

**ASO AC Teleconference
Wednesday 2 June 2021
12:00 PM UTC
Draft Minutes**

Attendees	Observers	Apologies
<p>AFRINIC Wafa Dahmani Zaafour (WD) Mike Silber (MS) – Vice Chair</p> <p>APNIC Nicole Chan (NC) Shubham Saran (SSa) Aftab Siddiqui (AS)</p> <p>ARIN Kevin Blumberg (KB) – Chair Martin Hannigan (MH) Louie Lee (LL)</p> <p>LACNIC Ricardo Patara (RP) Jorge Villa (JV) Esteban Lescano (EL)</p> <p>RIPE NCC Nurani Nimpuno (NN) Hervé Clément (HC) – Vice Chair James Kennedy (JK)</p> <p>Secretariat Germán Valdez (GV) Laureana Pavón (LP) – Minutes</p>	<p>ARIN Staff Sean Hopkins (SH) – ARIN</p> <p>ICANN Staff Carlos Reyes (CR)</p> <p>ICANN Board Ron da Silva (RdS)</p> <p>Community: Pankaj Chaturvedi (PC) – 2021 Manju Chen</p>	<p>AFRINIC Saul Stein (SSt)</p>

New action items from this meeting:

New Action Item 210602-1: KB to send out a Doodle poll to the AC to schedule a meeting approximately three weeks from today to discuss ASO AC ICANN Board selection procedures update.

=====

Agenda

0. Welcome
1. Roll Call
2. Agenda Review
3. Review Open Actions
4. Approval Minutes

a) 5 May 2021 – Monthly Teleconference

5. 2020- 2021 ICANN NomCom Process Report - Pankaj Chaturvedi,
 6. ASO Procedures Update
 7. ASO Virtual Meeting
 - 8 RIR Meeting Reports
 - LACNIC 35
 - RIPE 82
 9. AOB
 - a) 2021 - 2022 ASO Representative ICANN NomCom Timeline Process
 10. Adjourn
-

1. Welcome

KB welcomed participants and the meeting began at 12:02 UTC.

Roll call was performed, and quorum was established.

2. Agenda Review

KB suggested adding to the agenda the schedule of conflict with the AFRINIC conference currently underway.

He noted that the conflict had been brought up a couple of days ago on the list, that the conflict had not existed when the date had been set, and that it was an honest mistake many members of the ASO AC had missed. He added that, although 14 out of 15 members were present, the NRO EC Chair had been unable to attend and that the ASO AC meeting might be affecting members who could not be at AFRINIC.

NN suggested another addition to the agenda: the ICANN Seat 9 election.

3. Review Open Actions

Action Item 210505-1: GV to check with ICANN the deadline for submitting the name of the ASO representative selected to serve on the ICANN NomCom and to send the timeline followed previously by the ASO AC when selecting their NomCom representative to the list for the ASO AC to review. **COMPLETED**

Action Item 210505-2: GV to invite Pankaj Chaturvedi, current ASO AC appointee to the ICANN NomCom, to the next ASO AC meeting and add his report on the NomCom process this the meeting agenda. **COMPLETED**

Action Item 210505-3: KB to draft a brief note to the ARIN Advisory Council saying that the ASO AC had reviewed Draft Policy ARIN-2021-1 and concluded that the proposed changes did not affect global policy. **OVERTAKEN BY EVENTS**

KB observed that MH had sent a note to the AC saying that the global part was removed from the proposal.

Action Item 210505-4: KB prepare a draft agenda for a an ASO AC meeting in September to work on global policy (a potential run-through of the ASO AC global policy procedure and an explanation by policy representatives from each region on their global policy development processes). **COMPLETED**

Action Item 210407-1: KB to review the timeline for the time-sensitive items on which the ASO AC will work as part of their 'virtual meeting' (ASO AC procedures, global policy development process) to present to the ASO AC so they can determine what work needs to be done to prepare for two or three calls to address those specific topics and then schedule those calls. **ONGOING**

KB commented that there were two time-sensitive items: the next ICANN Board seat appointment and the NomCom appointment. He added that the last one was the global policy development process.

4. Approval Minutes

a) 5 May 2021 – Monthly Teleconference

HC moved to approve the 5 May ASO AC Monthly Teleconference minutes, SSa seconded the motion, no objections were heard and the motion carried.

5. 2020- 2021 ICANN NomCom Process Report - Pankaj Chaturvedi,

KB invited PC to provide an update on the ICANN NomCom process.

PC said he had been appointed to the NomCom twice (2020 and 2021) and began by commenting on his experience with the 2020 NomCom, which had had its initial meeting during ICANN 66 in Montreal, the only face-to-face meeting held by the NomCom in 2020 and 2021. He noted that, after the Montreal meeting, all meetings and interviews were done online as a result of the COVID pandemic.

PC shared that the 2020 NomCom had had seven days of continuous virtual meetings in different time zones for the final interviews, up to seven hours a day. He said that there had been preparation work; internal discussions; meetings before, during and after the interviews, which were about 45 minutes each, after which the NomCom had some time for discussion and feedback.

He said it had been the first time this kind of process had happened and that they had initially been weary of how it would work. He mentioned that one challenge was the fact that NomCom members could not have much interaction among themselves, adding that the candidates applying for the positions were ICANN insiders and very much aware of the process and that meeting the candidates virtually had been difficult for them as NomCom representatives. He noted that a lot of time had been consumed due to the virtual aspect of the NomCom activities.

PC summarized the work of the 2020 NomCom by saying that, apart from the face-to-face meeting in Montreal, they had conducted around 24-25 meetings for a total of 80-100 hours and that they had also researched the candidates, checked references and so on. He noted that in 2020 the NomCom had worked on seven positions: two members of the ICANN Board, one member of the PTI Board, ELAC, CCNSO and GNSO Council members.

Moving on the currently ongoing 2021 NomCom, PC said that there was no chance they would meet face-to-face in the next months due to the pandemic. He said the 2021 NomCom had started in December and that, by the end of the 2021 NomCom, they will have had almost 30 days plus 120-130 hours devoted to this activity. He concluded by saying that the NomCom definitely calls for much time and effort when there are no face-to-face meetings and invited questions.

KB thanked PC for his update, noting that the ASO AC appreciated all the work he had put in and the significant time commitment involved in doing the NomCom process remotely.

PC thanked the ASO AC for nominating him twice to the NomCom.

HC thanked PC and asked him whether the NomCom had had the opportunity to think about how to improve the NomCom procedures.

PC replied that improvements to the NomCom process are under discussion, that at the end of the NomCom and as part of the process, members provide suggestions for the next NomCom.

NN also thanked PC for serving on the NomCom and asked if there were any public documents he would be willing to share related to these improvements, i.e., any public report that PC could share with the ASO AC once the process is finalized and, if not, would he be willing to report the highlights to the ASO AC (e.g. post-mortem improvements, lessons learned, how to deal with problems, shortlisting, decision-making, etc.) without divulging private or confidential information.

Before dropping off the call, PC said he would be happy to share whatever the NomCom decides to make public. He added that he would check and come back to the Secretariat on this particular point (2020 NomCom) and that he would be happy to share any improvement plans and other things that are public with the ASO AC.

At this time, WD left the ASO AC meeting to attend the AFRINIC meeting.

6. ASO Procedures Update

KB presented the agenda item by saying that some ASO AC members had made some edits to the wiki with their observations. He said the ASO AC Chairs and the NRO EC Chair had had the normal chair call yesterday, where they had discussed how to move the process forward. KB noted that HPH had offered to make himself available to share his experience on the NomCom, things he found worked or didn't and, having served on the ASO himself, how these things might have to apply to the ASO. KB added that the recommendation that had come out of this call was to have a meeting in approximately three weeks to give the ASO some time to work on their notes, as the goal was to have everyone able to and interested in participating to provide feedback.

KB said he would also have a call with ICANN shortly where he would be discussing efficiencies that may be applied in relation to the due diligence part of the ICANN Board selection process, so hopefully the AC would have something from this in their call in three weeks.

KB asked MS if he had anything to add and whether there had been any movements on the wiki.

MS said that until recently nothing significant had been added to the wiki other than some minor adjustments and apologized if he had missed some.

NN asked whether they were talking about ASO procedures in general or about the selection process in particular, as there had been quite a few comments related to the selection procedure.

KB explained that the procedures update was focusing on the selection process for the board seat. He clarified that there was no closed session scheduled for the present call, as at this point the Seat 9 selection was over and the results had been announced. He added that they have the wiki for private comments and the private list is also still available.

NN asked whether today they would be talking about the status or about the content today.

KB repeated that the idea was to have those interested in working on this have a meeting in three weeks.

NN observed that the entire AC should have a discussion on what needed to be improved. She noted that having a smaller group work on this would be a practical and sensible option, but that the discussion of what the AC has learned could not be assigned to a smaller group. She proposed two suggestions: first, the entire AC should discuss what it has learned as a group; then, a smaller group could do the work.

KB agreed that feedback from all AC members was absolutely essential and that a smaller group had been suggested due to some concerns regarding the time commitment this would involve.

To underscore what NN had said, MH mentioned that no work has been done at an organized level to make any changes to the procedures other than an open call for comments on the wiki.

KB noted that, based on NN's and MH's comments, the meeting in three weeks would be open to all AC members.

All agreed.

KB observed that, from an agenda point of view, the meeting would be closed for observations specific to the last Board seat selection process and then open for general discussion.

New Action Item 210602-1: KB to send out a Doodle poll to the AC to schedule a meeting approximately three weeks from today to discuss ASO AC ICANN Board selection procedures update.

7. ASO Virtual Meeting

KB said he had sent a message to the list with a draft agenda for a 2.5 hour virtual meeting. He explained that that he had discussed with HPH the possibility of inviting one person from each RIR (whoever they each believed was the most appropriate person from each region, whether staff, chair of a working, SIG, etc.) to provide a very brief report on how their regional GPDP and some time for ASO AC to ask questions if needed. He noted that they would then review the ASO AC GPDP, that he wanted to compare what is in the MoU related to the ASO AC procedures for GPDP as a refresher, and finally see if any action items come out of this (e.g. meeting with the RIRs on a more consistent basis, some recommendation for procedural modifications or improvements). He concluded by saying that this was the only meeting he was going to recommend for this year, in September.

NN noted that much of the September session appeared to be about knowledge sharing and asked KB whether he was also looking to use this meeting to change the ASO AC procedures for the GPDP. She added that these were two different things, as the first one could be done with anyone present, while the second one meant that only ASO AC members could be present.

KB replied that this meeting would be for information sharing. He noted that the AC could then take this information and see if any procedural changes might be needed (improvements, clarifications), adding that the idea was not to get the work done in one meeting.

8. RIR Meeting Reports

LACNIC 35

RP presented an update on LACNIC 35, saying that he had already sent a more detailed report to the mailing list. He noted that the LACNIC meeting had taken place on 10-14 May; that it had been a virtual meeting; and that, as usual, there had been had some training activities, some reports. As for policy, he shared that eight or nine proposals had been presented at the Policy Forum (described in the email he sent to the mailing list), some of which had not yet reached the consensus stage, while other are being analyzed to see whether consensus was reached.

EL and JV thanked RP for his report and reiterated that further information on each policy had been included in the email sent by RP to the mailing list.

RIPE 82

HC reported that the RIPE 82 meeting had taken place virtually, that there had been a lot of discussion about IPv6 and DNS, that was currently no policy proposal in the RIPE NCC region, but there was discussion about the colors of IPv6 addresses and things like that which you can see that on the RIPE 82 website. Regarding the global policy issue mentioned by KB, HC said there had been a short presentation by the policy officer about the process. HC said there he and NN had made a report with ASO AC activities and would send the slides to the AC, as this was a good opportunity to begin the call for the next NomCom election process.

JK thanked everyone for their warm welcomes via email, that he looked forward to working with them on the AC, and that he hoped to meet them in person soon. Expanding on what HC had already mentioned about the colors of the address space in the Policy Working Group session, JK mentioned there were several separate but overlapping conversations and added that the activities he expects will come out of those conversations will begin to be addressed by the Working Group after Q3 this year, when a report will be delivered containing some high-level framework suggestions the working groups are expected to take into consideration when building policy.

NN noted that remarkably there hadn't been any policy discussions, not even transfer policy discussions and mentioned that they will probably see more discussion along the lines of registration, membership fees, other topics relating to usage such as code of conduct and other Community related topics but very little about policy as such.

HC said he would share with KB the link to the ASO AC Report presented during the RIPE 82 meeting.

9. AOB

a) 2021 - 2022 ASO Representative ICANN NomCom Timeline Process

KB commented that the timeline had been sent out by GV on 28 May and that it included a one-month nomination period. He noted that ASO AC members are welcome to nominate and be part of this process

and that their strong knowledge of the numbers would make them excellent candidates. He then recalled that the reason the AC had opened this nomination process was the enormous time commitment which had been taking away from their ability to work on ASO AC matters. KB stressed that passive outreach was not enough and implored members of the ASO AC to reach out to people they know and are numbers community aware and see if they would like to step forward.

SSt joined the meeting at this time.

b) KB thanked Filiz Yilmaz (FY) for all her years of diligent service as member and chair of the ASO AC. Others also expressed their appreciation and applauded FY.

c) KB formally welcome JK and said he was welcome to reach out to any of the members in his region, to the chairs, or to other members of the AC if he had any questions. JK thanked KB.

d) ICANN Seat 9 Election

NN observed that this topic had already been touched upon in an earlier agenda item and that the AC could discuss this during the upcoming procedures update session in September.

NN suggested that they might improve the procedure for announcing election results. She noted that the candidates had been announced without knowledge of the ASO AC and that, in the future, the ASO AC should be informed simultaneously with the candidates.

NN then asked whether the due diligence report commissioned by ICANN to the Mintz group had been shared with the AC Chair and, if so, whether it would be shared with the ASO AC.

KB replied that there had been a confluence of errors regarding the notification, that the original intent had been for the ASO AC to be informed of the results together with the candidates, and that they would make sure that something like this never happened again.

KB then explained that the result of the due diligence report was a pass/fail received by the chair of the ASO AC.

MS added that the only parties receiving the report were ICANN legal and the candidates themselves.

MH asked if there was some reason why the Chair couldn't share the pass / fail result with the AC. He said that, if the information provided by ICANN to KB was not confidential, then it should be shared with the AC. He added that, as the AC worked through improvements to the process, they should have some transparency, not necessarily on the details but on the pass/fail results and on what the process is.

KB repeated that he would be having a meeting to discuss with ICANN some of these 'efficiency problems' that had come up. He noted that there was a delineation between what ICANN is responsible for and what the ASO AC is responsible for. He added that the ASO AC procedures put a lot of weight on the ICANN due diligence report, but that the AC will have to discuss this when going over their procedures as, according to California law, this does not have much relevance to the AC other than the pass/fail result for the winning candidate.

MH said that when the AC reorganizes their procedures, a potential item for improvement might be the order of operations. He noted that seeing the pass/fail result for the candidates would allow the AC to say that they had performed oversight of the process.

KB noted he would seek some clarity on this and inquire whether this was personal information and if that was the reason why it was only sent to the chair.

MH replied that the AC needs to know the answer from ICANN so they can act accordingly.

NN supported the suggestion of bringing greater transparency around the process and agreed that understanding the timeline would be helpful. She added that, in the past, the chair had not been privy to information that the ASO AC could not access unless such information was confidential.

KB explained that it was actually documented in the ASO AC procedures that the chair receives this information.

MS commented that they needed input from ICANN legal, as the process had not been ideal and should be improved.

RdS mentioned that he had never received a due diligence report when he was a candidate. He explained that the role of ICANN legal with respect to the ASO as an appointing body was one of advice. If any concerns are raised in the ICANN due diligence, the ASO can engage in conversation or go ahead with an appointment even if ICANN has serious concerns. He summarized by saying that ICANN legal merely offers advice and the ASO AC as an individual body making an appointment makes the decision.

e) Invitation from ICANN to appoint a member of the Customer Standing Committee (CSC)

HC informed the AC that there had been an invitation from ICANN to appoint a member of the Customer Standing Committee (CSC), but that the NRO EC had decided to decline the invitation considering that there is a separate process for reviewing numbers related performance and that the CSC is involved in names related performance.

f) Before concluding, RdS took a moment to commend the ASO for their decision to appoint Alan Barret to the ICANN Board, adding that he has known AB for a long time and that he's already been in touch with him to coordinate the transition and congratulate him. He also thanked the AC for his time on the ICANN board and noted that he looks forward to meeting with everyone once again, specially once travel returns.

The AC thanked RdS for his six years of work on the ICANN board.

10. Adjourn

There being no further business to discuss, JK moved to adjourn the meeting, EL seconded the motion, and the meeting was adjourned at 13:19 UTC.