ASO AC Teleconference
Wednesday, 2 October 2024
12:00 PM UTC
Draft Minutes

Attendees	Observers	Apologies
APNIC Nicole Chan (Nicole C.) – Vice Chair Di Ma (Di M.) **ARIN** Chris Quesada (Chris Q.) Nick Nugent (Nick N.) Kevin Blumberg (Kevin B.) **LACNIC** Jorge Villa (Jorge V.) Esteban Lescano (Esteban L.) **RIPE NCC** Hervé Clément (Hervé C.) – Chair Constanze Buerger (Constanze B.) **Secretariat** Germán Valdez (Germán V.) Laureana Pavón (Laureana P.) – Minutes	**AFRINIC** Madhvi Gokool **APNIC** Jeremy Harrison **ARIN** Eddie Diego Hollis Kara Nancy Carter Michael Hollyman Ashley Perks Michael Abejuela **LACNIC** Maria Gayo Paula Suarez **RIPE NCC** Angela Dall'Ara Ulka Athale **ICANN Board** Alan Barrett Christian Kaufmann (CK) **ICANN Org** Andrew McConachie (Andrew M.) Ozan Sahin (Ozan S.) Carlos Reyes (Carlos R.) Steve Sheng (Steve S.) **Community:** Andrei Robachevsky Mirjam Kuehne Athina joined at 13:05 Sander Stefann	**APNIC** Gaurav Kansal (Gaurav K.) **LACNIC** Ricardo Patara (Ricardo P.) – Vice Chair

New and updated action items from this meeting:

New Action Item 241002-1: ASO AC members who wish to volunteer to be part of the QRC should express their interest via the mailing list with the next week. These volunteers will join Nicole C, Chris Q, and Constance B, who have already volunteered.

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

Agenda

0. Welcome
1. Roll Call
2. Agenda Review
3. Review Open Actions
4. Approval Minutes September 2024
5. ICP-2 Update
6. ICANN 81 Prep
7. 2025 NomCom Representative
8. ICANN Board Election Seat 10
        a) QRC Volunteers
9. Reports
        a) ICANN Board Activities
        b) AIS 2024
10. AOB
11. Closed Session (If need it)
12. 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 displayed on screen. No additions or changes were made, so the agenda was approved as written.

3. Review Open Actions

Action Item 240605-1: Hervé C. and Germán V. to start preparing the agenda for the ASO AC face-to-face meeting at ICANN 81 so that the AC can begin making their travel arrangements. **ONGOING**

To be discussed under agenda item 6.

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**

Also to be discussed under agenda item 5.

Action Item 240605-5: Kevin B. to create a slide outlining the role of observers during ASO AC meetings to be displayed on screen before the meeting agenda. **CLOSED**

HERVÉ C. noted that Action Item 240605-5 was left open during the September meeting as Kevin B. was not present on the call.

Kevin B. suggested closing this action item, as the text has been well-discussed. Recommendation: review the text at the f2f meeting at ICANN 81 and then begin using the text in the new year.

All agreed.

4. Approval Minutes September 2024

Esteban L. called the motion to approve the September 2024 ASO AC meeting minutes, no abstentions or oppositions were heard, so the motion carried.

5. ICP-2 Update

Hervé C. shared that the AC had a meeting with the RIR comms teams and ICANN's comms team to start preparing the questionnaire. The legal team sent the last version of the Principles document.

Nick N. thanked Maria G. and the rest of her team for preparing an introduction and staging a questionnaire so quickly. It looks great, but he has some questions.

Hervé C. called a motion to accept the latest version of the Principles document as written, Nick N. seconded the motion, no abstentions or opposition were heard, so the motion carried.

Hervé C. moved on to discuss the questionnaire itself. The decision was to launch this questionnaire on 8 October, which will be during the start of the next LACNIC meeting.

Esteban L. confirmed that there will be an informational session on Tuesday, during which they will present the questionnaire and call on people to participate in the consultation process.

Nick N. had some comments on the product prepared by Maria and the comms team.

The group then discussed various aspects of the questionnaire, including the language of the introduction, how the text of the Principles will be presented (inline or link to the Principles document), possibility of translating the Principles document and the questionnaire, scale used for rating agreement with each principle (scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree", not a scale of one to ten vs a five-option, as the goal of the public consultation is to measure the temperature (agreement/disagreement) of the numbers community on the principles the ASO AC is proposing), and others.

Steve S. also shared how ICANN will hold its public consultation on ICP-2. In this case, they will adapt their scale to match the one used by the RIRs.

Kevin B. summarized the discussion as follows: ICANN has a list of what they normally do, the RIRs have a list of what they normally do, the ASO AC wouldn't want to stray from the norm. And we only have three days.

As for the translations, it was brought up that Typeform has an auto translation tool, that there is concern regarding how to process open comments if they are accepted in any language, so they should be limited to the official languages of the RIRs. At CCG level, they usually have things in Spanish and Portuguese (typical of the LACNIC region) and in French (AFRINIC region).

Andrew M. said that ICANN is planning on publishing translations into the six languages used by ICANN as they become available.

As for what data will be published, Kevin B. said that he believes everything will be published (comments, name, email address, affiliation). The idea behind the questionnaire is that we are not engaging in a mailing list public conversation but are looking for the output to be there so everybody can see it.

Ozan S. observed that the ICANN public process requires each proceeding to provide a summary report once the proceeding closes. This can be general conclusions or more granular. How to approach this summary report is up to the ASO AC.

Kevin B. reiterated that, in the case of ICANN, it's important that ICANN does it the way they usually do it. With the RIRs, because we are doing a questionnaire and not using a mailing list, this was the reasoning behind making the results public: we're not looking for anonymous feedback. Most of the discussion was with Athina F. (who is not on the call right now). Multiple last-minute details need to be addressed, so, if the ASO AC can give a sense of the room, we need to defer to the chair and the people he's asked to help him to decide on what comes in over the next few days.

Michael A. agreed with Kevin B. that we need to see what the ASO AC is interested in doing. On one hand, there are legal requirements, but then there is also what the ASO AC would like to see as the output of the whole process. "Tell us what you'd like to see, then we'll tell you if there are any hurdles." The final answer may not be on this call, but it would be great to see what the ASO AC would like to see.

Hervé C. noted that the outcome of the survey is something the ASO AC will discuss at ICANN 81.

Ulka A. said her understanding was that the idea of having the questionnaire is that it replaces what would have been done through a mailing list (not anonymous), but because it is so complex we chose to do it as a questionnaire, not an open mailing list.

Kevin B. agreed. Now, the difference is between the gathering of the info vs the dissemination of the data. This is the discussion we need to have over the next few days.

Athina joined the meeting at this time.

Hervé C. asked whether we are ready to launch the document without further approval.

Athina F. stressed the need to decide what information will/won't be made published before the questionnaire goes live (for GDPR reasons).

After some further discussion, it was decided that the ASO AC would figure this out over the next few days and make sure we are all on the same page. All agreed that we have to deal with this before the questionnaire comes out, otherwise we will be creating problems for ourselves.

Hervé C. prosed the following way forward: the ASO AC to decide what information will be made public before the end of this week.

All agreed and Hervé C. concluded by thanking everyone for an intense and interesting discussion about ICP-2.

6. ICANN 81 Prep

Hervé C. gave the floor to Ozan S.

Ozan S. reported that ICANN 81 will take place on 9-14 October (https://meetings.icann.org/en/meetings/icann81/). He stressed that onsite registration will not be available and then detailed the sessions related to the ASO. Next steps: the ASO AC will work on the agenda for their sessions, and ICANN will work on the agenda for the rest of the sessions.

Hervé C. thanked Ozan S. He noted that it's been difficult to build a concrete agenda for ASO AC sessions at ICANN 81, so the AC will continue to work on this.

All ASO AC members present on the call confirmed that they would attend ICANN 81.

Ozan S. reported that the full ICANN 81 schedule will be available on 21 October.

7. 2025 NomCom Representative

Hervé C. summarized the situation, noting that Chris Q. had volunteered to be appointed to the NomCom by the ASO AC, but finally this will not be possible.

Chris Q. explained there is already a member on the ICANN board who works with Verisign, so he is removing his name to avoid any conflict.

Hervé C. thanked Chris Q. adding that he doesn't think we will be able to have an appointee to the NomCom for 2025 but will do our best to have someone in the future.

Kevin B. also thanked Chris Q. for highlighting this potential conflict, adding that it is very important and we should all consider such things.

Chris K. thanked Chris Q. for his statement. He also thanked all prior NomCom members, as this involves a difficult schedule and lots of work. He noted that it had come up during an ICANN Board meeting that the ASO didn't have a representative and we didn't know why. Also, questions from some people on the ICANN Board: How much work does the NomCom involve? Do people here have an opinion? Is it too much work?

Not interesting? Why do we as the ASO have a problem coming up with candidates? Other constituencies are keen on filling these positions.

Kevin B. replied that the key difference is that other constituencies are much larger, i.e., the ASO AC includes 15 people at most. Also, there is a perception, perhaps outdated, that the amount of work is significant, which may be a concern.

Hervé C. added that the AC has discussed this at length in the past, that councilors already have a lot of work, so they don't have much time. Chris Q. volunteered because his term on the AC is ending this year.

Alan B. observed that it's not necessary for the NomCom rep to be a member of the ASO-AC.

8. ICANN Board Election Seat 10

a) QRC Volunteers

Hervé C. reminded everyone that we are in the first phase (nominations) of the ICANN Election process, which will continue until 16 December. We must now form the Qualification Review Committee (QRC), whose role is to define the list of qualified candidates. With the new ASO AC operational procedures, the QRC consists of five ASO AC members, with no more than two from the same region.

Way forward: form the QRC within a week. ASO AC members can express interest today or later in the week via the mailing list.

Germán V. added that we already have a nomination, so although we have time, it would be good to have the QRC formed soon.

Nicole C, Chris Q, and Constance B. volunteered to be part of the QRC.

New Action Item 241002-1: ASO AC members who wish to volunteer to be part of the QRC should express their interest via the mailing list with the next week. These volunteers will join Nicole C, Chris Q, and Constance B, who have already volunteered.

9. Reports

a) ICANN Board Activities

Chris K. provided a couple of updates:
- When it comes to AFRINIC and the interaction between the RIRs and ICANN, we still have weekly calls, but there is not much to report, as we are waiting for the Mauritius courts to decide
- It's funny and ironic that Alan B. and I, as numbers people, are in high demand for the next round of gTLDs, mainly because we have a technical understanding and background, and we volunteer to a degree, also because we are non-conflicted. This has been quite time-consuming.
- The feedback we received about there not being an ASO representative to the NomCom.
- We have a new CEO coming, a numbers person as the new CEO. We have the first board meeting with the new CEO in January.
- The rest of the activities are DNS related or have to do with the next round of gTLDs, which is about 60% of what the Board is doing now.

- Also, thanks for bringing Alan B. back.

Alan B:
- The NomCom issue did make it's way to the board, the deadline has now passed but when the ASO AC has name I'm sure the person will be allowed in.
- I'm involved on the Audit Committee, also on the IANA Functions Review team, several committees, WGs, or caucuses related to the next round of TLDs, as Chris K. mentioned. Also, it does seem to be expected that we will volunteer for names related topics.
- I'm in the Board Committee for the Grant program (10M of the proceeds of the last round of gTLDs are going to this program).
- Pilot holistic review: at the moment some of the reviews are delayed pending the result of the pilot holistic review. I know the ASO was invited to put somebody on that team. I know this invitation was declined, but if you change your mind I'm sure your appointment will be well-received.

Chris K:
- As the majority of you will be in Istanbul, we will be available if you have further questions. We are looking forward to seeing you there

Re the holistic review, Germán V. said he will try to follow the developments and decisions that will come, as the ASO runs independent reviews with the cost covered by the NRO, so he needs to provision any new reviews to the ASO. It's been a while since the last review and the cost takes up a significant part of the NRO budget, so he will follow closely to be ready for a new review.

Alan B. explained that the holistic review is separate from the ASO Review. Apart from the delay, he expects the ASO review to proceed as previously.

Hervé C. thanked Alan B. and Chris K. for their update.

b) AIS 2024

Hervé C. shared that he and Nick N. had attended AIS 2024 on site, a three-day event organized by AFNOG in Mauritius. It was very useful and provided the opportunity for the African community to meet and discuss. There were very interesting presentations by the community, as well as a presentation by ICANN about their activities, multiple discussions about the situation at AFRINIC. He and Nick N. had the chance to give an informational presentation about ICP-2. There was much interest among the community, the presentation was very well attended. Also, our attendance was appreciated.

Nick N. added that he and Hervé C. had not only had the opportunity to interact with various African stakeholders but also to visit AFRINIC's offices and talk with the staff. The purpose was to deliver an ICP-2 update, much of the implicit purpose was to ensure AFRINIC and its community that we care and are invested. It was helpful. There seemed to be appreciation of the effort to support them, hopefully that came across.

10. AOB
-

11. Closed Session (if needed)
-

12. Adjourn

There being no further business to discuss, Nick N. called the motion to adjourn, KB. seconded the motion, no objections were heard, and the meeting was adjourned at 13:55 UTC.