

ASO AC Teleconference
Wednesday, 4 June 2025
12:00 PM UTC
Draft Minutes

Attendees	Observers	Apologies
APNIC Nicole Chan (Nicole C.) Maemura Akinori (Akinori M.) ARIN Nick Nugent (Nick N.) – Vice Chair Kevin Blumberg (Kevin B.) Amy Potter (Amy P.) LACNIC Ricardo Patara (Ricardo P.) Esteban Lescano (Esteban L.) – Vice Chair Jorge Villa (Jorge V.) RIPE NCC Hervé Clément (Hervé C.) – Chair Constanze Buerger (Constanze B.) Andrei Robachevsky (Andrei R.) Secretariat Germán Valdez (Germán V.) Laureana Pavón (Laureana P.) – Minutes	AFRINIC Madhvi Gokool APNIC Bhadrika Panchal ARIN Hollis Kara (Hollis K.) Chris Quesada Ashley Perks Nancy Carter Eddie Diego John Sweeting RIPE NCC Athina Fragkouli (Athina F.) Ulka Athale (Ulka A.) Mirjam Kuehne ICANN Org Ozan Sahin (Ozan S.) Andrew McConachie Observers: Brajesh Jain	Di Ma (Di M.)

New and updated action items from this meeting:

-

=====

Agenda

0. Welcome
1. Roll Call
2. Agenda Review
3. Review Open Actions
4. Approval Minutes 24 April 2025
5. ICP-2 Update
6. Agenda ICANN 83 f2f Meeting

7. Reports
 - a) ARIN 55
 - b) LACNIC 43
 - c) RIPE 90
 8. AOB
 9. Closed Session
 10. Adjourn
- =====

0. Welcome

Hervé C. welcomed everyone, and the meeting began at 12:00 UTC.

1. Roll Call

Roll call was taken and quorum was established.

2. Agenda Review

The draft agenda was displayed on screen and approved as written.

3. Review Open Actions

Action Item 250424-1: Hervé C. and Germán V. will try to find a date to organize the webinar on the ICP-2 Update with GAC. Germán V. will reply to Marco that we are happy to participate in the webinar and coordinate the session. **CLOSED**

- This meeting has already happened.

Action Item 250402-1: Hervé C. to send a message to the community on behalf of the ASO AC in remembrance of Nigel Hickson. **CLOSED**

- Hervé C. shared that there will be a session to remember Nigel at ICANN 83 and that everyone is invited to attend.

Action Item 250319-3: The Secretariat to set up the voting process for the ICANN Board Seat 10 Election. **CLOSED**

- Hervé C. noted that CK has been appointed for Seat 10 once again.

Action Item 240605-3: Hervé C. to prepare a new monthly report on the ICP-2 review and send it to the NRO AC for feedback. Hervé will then send the final version of this report to the EC prior to the next NRO EC meeting. **OPEN** (This is a monthly action which will remain open until the work on ICP-2 concludes.)

4. Approval Minutes 24 April 2025

Akinori M. moved to approve the minutes of the 24 April 2025 ASO AC teleconference as written, Esteban L. seconded the motion, no objections of opposition were heard so the motion carried.

5. ICP-2 Update

Hervé C. shared that the consultation was now closed, and that members of the AC have participated in multiple meetings related to their work on ICP-2. These activities are recorded on the ICP-2 Community Engagement page on the NRO website (<https://www.nro.net/policy/internet-coordination-policy-2/community-engagement/>). There have also been multiple discussions on the regional mailing lists, including a request to extend the consultation. In this case, we replied that the consultation was closed, but that if anyone still wishes to provide feedback, they can approach any member of the ASO AC in person or via email, and that if anyone wants to provide a public response to feedback that was previously published to any of the RIR mailing lists during the consultation, they may continue to do so. The ASO AC will take into account the input sent during the consultation period, the others will also be eventually considered

Kevin B. replied that he doesn't feel comfortable with communications being left to individual ASO AC members. We are a council, not individuals. He believes this is not a proper long-term strategy.

Nick N. took responsibility for this, adding that his reply to a comment on the mailing list might not have been properly worded (his idea had been to say that the door is never closed, that people can always talk to us). He agrees that it shouldn't be about contacting individual members.

All agreed that the AC should not be closed to discussing any issues but that this must be done as publicly as possible. It's a good practice to receive any comments that are submitted.

Hervé C. said that they should discuss how the community feedback will be addressed.

Andrei R. replied that the approach we took last time (when analyzing the feedback on the Principles document) had worked very well. We could adopt a two-phased approach: first, a spreadsheet for detecting and prioritizing common themes, then a second spreadsheet with our agreements/conclusions on individual issues. This approach was very structured, transparent, and productive. There are high expectations among the community that they will be able to see how the feedback was addressed in the document so they can trace how their input was considered.

Kevin B. replied that he doesn't think the way we did it last time will work this time. First, because of a timing issue (we only have Sunday to go through and figure out what needs to be done). The good news is that there are far fewer comments than last time, but they are much more complex. We should figure out what the comments were and then work through them. Some will take longer, as making one change will require multiple changes throughout the document. But we only have Sunday to come up with an agenda to decide what we need to go through. We should encapsulate the feedback and then go through them as a body.

As for the ICANN public comment proceeding, Andrew M. shared that he had finished the report on the comments received and passed it to the legal team. The report will be ready for sharing with the ASO AC by Sunday. After the AC reads his report, Andrew M. would be interested to hear whether the AC found it useful or whether they would prefer a different style/ type of summary.

Addressing what Kevin B. and Andrei had said, Ulka A. shared that she's been working on the best way to get the community feedback to the AC. She has prepared a spreadsheet, but different from the one she prepared for the Principles document. She hopes it will provide the AC with traceability and allow them to go through the feedback more quickly.

Esteban L. said that they will dedicate the first session on Sunday to having an overview of all the comments received, so he suggested that, if at all possible, Andrew M. and the RIR Comms team should have their reports ready by Sunday.

Hervé C. noted that he would not be arriving in Prague until Tuesday, so Nick N. and Esteban L. will be leading the sessions until then.

Andrei R. observed that we are coming to this ICANN meeting much less prepared than we did in February. We need a list of main themes and a discussion on how they will be addressed. Question: What are we trying to achieve by the end of next week? Are there any deliverables? Will our analysis of the comments be published? There's no need to rush, as we need to analyze the feedback very clearly and transparently.

Kevin B. replied that the entire AC will be present and that we are capable of doing focused work when we are together. Kevin B.'s understanding is that the bulk of the responses will be worked on during the week in a way that allows us to figure out changes to the draft, as our goal is to have a revised draft asap.

As a member of the drafting team, Esteban L. said that the goal is to have a new version as "final" as possible by the end of the week. To achieve this, we need to advance with the analysis in the first two days and then begin drafting. The AC's work in Malasia was very productive, but Esteban L. agrees that this time we don't have as much time, as we need to do the drafting during the week.

Kevin B. agreed that the AC's work will be very compacted compared to what we did before, but there are far fewer comments this time. We know that by Thursday the drafting team wants to have a revised version, so we need to start running on Sunday. We may need to adjust our methodology as we go.

Kevin B. added that there is no analysis team, that the entire AC will be going through the comments, not individual people going through the feedback serially but all of us working through them together. This time, the process we went through for the Principles document is not applicable for multiple reasons (less comments, shorter timeline).

Esteban L. agreed, noting that the discussion could be led by the people who worked through the comments (some have been more focused on the drafting than on the analysis of the comments). As a group, we will provide the work. We need to use our time in Prague very efficiently.

Andrei R. repeated his question: do we want to make the themes table available to the community?

Kevin B. replied that, in his opinion, we won't be able to answer this question until we start the work on Sunday. We might not have a themes table but a report or something else. It's premature to decide this before we start working on the input.

Hervé C. agreed with Kevin B. in the sense that we will have the answer on Sunday to Andrei R.'s very legitimate question.

6. Agenda ICANN 83 f2f Meeting

Hervé C. observed that there will be a lot of work on ICP-2 at ICANN 83, both closed and open sessions. In addition to analysis and drafting, there will be multiple meetings with different organizations over the week. We won't use the same slide deck every time. All of this involves a lot of logistics.

Ozan S. reminded everyone that they have time to register for ICANN 83 until Sunday, as on-site registration will not be possible. He then shared the ASO AC agenda for ICANN 83, which was displayed on screen, and the group discussed who might be the presenter at each joint meeting.

Esteban L. noted that ASO AC work sessions would likely begin after the ASO Information Session on Sunday, which would be presented by HPH and Nick. N. (as Hervé C. would not be arriving in Prague until Tuesday).

Kevin B. asked if there would be a dedicated space where we can work in parallel, to which Ozan S. replied that this time there will be no separate workroom for ASO members or RIR staff.

Hervé C. said that they will do their best to try to find a quiet place.

At 12:01, Nick N. apologized and left the call.

Andrei R. said that he would not be attending ICANN 83 in person. Although he doesn't want to impose his constraints, he would like to participate remotely at least in the initial working sessions.

Esteban L. said that the AC had asked Germán V. and ICANN to arrange remote participation for all official sessions. The problem would be if we have to work in an "unofficial corridor office", in which case remote participation will not be possible. He added that the AC will do our best to connect Andrei R. if there is a parallel working group without remote participation, even if it is with personal Zoom accounts.

Germán V. observed that remote participation will be provided for all the working sessions, and he will send Andrei R. the links via WhatsApp or email.

Andrei R. thanked Germán V. for this.

7. Reports

a) ARIN 55

Amy P:

- ARIN 55 went well, there weren't a lot of comments about the RIR Governance Document, not much active engagement as in other regions.

Kevin B:

- We had multiple opportunities for the community to comment on the RIR Governance Document (presentation + Q&A, table topics, a second meeting where we had a webinar two weeks after the meeting).
- A number of policies are still being discussed in the ARIN region, Kevin B. will share the link to the ARIN 55 report once it's available.

Hollis K:

- All of the input from the meetings, mailing lists etc. has been included in the table prepared by Ulka A.

b) LACNIC 43

Ricardo P. has already shared his LACNIC 43 report via the mailing list so everyone could see it in advance of today's teleconference.

Ricardo P:

- LACNIC 43 was a very productive, well-attended meeting.
- Highlight: we had two sessions about ICP-2, one more dynamic, more talkative. We did receive some comments from the public about the original document, the review process, next steps, etc. We asked people to send their comments to the mailing list, and we did receive some feedback.

c) RIPE 90

Hervé C:

- There was much discussion, lots of input, the RIPE community is very interested in ICP-2.
- We had an ICP-2 BoF which was very well attended, and participants asked many questions.
- With all the remarks we received, we produced a document and a slide deck with the outputs from the RIPE community which Hervé C. was able to present at the plenary (this report has already been shared with the AC via the mailing list).

Constance B:

- We also had an open-housed session on 29 April with lots of discussions.

Andrei R:

- I was surprised by how engaged the community was during the BoF and the plenary session. The comments are incorporated into Ulka A.'s spreadsheet.

8. AOB

Hervé C. thanked non-AC members for their participation in today's teleconference. After making sure that only AC members and the secretariat remained on the call, the AC continued with their closed session.

9. Closed Session

-

10. Adjourn

Esteban L. moved to adjourn the meeting, Akinori M. seconded the motion. There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 13:35.