

ASO AC Teleconference
Wednesday, 5 April 2023
12:00 PM UTC
Draft Minutes

Attendees	Observers	Apologies
AFRINIC Saul Stein (Saul S.) APNIC Nicole Chan (Nicole C.) – Vice Chair Di Ma (Di M.) ARIN Kevin Blumberg (Kevin B.) Chris Quesada (Chris Q.) Nick Nugent (Nick N.) LACNIC Ricardo Patara (Ricardo P.) – Vice Chair Jorge Villa (Jorge V.) Esteban Lescano (Esteban L.) RIPE NCC Hervé Clément (Hervé C.) – Chair Sander Steffan (Sander S.) James Kennedy (James K.) Secretariat Germán Valdez (Germán V.) Laureana Pavón (Laureana P.) – Minutes	ARIN John Sweeting (John S.) Eddie Diego (Eddie D.) AFRINIC Madhvi Gokool (Madhvi G.) RIPE NCC Angella Dall'Ara (Angella D.) ICANN Board Alan Barrett (Alan B.) ICANN Org Ozan Sahin (Ozan S.) Steve Sheng (Steve S.)	APNIC Gaurav Kansal (Gaurav K.)

New and updated action items from this meeting:

New Action Item 230405-1: Germán V. to publish the draft notes prepared by the Secretariat of the five ASO AC working sessions during ICANN76 (Cancun) as notes on the ASO AC website.

New Action Item 230405-2: Hervé C. to inquire with the NRO EC about the possibility of the ASO AC holding a f2f meeting in September during the APNIC meeting in Kyoto or at an alternative venue prior to September.

New Action Item 230405-3: Hervé C., James K. and Gaurav K. to work on concrete wording for the procedures on quorum and decision making before the last week of April. The ASO AC to review and discuss this text during the May ASO AC teleconference.

=====

Agenda

0. Welcome
1. Roll Call
2. Agenda Review
3. Review Open Actions
4. Approval Minutes
 - a) 8 March 2023 Teleconference
 - b) 13-14 March 2023 f2f Meeting
5. ASO AC f2f ICANN 76 Meeting Debrief
6. Next ASO AC f2f Meeting
7. ASO AC Procedures Review Update
8. ASO AC Notifications
9. ICANN Nom Com Call for Nominations Update
10. Closed Session (IF NEEDED)
11. AOB
12. Adjourn

=====

0. Welcome

Hervé C. welcomed everyone to the meeting at 12:02 UTC.

1. Roll Call

Roll call was taken. With twelve members present on the call, quorum was established.

2. Agenda Review

Hervé C. went over the agenda, which was shared on screen.

It was agreed that there would be no need for a closed session today.

Jorge V. said he would like to share an idea during the AOB.

3. Review Open Actions

Action Item 230313-1: Hervé C. to check with each RIR when a policy proposal is marked as global and whether it is vetted before it comes to the ASO AC. Also, to check what are the next steps once a policy is marked as global. **ONGOING**

Hervé C. observed that he has not started working on this action yet. He asked the others to share with him the name of the policy officer in each region.

Kevin B. suggested going through the Secretariat. Question for the group as part of this action item: If something is found to be going on re global policy, would the ASO AC like to give any advice to the region? If we are not going to do anything with the information, then it is not valuable.

Hervé C. agreed to include the above in the action item and will come back to this in May.

Action Item 230308-1: The Secretariat to publish the 2023 ASO Work Plan. **DONE**

Germán V. confirmed that the 2023 Work Plan has been published to the website.

Action Item 230111-1: The Secretariat to make the mailing lists more visible on the ASO website and include a list of all non-open (private) mailing lists and publish the list on the ASO website for transparency. **IN PROGRESS**

Germán V. explained that the plan is ongoing, resources have been committed by ARIN to design the banner. However, ARIN is in the eve of their meeting in Tampa, so Germán V. will coordinate to have something designed prior to the next ASO AC meeting.

4. Approval Minutes

- a) 8 March 2023 Teleconference
- b) 13-14 March 2023 f2f Meeting

Hervé C. said he had sent a couple of remarks on the draft version of the 8 March Teleconference, to which Germán V. replied that remarks have been duly noted.

Esteban L. moved to approve the 8 March 2023 Teleconference minutes, Kevin B. seconded the motion, no opposition or abstentions were heard, and the motion carried.

As for the 13-14 March minutes, Sander S. moved to approve, Esteban L. seconded, but Kevin B. opposed, noting that Cancun had not been a formal meeting, so these should not be accepted as formal minutes. He suggested publishing them, but not as formal minutes.

Chris Q. agreed with Kevin B.

Sander S. then proposed accepting that the draft minutes prepared by the Secretariat are an accurate representation of what was discussed during the five working sessions held by the ASO AC in Cancun and publishing them.

Germán V. said that he could arrange to publishing them on the website as notes of the f2f meetings during ICANN76.

Esteban L. agreed with Germán V.'s suggestion, as it is very important to have a record of all the work the ASO AC did at the f2f.

Kevin B. agreed that for transparency there's no reason not to include the notes on our website.

All agreed so the following action item was decided:

New Action Item 230405-1: Germán V. to publish the draft notes prepared by the Secretariat of the five ASO AC working sessions during ICANN76 (Cancun) as notes on the ASO AC website.

5. ASO AC f2f ICANN 76 Meeting Debrief

Hervé C. said that the idea of this agenda item was for ASO AC members to provide input on whether they had found the f2f meeting productive, learn what can be improved, etc. It's always useful to have at least once year a f2f meeting.

Esteban L. replied that, in his opinion, it had been a very useful and productive meeting, an example of how the work can be done and how the ASO AC can progress when working on a specific issue (in this case, the review of the operating procedures). He would like to repeat the experience because it had been very useful.

In turn, Kevin B. said that having the NRO EC members on site had been very beneficial for this particular meeting. Unfortunately, we don't know when this presence will be beneficial, so it is important to keep our eye on this to understand what the EC's priorities are and share with them what our priorities are. Things like the ICANN board and PTI joint session, it was wonderful to have that again and hopefully these things can continue.

Herve C. agreed. He then asked if the length and number of the time slots had been appropriate.

Kevin B. replied that, overall, it had been great. One suggestion for the next time: there should always be a time slot available for a closed session related to NomCom or ICANN Board election issues.

Esteban L. agreed.

Hervé C. thanked Kevin B. for his comment.

6. Next ASO AC f2f Meeting

Hervé C. said that the AC has to conclude the work on the procedures and asked the others' opinion about having a second meeting this year, perhaps in Kyoto (APNIC). He also asked the others' thoughts about meeting in 2024.

Kevin B. replied that the idea was to meet at a RIR meeting at the end of the year. The key consideration is that ICANN meetings have kept their first meeting close to the north American area. Unfortunately, the ASO AC is a geographically diversified group. Also, meeting in Belgrade at the RIPE meeting had turned out to be unbelievably useful, as we were able to get work done during the meeting and it also gave a perspective to ASO AC members who had never seen policy done outside their region. Question to Hervé C.: Will you be asking for support to have another meeting this year at another location?

Herve C. replied with another question: Will it be important to have a f2f meeting at the end of the discussion of the operational procedures review? In that case, September would be the limit for that. The specific location for next year's ASO AC f2f meeting remains open.

Saul S. agreed that the complexity of people getting to the meetings needs to be looked at.

In Esteban L's opinion, after seeing the results and benefits of our last f2f meeting, it would be a good idea to have another meeting before the end of this year to complete the discussions and have the document ready for the NRO EC's approval. The problem, however, may be the budget for our organizations. He also agreed that selecting a location that most people can attend is important and maybe in that case it is not the best idea to always have the ASO AC meeting with the ICANN community meetings.

Hervé C. noted that there is not much choice if the ASO AC wants to meet f2f before the completion of the procedures review document. The only place would be Kyoto in September, then the Hamburg ICANN meeting in October, which is a little late for our schedule.

Kevin B. said he does like the idea of moving around, and Hervé C.'s suggestion to meet at APNIC is in line with that. As for the reasons for the meeting, we have good reasons. Based on the Cancun meeting, there was a lot of discussion about candidates/nominations to the ICANN Board and there's a lot of work that could be done in September in regard to the output of Cancun (when we ask questions to the candidates, what those questions are, the different phases for the board election, etc.). There's a lot that could be done in September. But we would need approval in the next 45-60 days (for visas and so on). Do we have a formal motion from the ASO AC to request a meeting? Would anybody be opposed to that?

Hervé C. moved to inquire about the possibility of holding a f2f ASO AC meeting in September during the APNIC meeting in Kyoto, Sander S. seconded the motion, no oppositions or abstentions were heard, and the motion carried.

New Action Item 230405-2: Hervé C. to inquire with the NRO EC about the possibility of the ASO AC holding a f2f meeting in September during the APNIC meeting in Kyoto or at an alternative venue prior to September.

Steve S. then shared that Japan's visa process can be quite time consuming, particularly for those coming from Africa. He suggested starting the process as early as possible. He offered to go back to the ICANN travel department and share with the ASO AC what documentation is needed.

7. ASO AC Procedures Review Update

Hervé C. said that the idea for the timeline would be for the different working groups to have some documents ready for June so that the AC can take a look at them and have something ready to be approved in September.

Members of various working groups then shared the status of their work. All agreed on the need to advance and have something ready by June.

Kevin B. noted that one of the outputs from Cancun was the urgency around the ASO AC's quorum and voting rules and the suggestion to get those done irrespective of the other sections. Based on what he saw in Cancun, there had been a lot of support for the simplification suggested by Esteban L. The question is, can we push this through and get this done? If so, we could potentially approve this during our May meeting. Otherwise, it will get bundled in with the other things and it will be September before it gets to the EC. He asked whether the others agreed that we can expedite this new section on which we have a lot of support as a body.

Esteban L. agreed that there had been a lot of consensus about this proposed modification, but that he, James K. and Gaurav K. need to work on the concrete wording. To expedite the process, the three can work on the specific wording and have a proposal for the entire group before the end of April.

All agreed.

New Action Item 230405-3: Hervé C., James K. and Gaurav K. to work on concrete wording for the procedures on quorum and decision making before the last week of April. The ASO AC to review and discuss this text during the May ASO AC teleconference.

Kevin B. observed that, from his understanding, the AC had removed regional representation for quorum. He asked if that was that the others' interpretation as well.

Esteban L. agreed. In fact, this is in the meeting section, not the quorum section. We already changed the corresponding paragraph (removed the need for full geographic representation) as agreed at our f2f meeting.

8. ASO AC Notifications

Herve C. said that this agenda item has to do with how SOs and ACs are notified of ICANN's various invitations and activities.

Kevin B. asked the following question: Most of the other constituent bodies have their terms that start at the beginning or end of ICANN meetings, but the ASO AC is calendar based. Is this correct?

Steve S. replied that not all SOs and ACs are based on ICANN meetings, as some others are also calendar based (e.g., SSAC). There is quite a variety of practices within the community. If you know the future composition of the AC, a common practice is for the incoming leader to attend with the outgoing leader to facilitate the transition.

Kevin B. explained that, unfortunately, ASO AC chairs and vice chairs are chosen the first week of January, we don't know in advance. There should probably be a list of dates on which the transitions occur, that would be helpful. The most important aspect is the formalities around the notifications. Example: If the ICANN Board is going to request advice from the ASO AC, what path does this take? Does it go to the Secretariat, the chair? And what about vice versa? We don't have a well-documented procedure for the different scenarios that might occur.

Steve S. thanked Kevin B. for his comment and said he is very happy to engage in this discussion regarding communication channels.

Hervé thanked Kevin B. and Steve S. He will engage with Steve S. to continue this discussion.

9. ICANN Nom Com Call for Nominations Update

Herve C. he saw that the call for nominations had been published and will close on 25 April.

Germán V confirmed this, adding that a reminder has been published and the RIRs are propagating this reminder in their mailing lists as we speak. At this point we haven't received any nominations, so if you are considering doing outreach in your regions, you still have time to do so.

Hervé C. reiterated his request to the members of the AC to reach out to potential candidates to the position.

Kevin B. observed that it is important for the voting to support the option for the AC to defer the election and not elect anybody. We should not be forced to appoint a candidate and must set the bar higher. He wants to make sure that, if there is no candidate we believe will be able to do the work at the level we believe they should, then we should be able to defer and not select this year.

10. Closed Session (IF NEED IT)

-

11. AOB

Hervé C. gave the floor to Jorge V.

Jorge V. said he wanted to share an idea with his LACNIC colleagues, concretely, to delegate the task of keeping track of policies in the five RIRs to the PPFT, not only global policies (i.e., keeping track of policies in each region). The second part of the idea is to have a PPFT coordinator selected by PPFT members.

Hervé C. said that this might be linked to his action item regarding how a global policy can be marked as such. The idea might be more work, but it might provide an exact view of what is being discussed.

Jorge V. said that the AC has to check in our regions what is happening in terms of policy, it might be useful to know what is going on in the other regions. Have a table with active policies and their status in the five RIRs in a single document. Anyone who wants to know what is going on can refer to this single document. The PPFT could be the group updating this document. The first stage would be the most difficult, but from then on, it would only require adding or removing, so it would be easy. Jorge V. offered to share the idea on the list for discussion, perhaps attaching an example of what the document might look like.

James K. noted that the ASO AC's mission is focused on global policy. In the RIPE region there is a list of active policies. Perhaps we could have a link to such a page for all the RIRs. But he does not see the value of the ASO AC taking on that workload.

Jorge V. said that, in many cases we need to update our slide deck or do a presentation, and then we have to request all the regions for an update. If we have a common point for this information, it would make it easier for all of us.

Kevin B. agreed with James K., i.e., do not take on a lot of work that is not related to global policy. The point about the slides is true, but we have RIR staff who maintains this for the community, and we can go to them for this information and get it from the authoritative source.

John S. said that Eddie D. prepares a report at each ARIN meeting for our community and this report is maintained on the ARIN website. This would be the source of truth. There might be some conflicts if the ASO starts reporting on regional policy, as trying to track policies in two different places is not a good idea.

Angela D. said that she is already drafting a monthly summary about policy discussions in all RIRs, she can share this with the representative of the ASO AC taking care of global policy. Perhaps she can work with James K. and see what is interesting and share that with Germán V. prior to the monthly meetings.

Jorge V. said that his was merely an idea about the need to have the information in a single place to avoid having to go to each RIR for the information. There may obviously be a better way to do it.

John S. agreed that it would be good to set up a process through which the AC could get updated information, perhaps monthly.

James K. said that a link might be included on the ASO website to the policy proposals in each RIR, and to back that up we can lean on already existing mechanisms such as the monthly report of ongoing discussions. This would resolve the challenge mentioned by Jorge V. and avoid duplicating efforts.

Kevin B. said that he does not want to discuss anything outside of the global nature of a policy, adding that maybe this is the time to clean all that up.

Sander S. said he was tempted to set up a simple web interface where the RIR PDOs can update the status of policies directly, and to keep the ASO AC out of the loop. He does not think the ASO AC needs to be involved here, except as a consumer of the policy status information. This is useful for the community, but not something that we need to be involved in.

If anybody has additional comments on this, they can share them to the mailing list.

12. Adjourn

There being no further topics to discuss, Esteban L. moved to adjourn, Sander S. seconded the motion, no objections or abstentions were heard, so the meeting was adjourned at 1:28 pm UTC.