ASO AC Operational Procedures Review

Update: 29th December 2022

Current text: [ASO AC Operating Procedures | The Address Supporting Organization (ASO ICANN)](https://aso.icann.org/documents/operational-documents/operating-procedures-of-the-address-council-of-the-address-supporting-organization/)

**4. Officers**

* The proposal change was to elect Chair and Vice Chairs by ASO AC votes.
* Following discussions hold in our F2F meeting in Belgrade, we rejected this proposal and will not conduct any substantial change to this section.

**5. Meetings**

* 5.1: Leave the “minimum of 4 meetings”. This figure is manageable as meetings are defined each year.
* 5.1.1: for the “coming” year
* 5.1.1.1: change the § depending on our discussions w/r designations of vice chairs… but there was no consensus for this change in Belgrade
* 5.1.2: ok to delete “All AC members shall respond to the notice”
* 5.4: Comment period extended to 10 days?
* 5.5: reword with the assumption that only members who won’t attend answer. If quorum is not met meeting will be cancelled…
* 5.6: if not necessary don’t distinguish in-person or remote meeting. However an in-person meeting can be conducted at the first ICANN meeting of the year, or at another ICANN or RIR meeting.
* 5.6: closed sessions for ICANN board of Directors or other elections

**6. Global Policy**

Objectives:

* Keep document simple
* Improve readability/flow
* Our document should address "blank" parts of the MoU
* This document should contain basic information about what this is and followed by the actions ASO/AC should perform to attend what is described in the MoU.
* The idea is to focus on actions and not to "reflect" MoU document structure or text order.

Improvements:

* Some of current process in our documents and related to ICANN is already covered in this org procedures
* Maybe no need to have in our document as well (coherence)
* Flow/path a proposal can follow to be considered:
  + Via community
  + Via ICANN
  + Via ASO/AC (community request)
* Our document has some "confusion"
  + ASO/AC to determine if proposal is global or not (maybe when submitted via ASO/AC)
  + To be presented in RIRs fora only after ASO/AC decision (not this way)
* ASO/AC is expected to vote on a report from PPFT. Not clear on what to vote:
  + Accept report
  + Request NRO more time
* Request majority. If not reached, what to do?

More precisely:

\* Authority/Overview

Description of what a global policy is and the mandate in the MoU

\* PPFT

One PPFT is formed to monitor the RIRs fora in case a proposal that is placed as global or can be seem as one.

\* How it can be started

(a) via "normal" process in any of the RIRs fora, where community member sends a proposal for discussion

[action] PPFT member notifies to ASO/AC chair so the proposal is presented to the group

[action] in the case the group determines this does not fit as global proposal, inform RIR that will then coordinate with the author. If yes, ASO/AC confirms to the RIR that the proposal was considered and it has set the PPFT that will follow the discussion

(b) ICANN request ASO/AC to work on a proposal (in collaboration). ICANN will designate a person to follow the "normal" process via RIRs fora

[action] form a PPFT to work with ICANN staff on this. Once there is proposal text, coordinate with RIRs to have in inserted in their own policy development process

(c) ASO/AC could have received a proposal and send to the RIRs for discussion in their policy fora.

[action] ASO/AC chair to put this for discussion in the following group meeting. Group will decide if it fits or not as global proposal. If not, notifies the author. If yes, also notifies author and coordinate with RIRs to have in inserted in their own policy development process

To be clear: there is a part in our procedures, in comply with MoU, where ASO/AC would receive the proposal and then ask RIRs to publish it. In that case, ASO/AC would the "entrance" for the proposal and it is where we should check if the proposal would in fact be fit a description of global proposal.

\* Discussion Phase

Nothing to be done here except have reports from PPFT as discussions go.

ICANN has its own set of procedures and according to it, they will designate someone to pay attention to the discussion (no need for the ASO/AC to inform. They have liaison and secretary in our meetings and will be also informed there. Our meeting minutes are public as well)

\* Ratification

Once approved NRO EC signals ASO/AC. It will have 60 days to take decision

[action] assigned PPFT team to produce a report (certifies processes were followed or not)

[action] ASO/AC will have X days to review the report. Chair to include item for discussion in the following meeting.

[action] After meeting Chair to call for voting or to request NRO/EC more time

[action] Vote for accept or not the report. Report recommendation could be to ratify and pass for ICANN ratification. Or reject and signal NRO there are concerns about the process.

# what if it does not get majority vote: maybe this is when ASO/AC can request NRO EC for more time

If ASO/AC ratifies proposal, chair to send it to ICANN for ratification. They will have 60 days to process.

\* ICANN ratification

It has its own set of procedures on how to move forward at this stage

[action] keep a conversation with ICANN in this period in case they have question

[action] if ICANN accepts, receives confirmation and send forward to NRO EC

[action] if ICANN rejects, work with NRO EC on the basis of ICANN appointed concerns. MoU indicates that ASO/AC might forward a modified version for ICANN reconsideration. In this case it would reject only if ICANN does so by supermajority

[action] if ICANN request adjustments in the \*language\*, work with RIRs. It will be accepted only if all RIRs are okay

[action] in the MoU, only if rejected a second time, RIRs and ICANN calls for mediation

**7. procedures to Appoint Members to Various Bodies**

**8. Procedures for Removal of ASO appointed members**

These two § will be dealt in the specific voting part

**9. Selection of individuals to the ICANN Board of Directors**

Objectives:

* Document should be a reference for external (possible candidates)
* Guideline on how ASO/AC organizes to conduct the process

Improvements:

* Simple and clear criteria (eligibility) for candidates
* Homogeneous process to receive and confirm candidacy (web form?)
* Internal groups (QRC and IC)
* One from each region. What if this is not possible?
* Interview Phase: from 60 to 90 days
* Interviews

**1st written**, compulsory

- All approved candidates

- Filter (block candidates with “low” profile)

- AC would review responses and decide which to advance

**2nd** video or in person

- All moved from 1st interview

- More in-depth questions (*governance, corporate* *experience, internet hot* *topics*)

**3rd** video or in person

- If ASO/AC sees necessity

- Small group candidates (those not in this phase, were removed)

- Even deeper questions (external help, maybe)

* New section with recommendation

- Set calendar for interviews and meeting in advance

- Set task in work plan to prepare “**questionnaires**” in advance

- Work on final report format and criteria

More precisely:

Intro:

The document could address two main objectives:

- give candidates information about the "job", what is expected in terms of dedication, experience and knowledge and explain eligibility criteria.

- describe the processes to be conducted by the ASO/AC

\* Selection Procedures

[action] ASO/AC to prepare a timeline in advance (year before the current member term ends). Work plan should consider this and also internal actions: possible meetings during interview phase, questionnaires preparation, possible interviews time slots

[action] prepare for the reception of nomination (via web form or email), and reception of confirmation

[action] Form QRC with the limited function to review confirmation letter for completeness.

# QRC should be one member from each region, but what if one region can not set a representative?

\* Interview Phase

Based on previous experience, we should consider changing the interview period from 60 to 90 days. This to accommodate all interviews but also in-between meetings.

Candidates should be made aware they might be interviewed 3 times.

Second and third round of interviews would be stated as to be conducted in "videoconference" format. If "in person" is viable, ASO/AC would consult NRO for availability.

[action] establish IC (could same as QRC, but same concern above remains true). Tasked to organize and conduct interviews and prepare reports about each of them.

[action] IC to prepare a draft schedule considering time slots for all interviews needed (at least 1st and 2nd round), with the in-between meetings with the ASO/AC. Also possible meetings with IC members for report preparation

- 1st round interview (written)

To all candidates and should be used as "filter". To include basic questions to evaluate candidates on knowledge about numbers, ICANN and measure corporate/business experience.

[action] IC to organize the interview

[action] ASO/AC to review all candidates responses and meet to determine who to advance

- 2nd round

To those candidates moved from 1st round.

Questions focused on focused on governance, corporate experience, internet hot topics.

[action] IC to set interviews slots

[action] IC to conduct interviews and prepare report

[action] ASO/AC to review report and meet to decide if new interview is needed, and in this case with which candidates

- 3rd round

If needed, with candidates moved from 2nd round.

This should be an interview focused sharp questions. Maybe count with external help

[action] IC to set interviews slots

[action] IC to conduct interviews and prepare report

[action] ASO/AC to review report and meet to decide if new interview is needed, and in this case with which candidates

\* Selection Phase

[action] ASO/AC chair to schedule a meeting to evaluate candidates and set a date for voting period

\* Notification to ICANN

[action] Chair to request Secretariat to inform ICANN secretary about results

\* Review of candidates

This might be cut. Information about candidate review should be informed first paragraph of the section where we explain what candidates might expect from the process

\* Announcement

[action] ASO/AC Chair to instruct secretariat to inform results with votes count to voters only. confidential information

[action] ASO/AC Chair to instruct secretariat to publish election results after ICANN confirms success in the due diligence process

# New Section/Paragraph

Current procedure mentions the questionnaire preparation by the entire ASO/AC but this is present only in the 1st round. But this should be the case also for 2nd and 3rd round.

ASO/AC should also work in the format of report expected at each stage of the selection process. Current procedures states IC would produce a comparative report with raking of candidates. It is implicit that such report would be prepared by IC and would follow this format at the end of each interview.

ASO/AC should work in the expected format for the reports.

Also, the questionnaire preparation should be a task conducted in advance, prior to the beginning of the process. This should be a task in the working plan in the year such process would start.

**Voting section**

* To Include a specific section on Voting Process that can be applied to all the cases.
* Unify the way in which decisions are made, giving priority to e-vote.
* Simple majority (50%+1) of ASO AC will be the rule, and supermajority for few special cases (to be defined).
* To replace Schultze method for a more transparent and easier tool.
* All votes must be public by rule and private vote as an exception, only for ICANN Board election, or other ICANN position (e.g. NomCom), or Chair election.
* To include the obligation for ASO AC members to justify abstention votes (it will only count towards quorum not majority)
* Voting processes will be conducted always (including only one candidate).