ASO AC Teleconference
Wednesday, 1 November 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** Nick Nugent (Nick N.) Chris Quesada (Chris Q.) Kevin Blumberg (Kevin B.) **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.) **Secretariat** Germán Valdez (Germán V.) Laureana Pavón (Laureana P.) – Minutes	**APNIC** Jeremy Harrison (Jeremy H.) **ARIN** Eddie Diego (Eddie D.) John Sweeting (John S.) Michael Abejuela (Michael A.) **LACNIC** Eduardo Jimenez (Eduardo J.) **RIPE NCC** Angela Dall'Ara Athina Fragkouli (Athina F.) **ICANN Board** Alan Barrett (Alan B.) **ICANN Org** Ozan Sahin (Ozan S.) Steve Sheng (Steve S.) **NomCom** Ron da Silva (Ron dS)	**APNIC** Gaurav Kansal (Gaurav K.)

New and updated action items from this meeting:

=================

Agenda

0. Welcome
1. Roll Call
2. Agenda Review
3. Review Open Actions
4. Approval Minutes
   a) October 2023 Teleconference

5. NomCom Report
6. ASO AC Procedures Review Update
7. ICANN Board Elections Update
8.- ICP-2
  a) Montevideo Meeting Logistics
9. Meeting Report
  a) ARIN 52 Update
10. AOB
11. Closed Session (IF NEEDED)
12. Adjourn
=====================

0. Welcome

Hervé C. welcomed everyone to the meeting at 12:05 UTC.

1. Roll Call

Roll call was taken. Quorum was established (under the new procedures).

2. Agenda Review

Hervé C. noted that the closed session would be maintained.

He asked Ron dS, new official ASO AC representative to the NomCom, if he would like to present an update on the start of his activities. He also invited Alan B. to say some words about the ICANN Board activities.

Nick N. suggested moving ICP-2 up in the agenda and discussing this topic as early as possible so that the members of the Legal Team could drop off the call. All agreed.

No further changes or additions were noted.

3. Review Open Actions

Action Item 231011-1: All to define the composition of the QRC via the mailing list within one week. **CLOSED**

To be discussed later under ICANN Board Elections Update.

Action Item 231011-2: Hervé C. to send to Kevin B. the slide deck they had recently shared at AIS. **CLOSED**

Action item 20230911-1: As soon as the period for candidate acceptance closes (15 December), the ASO AC to set up times for special meetings for deliberating after the last round of interviews with the candidates to the ICANN Board. **OPEN**

Action item 20230911-2: The Secretariat to start creating the 2024 ICANN Board election wiki page (a sanitized version of last year's questionnaires and reports for this year's election). **CLOSED**

To be discussed later under ICANN Board Elections Update.

Action item 20230911-3: Each ASO AC member to read and review historical documents (questionnaires, reports, etc.) related to the ICANN Board elections to obtain a better understanding of what needs to be changed. **ONGOING**

To be discussed later under ICANN Board Elections Update.

4. Approval Minutes
   a) October 2023 Teleconference

Esteban L. called a motion to approve the ASO AC October 2023 Teleconference draft minutes as written, Kevin B. seconded the motion, no abstentions or oppositions were heard, and the motion carried.

5. NomCom Report

Hervé C. thanked Ron dS for attending the meeting, adding that the ICANN meeting in Hamburg had been the official start of his term on the NomCom.

Ron dS provided the following update:
- The NomCom has looked at their work for next year, looked at the timeframe, defined and identified ownership of the various committees.
- There have been onboarding activities, as there are 14 new members on the NomCom vs just four who are returning.
- Re the implementation of the NomCom review, Ron dS said he would be able to provide another update after the next ICANN meeting.
- One thing that came up that is interesting is that the NomCom has a geographic mandate (not more than five members of the Board can be from the same region). This came up with the ASO in mind, as at the time we did not have clarity on whether Chris Buckridge identified as European or from the Asia Pacific region. We now know that he identifies as from the Asia Pacific region, which simplifies things, but he could have elected to have been identified as European. In that case there would have been five members from Europe. This could have implications for the ASO AC's upcoming ICANN Board election (even though this time CK is already on the board, and you cannot have two ASO AC appointed board members from the same region).

Kevin B. confirmed that the ASO AC has already appointed a director who is from the RIPE region, so anyone from the RIPE region would be disqualified this time. The bigger question: several years ago, we started to get much tighter in our process, trying to get the candidates to the NomCom as early as possible to assist the NomCom in their due diligence when it came to regional diversity. He asked if there is any new recommendation regarding the deadline for knowing the region from which the candidates are from.

Ron dS replied that, at this point, this is informational and there is no request to change anything. He explained that he had not meant to present a "concern" but was merely sharing the dynamic.

Kevin B. noted that once the ASO AC's process is closed, this would be a perfect point to discuss within the NomCom. We cannot change any part of the timeline now, but he would be open to further discuss the timeline after this round.

Ron dS replied that he will take this action back to the NomCom.

Hervé C. agreed that the ASO AC would be open to having this discussion after May.

Ron dS dropped off the call at this time.

Alan B. then provided the following update on the activities of the ICANN board:
- The board is always busy working on multiple things.
- Currently three stand out: the next round of gTLDs, hiring a new CEO, and hiring a new ombudsperson.
- He explained the status of the new gTLD process, which is ongoing. ICANN hopes that the next round can open as early as 2025 or 2026.
- He presented the status of the hiring of a new CEO (community input, etc.). The announcement was published after the last ICANN meeting in Hamburg.
- New ombudsperson: a search committee has been set up for this. Alan B. is on this committee. Not much has been done so far, but the committee will likely be seeking community input on what they would like to see in this new ombudsperson.

Hervé C. shared that during the last ICANN meeting there was a joint public meeting between the NRO EC, himself, and the ICANN Board. There was the question of the appointment of the new ICANN CEO, how we are managing the situation with AFRINIC, Hervé C. provided some words about the AIS which he had attended. This session was recorded and is available on the ICANN 78 website.

Alan B. then added that ICANN is of course concerned about the situation in AFRINIC and is trying to help as much as possible, always without interfering. He explained that a receiver has been appointed and that the receiver's main task is to ensure continued operations and call for elections (AFRINIC is not bankrupt, it has problems with the board quorum). ICANN has offered that John Crain help the receiver learn about what RIRs do and their interaction with ICANN, and this offer has been accepted.

Hervé C. thanked Alan B. for his update.

8.- ICP-2

Hervé C. explained that the ASO AC received a request from John Curran and the NRO EC to work on ICP-2 in two stages: 1) implementation procedures for the existing ICP-2, 2) strengthening the ICP-2. He replied to the NRO EC saying that the ASO AC positively received this request and will join forces to work on this. As for practical information, there may be a 15 min presentation at the next RIPE meeting (November).

He added that the ASO AC will have a f2f meeting —a very useful way to advance on a matter as we've seen with the procedures update— in Montevideo, hosted by LACNIC.

Sander S. asked whether for the first stage the NRO EC will be sending the text for the ASO AC to approve.

Athina F. replied that there are two different processes. The first process is about creating implementation procedures for the existing ICP-2. For this part —which will not modify the existing ICP-2— the NRO will provide a first draft for the ASO AC to review. The second part has to do with the vision of the whole ICP-2, which is a much bigger process and will be led by the ASO AC.

Kevin B. noted that the ASO AC has had lots of preliminary discussions, and now we have lots of questions in terms of timeline, also re "review" vs "lead." As things have been explained, that is not the ASO AC taking the lead, that's just us taking part in the process. Kevin B. thinks there is a lot of work that needs to be done in terms of identifying who is responsible for each aspect. Does this mean that we are taking a step back in terms of putting this to the community? There is a lot to discuss. Kevin B. wants to be clear that he doesn't get the impression that the ASO AC is there to lead the process. We need to be sure we are working within the confines of our role. He is concerned that the preliminary discussions are going to cloud our work. That's why we need to get as much feedback on what the process should now be.

Athina F. thanked Kevin B. for his questions. She agrees that it is important for everyone to be clear on our roles and what the process looks like. For the first process (implementation procedures for ICP-2, no change to the document), indeed the idea is that the ASO AC has a say/input, as does ICANN. It's something we want to complete as soon as possible. The second part, the idea is that it will be community led, ASO AC led (this second part corresponds to the discussions the ASO AC had in Kyoto). She then proposed that any questions the AC may have, they can put them in writing so they can be addressed one by one.

Nick N. thanked Athina F. for the clarification. It seems implicit from what Athina F. has said, but just to make it explicit: the implementation procedures will be a separate document that the NRO will take the lead and draft. Athina F. confirmed this.

Follow-up question from Nick N: Is there any intention that these procedures will be folded into the new ICP-2? He understands that it is a separate task that has been commissioned to the ASO AC (to revise the ICP-2 itself), but his initial gut reaction is that the implementation procedures, as John Curran described them, are substantive in nature and would or should eventually need to become part of ICP-2.

Athina F. replied that the current ICP-2 includes certain principles and criteria for the establishment of a new RIR and those will not be touched. The idea is to come up with processes for how these criteria are taken into account and, what is already implicit, ensure that they are met at all times.

Saul S. said he shares Nick N.'s concerns.

Athina F. reiterated that the criteria will remain exactly as they are currently in the ICP-2.

Saul S. replied that talking about the criteria for maintaining an RIR is a change, as those do not exist right now, they are an addition.

Eduardo J. summarized by saying that what we are doing is not changing but interpreting the ICP-2. The other process, the long one, will indeed result in changing the ICP-2.

Kevin B. said it will take some time for some of the members of the AC to wrap our heads around this. So it would be helpful to have a timeline for stages 1 and 2.

Eduardo J. believes the idea is to have a first rough draft ready to discuss in January in Montevideo.

Esteban L. excused himself and left the call at this time.

Steve S. agreed with Kevin B. that clarifications are needed, as those are very good questions. Also, should phases 1 and 2 run sequentially or in parallel? From an ICANN point of view, as he said in Kyoto, we are

committed to being a partner in this. Our primary interest is to ensure that the process is transparent, participatory, and with the affected stakeholders given the opportunity to participate and comment; to see the end-product accepted by the global internet community. Also, how do we ensure that the African voices are heard? He encouraged everyone to give some thought to this.

Re AFRINIC governance issues, Hervé C. explained that there are no longer 15 members in the ASO AC. Probably from January 2024 we will have no representative from AFRINIC, which is problematic. Part of our discussion will be to see how we can consider African voices.

Michael A. thanked the ASO AC for the chance to speak. He said that some good comments had been brought up today. For clarity, he explained that we have a two-step process. For the AC there is the question of whether the first one will be folded into the second. This is not exclusive. As for the timeline, as Eduardo J. said, we will have something for the Montevideo meeting, but because we are not introducing anything new, that will be a shorter process. The second process will probably take a couple of years. After the Montevideo meeting everything will be clearer. Part 2 is kind of the continuation of what the AC started to discuss in Kyoto.

Kevin B. then went back to the 15-min slot Hervé C. had mentioned having at ripe. Without having the draft of the first part, other than mentioning that we have received the request from the EC, what else would we say there?

Hervé C. replied that it could be merely a presentation to make the community aware of the NRO EC's request to the ASO AC and that we will begin to work on that. Nothing specifically new, as we have not started to work on the request. No more than that.

Kevin B. does not think this is appropriate. Getting feedback without a plan in place does not help. Perhaps instead we could include this information on a slide as part of the ASO AC update.

Saul S. agreed with Kevin B., the community needs to have something to comment on.

Sander S. observed that we are a bottom-up community and that we of course need to inform our community that this is something we are looking at.

Nick N. noted that today's ASO AC meeting is public, so this is not something that is being done in secret. He is all for broadcasting information, but not OK with requesting input.

Sander S. agreed with this statement.

Hervé C. explained that when he said "gathering feedback" he might not have used the right word. He agrees with Kevin B. on this but believes that it is important to give the information.

Kevin B. said that there is a mechanism already in place: 1) a broadcast goes out to the RIRs (not necessary, but it can be sent), 2) the slides that are shared during the ASO AC update. In Kevin B.'s opinion, calling for a separate discussion of this will create a situation, and we don't even have a timeline for this.

Hervé C. then agreed that reserving 15 minutes for this topic is perhaps the wrong message, as it would imply a discussion with the community. He will take the points made by Kevin B., Nick N., and Sander S. into account. He will speak with Mirjam to say that this is what we will do with everyone's agreement.

Kevin B. reiterated that step 1 is not our process (it is for the staff and the NRO EC). Step 2 is our process but until we've started looking at step 1, he doesn't know what we can say other than we received the letter. It's very premature.

Hervé C. summarized the conversation by saying that it shows that there are many questions, so we need to continue discussions.

Before moving on to the organizational aspects of the Montevideo meeting, Hervé C. thanked everyone for their input.

a) Montevideo Meeting Logistics

GV provided a brief update:
- The Secretariat is checking the number of people who will attend.
- He will send an email to confirm if we will be able to meet at the LACNIC offices or if we will need to move the meeting to a nearby hotel.
- The Secretariat is also collecting information from those who need a visa. We will soon be contacting all members from APNIC to request the information we need to have the visas processed. This paperwork will take some time and we should not leave it to the last minute.
- The Secretariat will soon provide details of hotels for your stay.

Hervé C. noted that the RIPE NCC will be filling two seats on the ASO AC at their next meeting (his and James Kennedy's), so the names of RIPE ASO AC members will be confirmed in 1st December.

The lawyers left the meeting at this time.

6. ASO AC Procedures Review Update

Hervé C. thanked everyone one more time for their work on the procedures update and for participating in the voting. He said that they had all seen that f2f meetings were very useful.

He then asked Germán V. when this new version of the ASO AC Procedures can be published on the ASO website, to which Germán V. replied that they would be online by the end of the week.

7. ICANN Board Elections Update

Hervé C. noted that at the time of the last ASO AC meeting there had been only two candidates. Germán V. confirmed that this is still the case.

Hervé C. said that there was also the question of the formation of the QRC.
For the record, the Qualification Review Committee (QRC) will be made up as follows: Sander S. (RIPE NCC), Nicole C. (APNIC), Saul S. (AFRINIC), Chris Q. (ARIN), and Ricardo P. (LACNIC).

Re Action Item 20230911-2, Germán V. explained that he has updated the internal wiki based on the page we used during the last process. We have the questions we used last time, also the timeline we developed (questions, interviews, voting). Right now, the dates are open, but that might be related to other action

items. Germán V. is working on a more detailed timeline for next year's process. Those dates will be filled in once we have confirmation of the number of candidates running in the process.

He noted that if anyone has an issue accessing the wiki, they should let the Secretariat know.

The information is there on the wiki for all to read, so Action Item 20230911-3 is also ongoing.

Kevin B. then said that, historically, where possible, we have tried to keep the QRC and IC members the same. If that's not going to be the case, the QRC person should speak in their region to the person who will be part of the IC. This is very helpful for process continuation.

Hervé C. added that we now have the new operational procedures: "there could be up to two people from each region." This is something we could figure out as well.

9. Meeting Report
a) ARIN 52 Update

KB:
- Manu policies were discussed, some similar to other regions (what is leasing, etc.). All these policies are available on the ARIN website.
- Kevin B. presented the ASO update. This update was cut down significantly because of time constraints, but his focus was to discuss the board nomination process. A couple of people expressed interest and asked in regard to what was involved, timelines, etc. So that was a positive outcome.
- Also, ARIN had a significant fellowship group this year, and they asked for me or another ASO AC member from the region to do a presentation on what the ASO is, a brief explanation similar to the ASO update but a little less scary for people who are new to ARIN (a Zoom session to give them the opportunity to ask questions and so on). This was very productive.
- Suggestion for the other regions: If you have the chance to do some preliminary work with fellows prior to a conference, this will surely be well received.

10. AOB

Hervé C. congratulated Kevin B. for his re-appointment to the ASO AC.

Also, Di Ma was confirmed once again to his position on the ASO AC, so congratulations to him as well.

11. Closed Session (IF NEEDED)

12. Adjourn

There being no further business to discuss, Saul S. called the motion to adjourn, no objections were heard, and meeting was adjourned at 12:50 UTC.