

**ASO AC Teleconference
Wednesday, 7 June 2023
12:00 PM UTC
Draft Minutes**

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

New and updated action items from this meeting:

New Action Item 230607-1: Nicole C. to check the APNIC 56 program to see which meetings the APNIC representatives to the AC may need to attend and share that information with Germán V. The goal is to see when additional slots can be scheduled during APNIC 56 (other than Monday 11 September, which is already reserved for the AC).

New Action Item 230607-2: Esteban L. and James K. to finalize the draft of the voting section of the procedures (including the addition of a discussion phase prior to a re-vote in case of a tie). This should be completed and shared with the AC by next Monday, 12 June.

New Action Item 230607-3: Ricardo P. to go over the documents of the sections of the procedures for which the review has already been completed and check for terminology consistency.

New Action Item 230607-4: All members of the ASO AC to read the ICP-2 and include the ICP-2 review as an agenda item for the ASO AC's upcoming meetings.

New Action Item 230607-5: Germán V. will find out how the APNIC 56 registration fees will be handled, i.e., whether they will be waived.

=====

Agenda

0. Welcome
1. Roll Call
2. Agenda Review
3. Review Open Actions
4. Approval Minutes
 - a) 3 May 2023 Teleconference
5. ASO AC Second f2f Meeting Update
6. ASO AC Procedures Review Update
7. Updates
 - a) LACNIC 39 Update
 - b) RIPE 86 Update
 - c) ICANN NomCom Update
8. AOB
9. Closed Session (IF NEEDED)
10. Adjourn

=====

0. Welcome

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

1. Roll Call

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

2. Agenda Review

Hervé C. asked whether anyone wanted to add any items under AOB and whether anyone had anything to discuss in a closed session.

No topics were brought up for discussion in a closed session.

No further comments were heard, so the agenda was accepted as written.

3. Review Open Actions

Hervé C. proceeded to go through the list of open actions.

Updated 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. Hervé C. to compile all the answers in a document and share it with the ASO AC. **ONGOING**

Hervé C. will complete Action Item 230313-1 prior to the next meeting.

Action Item 230503-1: Hervé C. to reply to the NRO EC that the venue selected for the second 2023 f2f ASO AC meeting is APNIC 56 (Kyoto). **CLOSED**

Action Item 230503-2: All Procedures Review working groups to upload their texts to the wiki. All members of the AC to read the texts proposed for the different sections and provide comments on the wiki by 18 May. **CLOSED**

Hervé C. invited Ricardo P. to say a few words on this, then we can discuss this under agenda item No. 6.

Ricardo P. provided a brief update: We sent an email to the mailing list to get some feedback regarding the way forward. The idea was to try to prioritize and take advantage of the next NRO EC meetings to present some of the revised sections.

Action Item 230503-2 will be discussed further under agenda item No. 6.

Action Item 230503-3: Germán V. to look for the documents related to the calculations from when the AC decided to use the Schultze counting method for ICANN Board elections and send these documents to Kevin B., who will share with the others what his concerns are re the abuse of instant run-off voting in cases where the number of voters is low. **CLOSED**

To be discussed under agenda item No. 6.

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. **CLOSED**

Germán V. noted that the banner had been published the day after the May ASO AC teleconference.

4. Approval Minutes

a) 3 May 2023 Teleconference

Saul S. proposed a motion to approve the 3 May 2023 ASO AC Teleconference minutes, James K. seconded the motion, no abstentions or objections were heard, so motion carried.

5. ASO AC Second f2f Meeting Update

Hervé C. reminded everyone that, as discussed, the second 2f2 meeting will take place in Kyoto during APNIC 56.

Gaurav K. asked whether it would be possible to have the ASO AC meetings before the week of the conference so that the ASO AC members from the APNIC region might better avoid clashes.

Hervé C. replied that he and the co-chairs had analyzed the program of the APNIC meeting as well as the requirements for our second f2f meeting and travel arrangements, etc. It appears that Monday is pretty free, so we will try to organize our sessions on Monday to make sure that everyone can attend the sessions (some AC members will be unable to arrive in Kyoto before Sunday). He asked Gaurav K. if he could explain his constraints during the meeting.

Gaurav K. explained that the conference week will start on September 11th, that both he and Di Ma are part of APNIC SIGs, so the ASO AC sessions may overlap. He asked whether it would be possible for the AC to meet on 8-9 September, adding that if it was not possible the two would step out of the ASO AC meeting and then return later.

Hervé C. said that he would personally be unable to start before Monday morning.

Sander S. said he would adapt to whatever is most convenient for the rest.

Kevin B. said that it would be impossible to have the meeting earlier than the 11th, as travel times are very long. Moving it earlier would mean losing another work week.

Nicole C. noted that 7-10 September are reserved for workshops, not the formal meeting, which starts on the 12th and ends on the 15th. Nicole C., Di M. and Gaurav K. will be very busy during that period, so the 11th would be better for the three.

Ricardo P. shared the concerns pointed out by Kevin: if we start before the 11th, it will take a lot of time from our work. He said that, during their preparatory meeting, the chairs had discussed trying to find slots that would clash the least with other important activities (e.g., policy). The three found that Monday would be best, along with perhaps some other slots during the week. From what Nicole C. found out, Monday would be the least conflicting day for everyone.

Esteban L. agreed, adding that is a long trip from Argentina and will take almost two days to arrive to Kyoto.

James K. does not have any hard restraints yet regarding dates and is happy to adapt to dates that are best for the group.

Hervé C. noted that we can have our sessions at any time of the day that conflicts the least with activities that AC members must attend. He asked Nicole C. to check with Sunny Chendi, who is the Point of contact for the organization. Then we will try our best to schedule convenient times. During the last meeting, we had five specific slots for our work, so perhaps five one-hour slots plus a closed session would be a good option.

Esteban L. observed that it's important to take advantage of the fact that all of us are travelling to Kyoto and meet the same amount of time we did at our f2f in Cancun.

Kevin B. agreed. He hopes to have as much time as was committed in Cancun, hopefully with less things that are distracting so we can spend some more time on the review. Of course, this is contingent on the scheduling of the APNIC meeting.

Hervé C. asked Nicole C. if she could look at the APNIC 56 program and try to prepare a list of all the potential slots for the AC meeting. That will help us with the organization. Also, if we all agree to start on Monday and that we will all be there until Thursday, it will help everyone organize their trip.

Nicole C. observed that APNIC has published the official program. She agreed that Monday morning would be good to start.

Di M. also agreed that Monday morning would be fine.

Jorge V. then asked whether there is any news about the documentation needed to apply for a Japanese visa.

Ozan S. said that he and Steve S. had checked with the ICANN travel team for advice on Japanese travel, who provided them with general information. They underlined that it is important to specify in the application that an organization – APNIC – is inviting you to an event. On the APNIC website there is an information form AC members can request. Providing financial information can also help and the ICANN travel team stressed that it would be helpful to clarify that the organization is the funding source, as this would increase the probability of the application being approved.

Hervé C. thanked Ozan S. for the information.

The link to the visa information on the APNIC 56 website was shared:
<https://conference.apnic.net/56/travel/visa/>

Hervé C. said that HPH and PW will be in Kyoto and asked whether the other CEOs will also be there.

Germán V. replied that the NRO EC has not discussed having an official meeting in Kyoto. He can ask the EC at their next meeting.

As for the meeting days for the AC in Kyoto, Germán V. said he would need specific information about any slots outside Monday to secure a room for the group.

Hervé C. said that, in his opinion, it will be necessary to meet outside Monday. We will need a room for an open session, so we will need space in case people outside the AC wish to participate as observers. He asked whether there will be an ASO AC dinner.

Germán V. said that he will have to check, as the entire week is filled with socials and cocktails. He will try to figure out a space and a date for a group dinner.

Hervé C. thanked Germán V, adding that, while it is not the most important thing, it is always nice to have a dinner.

Esteban L. mentioned that another option would be to have lunch, to which Germán V. replied that he would take that option into account.

After some further discussion, the following action item was decided:

New Action Item 230607-1: Nicole C. to check the APNIC 56 program to see which meetings the APNIC representatives to the AC may need to attend and share that information with Germán V. The goal is to see when additional slots can be scheduled during APNIC 56 (other than Monday 11 September, which is already reserved for the AC).

6. ASO AC Procedures Review Update

Hervé C. shared a few words before giving the floor to Ricardo P. He thanked Ricardo P. for this work. He then shared that Germán V. has confirmed that there will be three NRO EC meetings prior to APNIC 56 (20 June, 18 July, 15 August). The idea would be to present something to the EC before 20 June, perhaps not all the sections but some of the things on which we agree and then the rest in July.

Ricardo P. reminded everyone that the AC discussed this timeline during the May teleconference: we asked everyone to take a look at the documents that the different groups working on the procedures have shared on the wiki and comment, so that if there were any concerns, we could address them. No comments were posted, so Ricardo P. assumes that everyone agrees.

Ricardo P. then recalled that there were some concerns re the Schulze method, and shared that the chairs had discussed that we might try to send some part of the documents for the EC to review so

as not to freeze everything until all the docs are ready. However, Esteban L. had then shared that the voting issue might also be ready. The idea was to take advantage of the EC meetings.

Kevin B. said that he would not put a roadblock to the proposed voting mechanism, as based on comments from James K. and Sander S. as well as on his own review, the benefits outweigh any issues he may still have. The only thing that is missing is the tie breaker, we don't have a mechanism in case of a tie. With a limited set of candidates and 13-15 voters, the possibility of a tie increases. His proposal is to have a review by the ASO AC and a re-vote between the top two candidates. If the tie persists, he would not like rolling the dice. He asked James K. if he had any suggestions.

James K. said that, in case of a tie, he understands that we would run a revote in that scenario. He likes the scenario of limiting the re-vote to the top two candidates.

KB: just include allow for consideration, otherwise the result will be the same. But a fair and frank discussion can be helpful

James K. said he liked the idea of a discussion phase before the re-vote.

Esteban L. also agreed that having deliberation before the revote will be helpful, adding that it would be easy to incorporate this into the text that the group has written.

Sander S. observed that talking with each other is always good.

Hervé C. asked Esteban L. if, in his opinion, it would be feasible to add something to this effect in the next five days so it can be ready before the next EC meeting.

Esteban L. noted that it is a good idea to send the documents to the EC as early as possible, as there will probably be some discussion with the EC or the legal team. He agreed to have something ready by next Monday.

New Action Item 230607-2: Esteban L. and James K. to finalize the draft of the voting section of the procedures (including the addition of a discussion phase prior to a re-vote in case of a tie). This should be completed and shared with the AC by next Monday 12 June.

At Kevin B.'s request, Hervé C. confirmed that this will be a draft text.

Kevin B. then observed that we have not done a grammar and consistency check between the different documents to make sure we are using the same terminology and so on.

Hervé C. agreed that this is something that needs to be done. The idea is to start the process with the NRO EC, and we will make sure that they are aware that this is a draft text.

Esteban L. fully agreed with Hervé C., adding that we can also ask the EC to check or somehow use the legal team to check the wording, the coherence of the terminology, etc. We can request their help.

James K. suggested that perhaps we could request one of the comms departments to check the language consistency.

Hervé C. agreed.

Esteban L. clarified that we would not be asking them to review the content or the ideas, merely an editorial review (grammar, legal, and syntax check).

Hervé C. noted that the other paragraph they had worked on is meeting organization and suggested that perhaps we can read it once again. He will re-share this section.

Ricardo P. said he would also check the text of the ICANN Board appointment. As he understands it, Kevin B. was talking about simply checking that the terminology we are using is consistent. He volunteered to do this: check the three of four documents to make sure that the language is consistent with the language used in our procedures.

New Action Item 230607-3: Ricardo P. to go over the documents of the sections of the procedures for which the review has already been completed and check for terminology consistency.

Hervé C. thanked Ricardo P. one more time, and concluding the discussion by noting that the idea is to have a simple process, a simple document, so that you can understand it even if English is not your native language. Simplicity and efficiency, as well as making sure that the procedures also work if there are less than 15 ASO AC members.

7. Updates

a) LACNIC 39 Update

Hervé C. opened the topic by noting that Ricardo P. had sent an update of this meeting to the mailing list.

Ricardo P. then shared some highlights of LACNIC 39: Five policy proposals were discussed, most of them regarding the Policy Development Process. One that he thinks is important and has seen discussed in other forums was regarding the critical infrastructure reserves. This proposal specifies that, whenever any resources allocated to critical infrastructure are returned, they should return to the same pool reserved for critical infrastructure. The proposal received good feedback. He added that Hervé C. had also attended the meeting, where they had the opportunity to have lunch and also to meet with Oscar Robles to discuss some of the things that are going on.

Esteban L, added that the number of attendees had been very high, and that it is increasing meeting to meeting. Also, in some way LACNIC sees that the local community is increasingly participating in LACNIC events. The last three events after the pandemic were dominated by local communities, ISPs, universities, etc., which is a very good sign. It is always important to be connected with the local communities, which is why it is good to have the meetings in different countries, not just the big ones.

Jorge V. agreed and added that the next LACNIC meeting will be held in Fortaleza, Brazil, in the month of October.

Hervé C. then said that this year, he is trying to attend an RIR meeting in each region. He shared that it had been his second LACNIC meeting, the atmosphere is very good, the community is very keen to work in good spirit. We had a discussion about the challenge of AFRINIC. We made Oscar Robles aware of our procedures review.

b) RIPE 86 Update

Hervé C. observed that RIPE 86 had taken place in Rotterdam a couple of weeks ago, the largest meeting ever in terms of attendees, a very good atmosphere, good coordination with all organizations. For example, with the Russian-Ukrainian war, for example, there are many people committed to making the Internet work in a good way. There were many interesting sessions on various topics, and Hervé C. presented the ASO AC update.

Sander S. added that it had been a really good RIPE meeting. In his personal opinion, the atmosphere improved compared to the last time. It seems that RIPE is moving in the right direction.

James K. noted that two policy proposals had been presented: Reducing IXP IPv4 Assignment Default Size to a /26, and Minimum Size for IPv4 Temporary Assignments. Both proposals have moved on to the discussion phase. Also, there is an ongoing IPv6 policy review, there has been constructive criticism and changes need to be made. Activity is ongoing. He agreed with Sander that there seems to be less tension, which is great to see.

b) ICANN NomCom Update

Hervé C. gave the floor to Germán V., who reported that the results had been reported to ICANN according to the timeline and that no concerns had been raised regarding the election of Ron da Silva, the announcement has been published on the ASO website.

Kevin B. asked whether any ASO member had not voted during this process.

Germán V. said that this time everyone had voted.

Jorge V. mentioned that there had been three abstentions but that everyone had voted.

Hervé C. concluded by saying that that was good news, as participation in all decisions is important.

8. AOB

Hervé C. reminded everyone that ICANN 77 will be held next week in Washington, adding that he will not be able to attend but Nicole C. will be there and can participate where needed.

Esteban L. said he will also attend, so if you need anything let him know.

Hervé C. suggested that Esteban L. can organize with Nicole C and that, if there is anything else, he will let them you know.

Kevin B. then observed that, if the intent is for the AC to do a review of ICP-2 in September, it would be beneficial to have some discussions about this during the AC meetings before then. We must have a framework of what work we want to do, and for that we need to have discussion and be informed. The document is twenty years old, it needs a review, which will not be simple. This type of document will last for many, many years. The AC is used to specificity, but this kind of document requires a different approach and should be included in the ASO AC meeting agenda.

Hervé C. proposed and everyone accepted the following action item:

New Action Item 230607-4: All members of the ASO AC to read the ICP-2 and include the ICP-2 review as an agenda item for the ASO AC's upcoming meetings.

Ricardo P. then asked whether ASO AC members need to take care of the APNIC 56 event fee or whether the NRO will take care of this. He noted that this information is important for the visa procedures.

New Action Item 230607-5: Germán V. will find out how the APNIC 56 registration fees will be handled, i.e., whether they will be waived.

9. Closed Session (IF NEEDED)

-

10. Adjourn

There being no further business to discuss, Esteban L. moved to adjourn the meeting and Saul S. seconded the motion. There being no votes against or abstentions, the meeting was adjourned at 13:13 UTC.