware of this letter and were happy to answer any questions.

HC thanked OR for the information. He underlined NN's request to provide some communication to the community about the background, as there was confusion in the community over the difference between the ASO and the ASO AC.

4. Approval Minutes February 2020

HC proposed the motion to accept the minutes from the January 2020 teleconference. BJ seconded the motion. There were no objections. Motion carried.

AS asked the Secretariat to publish the minutes on the ASO website.

5. ICANN 67

AS noted that the ASO AC F2F in Cancun had been cancelled due to Covid-19. The ICANN meeting had been converted into a virtual meeting. There were no ASO related sessions except the joint ICANN Board – ASO session.

OR noted that he had sent an email to AS noting that the NRO EC had no topics for the agenda for this session. If neither the ASO AC nor the ICANN Board had topics to discuss, the session would be canceled.

HC commented that, if there were no specific topics, then the session should be canceled. He added that the ASO AC had planned to discuss the Seat 9 and 10 election processes in depth during the F2F meeting so an alternative session should be organized as soon as possible, either remotely or in-person.

BJ asked if the ASO Public Session would go ahead.

RdS commented that all ICANN 67 sessions had been assessed to see which ones were essential. These were the ones being held virtually. There were a lot of sessions on the original agenda that hadn't been rescheduled as a virtual item, not just the ASO related ones. He added that there had been a discussion with the SO/AC leadership to make this determination.

AS noted that he was more concerned about the ICANN Board – ASO Session. He asked if the Board had anything for the agenda for that session.

RdS noted that the board had not discussed this but would meet later in the week. He thought that the ASO's inspection request could be an agenda item.

AK commented that the inspection request would likely not be on the agenda as the response was sent from ICANN's General Counsel: it was not a Board deliberation.

CR noted (via chat) the standard Board agenda items for each constituent:

1. Key priorities for action of ICANN constituencies in 2020 (e.g. prioritization of recommendations, streamlining of reviews, improve effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model, ...)

2. Specific developments coming up that ICANN constituencies feel need to be addressed when updating the ICANN Strategic Plan

AS noted that these questions could be answered via email.

BJ commented that the communication goes both ways: the Board should let the ASO AC know what information it wanted.

KB noted that he was not aware of any other ASO AC topics and suggested that the NRO EC was informed of this. If the Board or NRO EC had topics for the agenda, the ASO AC would be available.

RdS noted that this was timely feedback: other Board members might have some topics. If not, the session could be cancelled and the standard questions could be answered by email.

AM noted that the Board would be working on the Strategic Plan. One of the items was the evaluation of the unique identifier system. There were several number related identifiers under discussion, including IPv6. He thought that the RIR community should drive the discussion on IPv6. He asked the ASO AC to provide any ideas regarding the advancement of the IPv6 strategy.

AS asked AM to bring this to the attention of the NRO EC as it was out of scope for the ASO AC.

NN suggested that the ASO AC might still want to put together the usual ASO Update presentation and upload it to the ICANN 67 archives: it would be a nice way for the ASO AC to participate.

AS agreed and noted that he would circulate the previous version of the presentation so that each region could update it. It would then be published on the ASO website and ICANN would be asked to upload it to the ICANN 67 archives.

NN (via chat) noted that the IPv4 status in each region is worth including in addition to the policy discussions.

New Action Item 200304-1: KB/AS/JV to update and circulate the ASO slide deck for each region to update prior to the ICANN 67 (virtual) meeting.

6. ASO AC F2F Meeting

BJ suggested that the ASO AC hold a F2F meeting as soon as possible.

AS noted that the ASO AC had agreed to update the Operating Procedures to state "*The in-*

person meeting will be conducted at an ICANN Community Forum or, with the approval of the NRO EC, at any other suitable venue.” However, the ASO AC never actually voted on this. This could be solved easily with a 7-day vote.

KB noted that the original procedures allowed for the F2F Meeting venue to be something other than ICANN: the terminology was simply cleaned up. The issue of the vote needs to be addressed, but more importantly the ASO AC needed to figure out how it could hold an F2F meeting. He mentioned that there were several events coming up over the next two months, including RIPE, LACNIC and AFRINIC Meetings. However, as more and more conferences and events were being cancelled, it could not be guaranteed that an RIR meeting would actually take place in the coming 90 days. He added that the ASO AC should try to figure out another way of doing the work.

AS agreed and noted that more travel restrictions were happening on a daily basis due to Covid-19. The ASO AC had committed to review the Seat 9/10 Selection procedure and needed to find an alternative way to meet.

BJ noted he had no issue with the 7-day voting period. Regarding the F2F, it was an extraordinary situation and so there needed to be flexibility. It was not stated anywhere in the ICANN Bylaws that an ICANN Meeting could be held remotely for example.

AS commented that it was not an issue: as per the Operating Procedures, the NRO EC could approve any F2F meeting planned outside of the ICANN Meeting.

BJ suggested that sub-committees could be formed to work on specific methodologies, which could then be discussed by the ASO AC during a conference call.

HC commented that the risk from Covid-19 would probably not be reduced in the next few months so it was unlikely that an F2F could be organized. ICANN 69 (November) could be an option.

NN asked what specifically couldn't be solved without a F2F meeting. The Operating Procedures allowed for special meetings to be called as necessary. She believed that the pending work could be done remotely.

Regarding the change to the Operating Procedures, NN suggested that, as the change had not yet been voted on, the ASO AC should not make that change. The text could be amended to something more pragmatic and flexible. The ASO AC should not restrict itself, which was one of the comments that the NRO EC had given. She suggested that the ASO AC could check the calendar at the beginning of each year and decide when to hold a F2F.

AS commented that it was impossible to do a day's work remotely: it was helpful to have people in the same room. Also there was the issue of time zones.

KB suggested moving the discussion on the procedure change to the mailing list. He noted that, within his organization, people were only able to book upcoming travel within 14 days of departure. AS had approached the NRO EC regarding the cost implications and budget considerations of holding the F2F in various locations. He agreed that a F2F meeting would be more productive than a virtual one but this might not be possible and an alternative solution was necessary. A single conference call would not work due to time zones.

OR commented that the RIRs had budgeted for ASO AC representatives to attend the meeting in Cancun. If a meeting were to be held in a different location, the aggregate cost would be the same: some regions would have to pay more, some less but this was not an issue for a change of location.

NN agreed that a F2F would of course be better than a videoconference. However, she would like to understand which parts of the work were crucial to compete in the coming months and

which would require an F2F meeting. Some people might not want or be able to travel under the current conditions.

AS commented that he would send a mail regarding the work that needed to be completed.

KB noted that the Seat 9/10 Board Selection procedures were contingent on having a productive F2F meeting: the work is time sensitive.

NN suggested that, given the situation, the Chairs produce a work plan, estimate how many extra meetings would be necessary and see if there were volunteers to work on specific parts of the work plan and then try to do the necessary work remotely. An F2F would be ideal but if that was not possible, a productive solution needed to be found.

NM commented (via chat) that the mailing lists were equally as effective as an F2F meeting.

AS concluded that this topic would be discussed further on the mailing list.

7. AOB

There was no AOB.

8. Adjourn

BJ proposed the motion to adjourn. KB seconded the motion. There were no objections. Motion carried.

The meeting ended at 13:29 UTC.

-END-