ASO AC Teleconference
Wednesday, 4 December 2024
12:00 PM UTC
***Draft* Minutes**

Attendees	Observers	Apologies
APNIC Nicole Chan (Nicole C.) – Vice Chair Gaurav Kansal (Gaurav K.) **ARIN** Chris Quesada (Chris Q.) Nick Nugent (Nick N.) Kevin Blumberg (Kevin B.) **LACNIC** Jorge Villa (Jorge V.) Esteban Lescano (Esteban L.) Ricardo Patara (Ricardo P.) – Vice Chair **RIPE NCC** Hervé Clément (Hervé C.) – Chair Constanze Buerger (Constanze B.) **Secretariat** Germán Valdez (Germán V.) Laureana Pavón (Laureana P.) – Minutes	**AFRINIC** Madhvi Gokool Saul Stein **APNIC** Jeremy Harrison Maemura Akinori **ARIN** Eddie Diego Hollis Kara Michael Abejuela John Sweeting Nancy Carter Amy Potter Ashley Perks **RIPE NCC** Ulka Athale (Ulka A.) Mirjam Kuehne Athina Fragkouli Andrei Robachevsky (Andrei R.) **ICANN Board** Alan Barret **ICANN Org** Andrew McConachie (Andrew M.) Ozan Sahin (Ozan S.) Carlos Reyes **Community:**	**APNIC** Di Ma (Di M.)

New and updated action items from this meeting:

New Action Item 241204-1: Germán V. to send an email to ASO AC members with the 2025 ASO AC Chair Election schedule, as well as the relevant procedures.

==========

Agenda

0. Welcome
1. Roll Call
2. Agenda Review
3. Approval of Minutes
    a) November 2024 Teleconference
4. Review Open Actions
5. ICP-2 Update
6. ICANN Board Seat 10 Election Update
7. 2024 Work Plan Activity Review
8. 2025 ASO AC Work Plan
9. Annual Transparency Review
10. 2025 ASO AC Teleconference Schedule
11. 2025 ASO AC Chair Election Schedule
12. 2024 ASO AC Appointments Review
13. ICANN Publication Series
14. New ASO AC onboarding session
15. Farewell leaving ASO AC members
16. AOB
17. Closed Session
18. Adjourn

==========

0. Welcome
Hervé C. opened the meeting at 12:00 UTC.

1. Roll call
Roll call was taken quorum was established.

2. Agenda Review
The agenda was approved as written.

3. Approval of November 2024 Teleconference Minutes
Esteban L. moved to approve the November 2024 ASO AC minutes, Kevin B. seconded the motion, no opposition or abstentions were heard, so the motion carried.

4. Review Open Actions

Action Item 241106-1: German V. to send an official email informing ICANN that Louie Lee has been appointed to the NomCom. **CLOSED**

Action Item 240605-3: Hervé C. to prepare a new monthly report on the ICP-2 review and send it to the ASO AC for feedback. Hervé will then send the final version of this report to the EC prior to the next NRO EC meeting. **OPEN**

It was decided to keep Action Item 240605-3 open to consider future reports.

5. ICP-2 Update

Hervé C. said that the idea for today was to accept a timeline for the ASO AC's work during 2025 so we can prepare our travels for 2025.

Nick N. noted that ASO AC met in Istanbul, where they met meet with the Legal Team to hash out some of the logistics of the timeline. He then went over the highlights/milestones of the timeline: 1) the NRO EC will be meeting f2f at ICANN 82 in Seattle, where the EC has agreed to review the full new ICP-2 document, so the ideal time for the ASO AC to meet to work on drafting the final document will be at APNIC 59 in Malaysia. 2) The ASO AC's next meeting would be in Prague (ICANN 83). 3) The ASO AC will be doing a lot of work via email / online. The timeline will be tight, as we need to get the draft to the NRO EC before the end of the year. We proposed looking at the feedback as it comes in vs. waiting for the consultation to close. 4) After December, we will hand over the process to the Legal Team/EC and our task will be done, as the ASO AC was charged with the drafting, not the entire process.

Kevin B. stressed that one of the things that was decided in Istanbul was to work on several things in parallel, not one after the other (e.g., a team working on the ICANN Board election, another on the drafting of ICP-2, and so on). The most important thing that came out of Istanbul is that we need to better communicate our timeline. Ulka A. and CCG have offered their help with this. One of the key points of the timeline is the report on the answers to the questionnaire. Kevin B. suggested having a group draft a report and have it ready at the end of January, so the AC has time to review it prior to our meeting in February. Also, the feedback we receive through the questionnaire will give us a sense of its success.

Hervé C. agreed that it will be necessary to create working groups: one to work on the new ICP-2 document (the "parchment"), another to analyze the results of the questionnaire, another to work on the Seat 10 election (we need to form the IC).

Constance B. shared her concern that the time from publishing the version 1 of the parchment until June is very short.

Nick N. replied that the first look of the ICP-2 is a courtesy we are doing for the community (to allow greater participation, transparency, etc.). The initial first look idea was suggested in Istanbul, and it seemed like a good one. In his opinion, this step will not be a consultation but a courtesy. One option might be not to advertise it but instead have it as an aspirational goal.

Kevin B. added that one of the things he, Nick N. and Hervé C. had worked on after Istanbul was trying to compress some of the timeline. By the time we get to February, the Legal Team will have already seen some of the work, so this should cut down the timeline significantly. This gives us a better chance to meet our goal.

As an incoming member of the ASO AC, Andrei R. volunteered to be part of the working group for the analysis of the survey results. This was noted.

Esteban L. agreed with Kevin B. One of our learnings from the first stage of this process is that we have to work together with the Legal Team and the NRO EC, so when we arrive at the final version, we have the agreement of everyone involved.

Going back to the “first look” and whether we publicized it, Nick N. suggested we don’t, but said he would like to hear the others’ opinions. Should we promise that we will publish this or keep it as an aspirational goal?

Athina F. replied that, in Istanbul, we noted that if the parchment was published in the middle of an RIR meeting cycle, it wouldn’t be fair, as some RIRs would have two chances to comment. What we discussed was sharing a first version through webinars, and a second version incorporating this input up for discussion at RIR meetings. This would be part of the public timeline.

Kevin B. noted that, even if we promise to publish this, we should put an * saying that it is contingent on NRO EC approval of the draft.

Ulka A. added that there is a lot of interest among the RIR community about this process, so it’s probably a good idea to publish this, even if saying that this is a goal that the ASO AC has.

Andrei R. asked how the ASO AC sees the public consultation, i.e., what shape and form it will take (open the floor? Another survey? Meetings, webinars?).

Kevin B. replied that the heavy work on the answers to the questionnaire will begin in January. What it will look like is entirely dependent on how the results from the questionnaire come out. The format that’s been described so far is a webinar and Q&As, but it’s premature right now to say what it’s going to look like. We’re probably a month away from saying what the consultation will look like, so the decision will be made later.

Andrei R. noted that this is something we need to decide before publishing the first look.

Re the schedule for the consultation summary, Nick N. added that it may take a bit longer than originally thought to get this out. We may have to budget at least two weeks for the EC review, and then perhaps additional time might be needed.

Kevin B. agreed. That’s why we need to finalize the parchment by the end of January and say that our aspiration is for it to be made public prior to the first APNIC meeting of 2025. If needed, we could schedule a teleconference specifically to review the draft, not necessarily wait until the next scheduled meeting.

Andrei R. and Constance agreed.

Ulka A. observed that the CCG is working towards publishing the data, at least the raw data, along with ICANN (20 January). The CCG is also analyzing what data they can provide to the corresponding working group to facilitate their work.

After some additional discussion, Hervé C. suggested approving the timeline by motion.

Esteban L. moved to accept the ICP-2 timeline as written as presented by Nick N. and discussed by the ASO AC, Nicole seconded the motion, no objections or abstentions were heard, so the timeline was approved (f2f meetings at APNIC 59 in Malaysia and ICANN 83 in Prague).

Hervé C. observed that they now need to decide the exact dates on which the ASO AC will schedule its f2f working sessions in Malaysia and the members of each working group. So far, we know that the drafting

team will be Nick N. and Esteban L. Similarly, Andrei R., Kevin B., Constance B. and Amy P. have volunteered to be part of the team that will analyze the results of the questionnaire. We need to decide who will be part of the team working on the ICANN Seat 10 election, including the members of the Interview Committee.

It was suggested to have 28 February - 1st March as anchor days for ASO AC working sessions at APNIC 59. Others suggested that three days of working sessions would be better, as the ASO AC will not be going to ICANN in March and there are also some other things we need to do (onboarding, etc.).

Decision: Because we need to know whether the NRO EC will approve a f2f meeting of the ASO AC at APNIC 59, the ASO AC will decide on which dates they would like to schedule three days of working sessions at APNIC 59 after this call and via the mailing list.

Hervé C. stressed the need to know whether the NRO EC approves this meeting ASAP so we can make travel arrangements and avoid clashes with our day jobs.

Germán V. replied that he'll notify the NRO EC of ASO AC meeting plan in APNIC59, as well as with APNIC staff to secure a room during the APNIC conference.

6. ICANN Board Seat 10 Election Update

Germán V. provided the following update: we still have two candidates, the attestation document has been sent, as well as a reminder to both candidates who have expressed interest. Nominations will close on 16 December.

Hervé C. observed that we need to form the IC and prepare a timeline for the interviews.

The composition of the IC was decided: Ricardo P. Hervé C., Nicole C., Kevin B., and Amy P.

7. 2024 Work Plan Activity Review

Hervé C. noted that he and Constance C. have already volunteered to work on the 2024 Work Plan Activity Review and will have something ready for the next ASO AC teleconference.

8. 2025 ASO AC Work Plan

Hervé C. shared that Kevin B. has already volunteered to work on the 2025 ASO AC Work Plan.

9. Annual Transparency Review

Hervé C. reminded everyone that Kevin B. had done a full update of the Annual Transparency Review last year and that Christ Q. has already volunteered to help this year's review until the end of his term.

Hervé C. volunteered to help Kevin B.

Kevin B. noted that this time it should not be a long process, as opposed to what we've done in previous years.

10. 2025 ASO AC Teleconference Schedule

Germán V. displayed the proposed teleconference schedule on screen. All went over the proposed dates and a few proposed changes were included.

Hervé C. suggested having the first ASO AC meeting on 8 January, with voting for the ASO AC chair beginning on 1st January. He also noted that there are no issues/clashes with the 5 February teleconferences. The other dates can be agreed at a later date.

All agreed.

11. 2025 ASO AC Chair Election Schedule

Hervé C. went over the election schedule.

New Action Item 241204-1: Germán V. to send an email to ASO AC members with the 2025 ASO AC Chair Election schedule, as well as the relevant procedures.

12. 2024 ASO AC Appointments Review

Hervé C. shared that there was only one appointment during 2024 (Louie Lee to the ICANN NomCom).

13. ICANN Publication Series

Andrew M. said that in Istanbul there had been some discussion about the placeholder name "parchment", so he had volunteered to share how ICANN names its publication series. He then shared on screen a presentation on ICANN Publication Series and how they are named to provide guidance on how this "parchment" document might be named. He went over how each SO / AC has named their publication series (some use numbered schemes, others simply the title of each document, others more complex options). Conclusion: Advisory Committees have numbered document series, while SOs don't. Recommendation for "parchment:" give it a good descriptive title and in the opening paragraph include a statement such as "this document supersedes....".

Kevin B. observed that they should not rename the document during the process to avoid confusing the community. It would be a disservice to the community to change the name right now. Once the final document is decided, it will be up to ICANN to decide how it will be named.

Chris Q. agreed.

Nick N. agreed partially, as he believes the ASO AC can provide input on that issue (name of the document).

Andrei R. said that the title of the document will likely change, as in a way it is a completely different document but agreed that keeping the working title throughout the process makes sense.

14. New ASO AC onboarding session

Hervé C. shared that a Doodle poll has been sent out to have this session during the week of 9 December.

Kevin B. observed that, given the heavy work load the ASO AC will have in 2025, he believes we should have a second onboarding session during our f2f meeting at APNIC 59.

15. Farewell leaving ASO AC members

Hervé C. thanked Chris Q. and Gaurav K. for their participation and work on the ASO AC.

Other AC members echoed Hervé C.'s words.

16. AOB

-

17. Closed Session

-

18. Adjourn

There being no further business to discuss, Chris Q. moved to adjourn the meeting, Nicole C. seconded the motion, no opposition or abstentions were heard so the meeting was adjourned at 13:33 UTC.