

**ASO Procedures Review Core Team Meeting  
10 February 2023, 12:00 UTC  
NOTES**

**Attendees:**

Herve Clement (HC) – RIPE NCC  
James Kennedy (JK) – RIPE NCC  
Sander Steffann (SSteffan) – RIPE NCC  
Esteban Lescano (EL) – LACNIC  
Ricardo Patara (RP) – LACNIC  
Saul Stein (SStein) – AFRINIC  
Gaurav Kansal (GK) – APNIC

**Secretariat:**

Laureana Pavón – Notes  
=====

The meeting began at 12:04 UTC.

HC: This meeting is not to work operationally on the different topics but to define the short, middle and long term objectives for each WG (i.e., the work until the end of this month before ICANN 76, then the more advanced work within the ASO AC slots in Cancun, finally to finish and have a very complete document to present to the NRO EC in June this year so that we can vote.

All agreed.

While sharing on screen the document he prepared with the various recommendations presented for the review of the different sections of the procedures along with the comments that JK sent yesterday, HC asked whether it would be feasible to re-write the text by the end of the month, simply to consolidate the different recommendations. Opinions? Each topic could have different objectives.

EL: Maybe we can go a step forward and begin to work on some concrete wording. Some sections are easy (editorial changes), while others are more complex (e.g., chapter on how the ASO AC makes decisions). Then we can advance in the easiest part and leave the hard ones for the next step. Each teams should say whether this is possible for their sections.

HC then went through each chapter under review:

**Officers:** (SStein, EL) – No work is required

**Meetings:** (EL and HC) – Before the ICANN meeting, we can provide a text which will not be too different from the current text, we will underline the differences.

**Global Policy:** (RP, SStein)

HC: This may be a bit more complicated. Perhaps the completed text may not be ready, but the WG can improve the recommendations.

RP: Agree that this is more complex, but I think we need to have something more advanced to give the AC a clearer idea of what we are proposing. The only thing we can do now is to start writing the proposed text. We can try to do this.

SStein: This is complicated, the current text does not make sense.

EL: Agree, this is why this is one of the most important chapters to review, we can continue working on this after Cancun.

At Sander's request, HC explained that the last global policy had been presented in 2010 and explained what that policy was it was.

JK: <https://aso.icann.org/policy/global/current-global-policies/>

Conclusion: RP and SStein will work together on this and will send an email sharing what they have done prior to the Cancun meeting.

**Voting & Appointing members to various bodies:** EL, JK, GK

**Removal of ASO appointed members:** RP, GK

EL: Welcome GK to the team. The problem with this section is that it covers several parts of the procedures. We discussed in Belgrade that the idea is to unify the threshold for making decisions inside the AC. I suggest this needs deep work, perhaps during our f2f meeting. We can prepare some deeper ideas to discuss during the f2f meeting.

JK: Agree. We've got a bit of heavy lifting to do between now and ICANN. We can put together some pointed questions for the group, then we can start editing the actual text and have a new version of the text soon after the f2f.

EL: We can prepare some kind of presentation where we analyze the differences between the voting thresholds (e.g., majority vs super majority, unanimity vs rough consensus). We have to decide what will be the general standard. Based on what we discussed in Belgrade, the general standard will be majority, but we did not decide which issues require supermajority.

SStein: It's important not to be too prescriptive (define what kind of things require supermajority, but without being extremely prescriptive).

EL: In Belgrade we also discussed private vs private voting.

JK: One of the goals is to simplify. In advance of the f2f we can prepare the different scenarios and what we think would be appropriate in each case and then discuss this in Cancun.

**Selection of individuals to the ICANN board of directors:** RP, GV

HC: Another difficult one.

RP: Agree, it's not an easy point. My idea is not to work on a text now, we don't have a big issue with the current text. For some of the points we need some more feedback from the whole group. I would like to discuss the major questions with the entire ac in Cancun. Once we advance in the ideas, the entire text related to selection of ICANN Board members is in specific areas (unlike the voting, which affects multiple sections of the text). My idea is to have a clearer specification of what the problem is and have a broader discussion with the group in Cancun. I will share what we have discussed so far with GK so that he can keep up with the current work.

HC then shared the agenda for the ASO AC at ICANN 76 to decide in which session we can discuss each topic. He went over the agenda analyzing the different slots and trying to rank priority topics.

EL: Board selection is more important for us than voting (voting is a tool).

JK: Global policy is also an important topic

EL: The first session can begin with intros and the "Officers" topic, which is a very short topic and everyone is in agreement.

JK: But how will we decide if the AC does not agree?

SStef: In this phase, we should work towards consensus.

EL: "Officials" is a good example: because there is consensus, there will be no voting. For the other topics, we will continue to discuss and share ideas to try to reach consensus.

The group discussed the different slots trying to decide which topic (chapters of the procedures to be reviewed) would be discussed in each.

HC: We can be flexible, e.g., "During sessions 2, 3, 4, and 5 we will be discussing the procedural review update."

SStein: Conceptually agree, but we need to have some time frame.

EL agreed. It's important to cover all the issues.

JK: We can set a schedule and set aside some time for whatever topic needs more time.

HC will send the agenda to LP.

HC: One more time: do you think end of June is a good time to have something complete?

All agreed.

HC: We may need to have 1 or 2 additional meetings to complete the procedures review. Then, once we propose the final text, we need some time to see that everything is consistent. We can do that in June.

EL agreed.

HC: I will send to the procedures mailing list the proposed timeline for Cancun and what we've discussed today, then you can all comment on this.

JK: It's important to keep in mind that we have some time on Tuesday afternoon. If we want to get some more people in our little groups, we can do it then.

Meeting ended at 12:50 UTC.