ASO AC – San Juan, Puerto Rico (ICANN 79)
Monday, 4 March 2024
12:00 PM UTC
Notes

Attendees	Observers
APNIC	**APNIC**
Nicole Chan (Nicole C.) – Vice Chair	Paul Wilson (Paul W.)
Gaurav Kansal (Gaurav K.) - online	Keni Huang (Keni H.)
ARIN	**ARIN**
Nick Nugent (Nick N.)	John Curran (JC)
Chris Quesada (Chris Q.)	
Kevin Blumberg (Kevin B.)	**RIPE NCC**
	Athina Fragkouli (AF)
LACNIC	Micheal Abejuela (MA)
Ricardo Patara (Ricardo P.) – Vice Chair	Nancy Carter
Esteban Lescano (Esteban L.)	
Jorge Villa - Online	**ICANN Org**
	Ozan Sahin (Ozan S.)
RIPE NCC	Steve Sheng (Steve S.)
Hervé Clément (Hervé C.) – Chair	Danielle Rutherford
Constanze Buerger (Constanze B.)	Carlos Reyes
Sander Steffan (Sander S.)	
	Observers
Secretariat	Raymond Mammath (Ghana), online
Germán Valdez (Germán V.)	Anuk Agrawal
Laureana Pavón (Laureana P.) – Minutes	Sebastian Bachollet (LACRALO chair)
	Akinori Maemura (AM)

New Action Items stemming from the ASO AC f2f Meeting held in San Juan

New Action Item 240305-1: Hervé C. to ask Ron da Silva whether he would be ok to continue to serve as the ASO AC NomCom representative if "conditions are met".

New Action Item 240305-2: The Secretariat to publish the three existing versions of the MoU (1999, 2004, 2019) on the ASO wiki.

New Action Item 240305-3: Steve Sheng to share with the ASO AC the documents he has from the time when AFRINIC was created (documents proving that AFRINIC met all the requirements of ICP-2). This will serve as background information for the discussion of the ICP-2 principles.

New Action Item 240305-4: The Secretariat to schedule weekly teleconferences for a period of four weeks during which the ASO AC will continue to discuss the principles document. After the initial four, these teleconferences will continue but their frequency will be reduced.

New Action Item 240305-5: The Secretariat to expedite creating on the ASO AC website a section/page dedicated to the ICP-2 Review. This should include the proposed timeline, some historical information, and any other relevant documents and/or information as needed.

New Action Item 240305-6: The ASO AC to promptly discuss via the mailing list who will help the Secretariat decide what documents/information should be displayed in the ICP-2 Review part of the ASO AC website.

Meeting notes

Work Session 1/12

Hervé C: welcomed everyone and presented the work to be done during the week, including the agenda.

Kevin B: shared and explained the timeline for the two phases of the ICP-2 Review. Goal for this week: have a finalized timeline to present to the NRO EC for approval.

John C: The EC presumes the AC will do extensive online work, but to the extent you meet f2f all the RIRs have budget concerns, so we'd like to hear the list of where you'd like to go and travel requirements as early as possible. Also, we'd like all of you going to the same place.

Kevin B: The ASO AC will not be meeting at RIR meetings, so no additional travel there. All of our online meetings are open, we will offer more sessions to allow more members of the AFRINIC region to have updates as well. As for additional travel, we are looking at the ICANN meeting in Istanbul, that would be our only request that the ASO AC chair will formally submit.

Sander S: Thanks to Kevin B. for the planning and thanks to the NRO EC for the Montevideo meeting, which was extremely successful, as well as for this meeting in Puerto Rico.

John C: We encourage that when we hold a f2f meeting for everyone to attend and suggest strongly remind AC members of the importance of their duty.

Kevin B: Although this is not a formal meeting, I will ask the ASO AC chair to prepare attendance records for f2f meetings.

Esteban L: This has to do with transparency.

Hervé C: We need to find ways to have people participate.

John C: The NRO had its legal team review the input the AC supplied; we are finishing this. Then we'll loop in ICANN, we are optimistic that this will go well. Thank you to the ASO AC for this. The implementations procedures document is operational, so I don't see any delays. However, we need to consider the participation of ICANN, so the finalization date is TBD.

Kevin B: The participation of ASO AC members is critical, it doesn't have to be through the mic, it can be via the mailing list or the chat. If this is not enough, then the chair could roll call to ask for comments, but that would be the last resort.

Sebastian Bachollet: As I am representing the end user within ICANN in Europe, what are you expecting from us and when would you like us to be involved? What will be the timeframe you'd like the ICANN comment period or something else?

John C: The NRO EC looked at ICP-2 last year and saw that it hadn't been updated in 20+ years. We wanted the internet number community to do this, and the only group that has community representation is the ASO AC, so we asked them to look at the document and see what is needed, including the community. Hopefully, the ASO AC will engage with every RIR community and others and come up with a cohesive view of what would be needed for this document. This will then go to ICANN, which has another consultation process. Unlike the procedures document, the update of the ICP-2 will be a long, complex process with multiple consultations with the community.

Kevin B: We've already heard from some ACs and SOs that they'd like more information. Informational sessions on how the NRO works may not be done by the ASO AC but by the NRO EC. We want to be collaborative in this regard.

Sebastian B: I just realized we are talking about two different acronyms. Now I get the point but be careful when communicating with ICANN (the use of AC may be confused with Advisory Council). Also, please don't think that because we are not here that we don't care. I think your work is essential and at the end of the day we need to support what you are doing.

Hervé C: Perhaps we can have a more visible agenda as it will be great to have increased participation of other ICANN bodies.

Akinori M: Thank you for your point, Sebastian. The ASO does its business mainly at RIR meetings, but sometimes we come to ICANN. Perhaps the ASO should provide a summary update to the community, perhaps a liaison.

Keni H: The ICP-2 update is very important, I am concerned about timing. Consultation might take a long time, even years. Probably it's not necessary to wait until ICP-2 is final to start asking for community feedback.

Kevin B: We are working on an expedited basis to get community feedback (12 month process). So far, the ASO AC is going to run a consultation process of 30 to 45 days to get feedback from stakeholders. I know ICANN follows a similar consultation timeline. The only question is whether the RIRs that have a unique way of doing things will want to have internal consultations.

John C: When the ASO AC does global number policy, each region follows its own PDP. The problem is that it is a 3 to 5 year process. However, this is not a GDP. We can run a different development process, it's up to each RIR to decide how they will conduct the consultation in their region. If all the RIRs are flexible on how they handle this, we are not confined to such a lengthy process.

Kevin B: The intention is to allow for any RIR that wants to run a consultation to have time to do it.

Sebastian B: If at any time you need input from the ACs or SOs, just come to us. Thank you for your work.

Sander S: I was told that the work we do on ICP-2 may be the most important work we've done, and we are fully aware of the responsibilities that come with that.

Akinori M: My concern is whether the AFRINIC community will be able to participate.

Hervé C: We have considered this fully, as we want all the community involved in a quality way. AFRINIC is definitely part of this process.

Kevin B: That's the reason for running an ASO consultation, not an RIR consultation. But that does not solve the issue of information and participation. So, we'll do updates with the RIRs, as well as zoom sessions, post documents to the ASO website. We are very sensitive of the situation right now. We will continue to see how we can engage, e.g., if an IAS event happens, we'll be there.

John C: To the extent possible, it would be helpful if the ASO AC can have very public documents and engagement in all the regions. Obviously, some processes in some regions require final sign off, so at some time there will need to be signature by AFRINIC, but hopefully by then AFRINIC will be out of its trials.

Hervé C: Our goal is to be as open and transparent as possible, engaging all the regions. Our only closed sessions are about ongoing elections. We also have an open mailing list. We could also provide a report to the different ACs and SOs about what we do.

Kevin B: 95% of the work we do is public. We keep a private mailing list exclusively for personal data. Also, we had a discussion in Montevideo about our working documents. An option was to take a snapshot once a month. This would give everyone a month to work on the docs while also keeping public records.

Esteban L: This would increase the workload for the Secretariat quite a bit. But I agree with the idea of setting some milestones or control points.

Chris Q: Perhaps we could do a quarterly summary. We are looking at a long process, an update a month might be a lot.

Kevin B: This is up to the secretariat. Obviously, the quarterly summary is an excellent idea.

Hervé C: Summaries with bullet points could be helpful, as people will likely not read monthly updates. Would we have the manpower to do all the work monthly if multiple comments start coming in?

Nick N: When additional questions arise, if they require circling back with the ASO AC, that can be handled quickly. However, we cannot discount that they may have to be circled back to the community.

Kevin B: It's more about transparency.

John C: We have to have respect for the community, both the people who will be involved in the process as well as the community in 5-10 years. I see the value of having snapshots, but snapshots that show almost the same content as before are not useful. Five years from now, I want to see how comments originated a new document. The incremental timeline is not as important as making

sure that we record how things progressed. We did not have this for the original ICP-2, so it would be good to have it for this updated version.

Athina F: It doesn't have to be sophisticated: a file that shows what comment was received and what changes it originated (why they were incorporated or not, etc.). This may be useful for transparency.

Kevin B: This depends on how much feedback we receive. We could release a different version whenever significant changes are introduced to the document.

Constanze B: Perhaps we could use a class method (grouping similar inputs).

After some further discussion, the group moved on to the next item on the agenda: Update on the ICANN Seat 9 Election process.

Ricardo P. explained the process: We received five nominations, then began the written interview process. Candidates were given 10 days to reply. This deadline has gone by, and we only received responses from four of the candidates. We are now analyzing the responses and ready to start the next phase: oral interviews.

Kevin B: We are on track, on schedule, the process is moving smoothly.

After discussing the agenda for Session 2, the group left for lunch.

Work Session 2/12

Attendees	Observers
APNIC Nicole Chan (Nicole C.) – Vice Chair **ARIN** Nick Nugent (Nick N.) Chris Quesada (Chris Q.) Kevin Blumberg (Kevin B.) **LACNIC** Ricardo Patara (Ricardo P.) – Vice Chair Esteban Lescano (Esteban L.) Jorge Villa - Online **RIPE NCC** Hervé Clément (Hervé C.) – Chair Constanze Buerger (Constanze B.) Sander Steffan (Sander S.) **Secretariat** Germán Valdez (Germán V.) Laureana Pavón (Laureana P.) – Minutes	**APNIC** Paul Wilson (Paul W.) **ICANN Org** Ozan Sahin (Ozan S.) Steve Sheng (Steve S.) Carlos Reyes (Carlos R.) Andrew McConachie

A table with the ICP-2 Review – ASO AC 2024/2025 timeline (draft version) was displayed on screen and Kevin B once again went over the dates for each step in the process. He reiterated that the goal of this f2f meeting in San Juan is to have this timeline to go from draft to final.

The group then discussed the timeline with input from the various people present at the meeting:

Steve S: If the ASO AC will meet f2f in Istanbul, we can time the consultation to conclude before Istanbul. Perhaps the ASO AC can use the time in Istanbul to decide how you will address the comments received. This is part of transparency.

Ozan S: Comments will be publicly available as they come in.

Kevin B: Is there an expectation of privacy?

Ozan S: Submitters must create an ICANN account, individual or collective. Usually when a group has their comments ready, they are submitted collectively.

Kevin B: Two-fold problem: 1) spamming (random bots responding), 2) how do we go through all this in a completely open model? If there is an expectation of privacy, we need to have closed sessions, which we want to avoid.

Ozan S: When people create their account, they agree for comments to be public (GDPR perspective, we need to honor requests to not publish their names).

Paul W: I don't see AFRINIC at all on the table.

Kevin B: This doesn't reflect the work of the ASO AC itself. We will be having Zoom updates with the same information, expanding those for AFRINIC if needed. Also, we are hoping that an IAS meeting will take place, in which case it might be necessary to expand our budget request to send a small delegation to IAS. Hopefully there will be an update as to whether the IAS will be taking place soon.

Kevin B: Question for Nick N: Can we start working on the draft before we receive all the feedback? Then, will we be able to go from Istanbul to a draft before mid-January?

Nick N: I think it's possible, there's a lot of ideation that can take place before all the feedback comes in.

Kevin B: We were given a 2024/2025 timeline. We have endeavored to have things complete by June 2025. Is this a reasonable timeline as far as the EC is concerned?

Paul W: I'm sure it will be alright.

Hervé C: I agree with the proposed timeline.

Esteban L: I also agree. If we allow each RIR to have its own process, given that AFRINIC has no process at all, I wonder if there will be differences in AFRINIC's process. In my opinion, it would be better to maintain this as a global process in terms of legitimacy and how the process is managed.

Kevin B: I agree. We are running our own process, a global process, this is our responsibility.

Esteban L: I fully agree. But speaking for LACNIC, we should have some information session or similar, not a consultation within the global process. This can be managed in every region.

Kevin B: Are you suggesting that, if the RIRs are going to run their consultations, they should see to it that AFRINIC also has a consultation?

Esteban L: Yes. My idea is that it would be better to have a fully global process.

Hervé C. agreed with Esteban L. and then moved on to another agenda item.

While Germán V. shared on screen the ICANN Feedback to ASO AC's Timeline on ICP-2 Review, Kevin B. went over the document and sought answers to the questions included in the document:

Overall Feedback:

Relationship between ICP-2 Version 2 and ICP-2 Version 1 Implementation Document

- *Currently an ICP-2 version 1 implementation document is being drafted, and we understand that the intention is for it to go into effect well before the ASO AC finishes ICP-2 version 2 work. Will the ICP-2 version 2 replace ICP-2 version 1 and therefore also make the ICP-2 version 1 implementation document obsolete?*
- *Will there be a need for an ICP-2 version 2 implementation document, or will key concepts in the ICP-2 version 1 implementation document be included in ICP-2 version 2?*

Micheal A: I would say that just as we are dealing with ICP-2 and the implementation procedures now, while comments will be considered, it is not intended to be an operational document.

Steve S: What I hear is that v2 of ICP-2 will supersede ICP-2 version 1, so the procedures will be obsolete.

All then went on to discuss what the name of the new document should be (i.e., ICP-2 version 2 or a completely different name), whether the group can draft a completely new document or merely review the existing one, and the importance of requesting clarification of the ASO AC's mandate.

ICP-2 Version 2 development process

- *For ICP-2 version 2, ICANN understands this to be a community-led process with broad engagement and input from RIRs, the ICANN community, and the broader internet community. Please confirm if our understanding is correct.*

ICANN's Role

- *If ICP-2 version 2 remains an instruction to ICANN on the recognition (and continued maintenance) of RIRs, then ICANN expects to be involved and to provide expertise and input into the process. Any changes to (or addition of) obligations on ICANN would require consideration through ICANN's public comment processes prior to ICANN Board consideration.*
- *ICANN wishes to be a supporter and partner to the ASO's effort. We recommend further discussion between both groups to reach a common understanding of ICANN's role.*

Steve S: There are two parts to this question. For getting ICANN community input, the process itself is enough. There are actually three comments periods. We are still trying to figure this out ourselves, ASO AC input on what our role will be. How we can support the ASO AC's work.

Kevin B: The question you pose is more operational and related to the EC. I don't want to overstep my bounds as a member of the ASO AC. Hopefully what we provide is generic enough so that all parties can say "OK, here's how we're going to do things." Operational aspects would never be included in our document.

Steve S: Perhaps we can table this, we need some time to think about this (NRO EC / ASO AC). This morning's discussion was very good in explaining that the ASO AC is considering transparency.

Timelines and Logistics of the development process

Promote Transparency and Increase Participation:

- *To promote transparency and increase participation, we recommend all working sessions related to ICP-2 version 2 be open, with remote participation made available. This includes regular document working sessions, face-to-face meetings during ICANN Public Meetings, RIR meetings, or dedicated workshops.*

Stakeholder Input:

- *We recommend three ICANN Public Comment proceedings.*
    - *The first proceeding would focus on ICANN community input on the draft principles document. It should augment and complement the ASO's own stakeholder consultation. The proceeding should be no less than 40 days. At the end of the proceeding, ICANN staff will develop a summary report. Looking at ASO AC's draft timeline, we recommend this proceeding start at the end of September 2024 and close shortly after ICANN81 in November 2024.*
    - *The second proceeding would focus on the ICP-2 version 2 draft document. Again, it should augment and complement the ASO's own stakeholder consultation. The proceeding should be no less than 40 days. At the end of the proceeding, ICANN staff will develop a summary report. Looking at ASO AC's timeline, we recommend this proceeding start in late February/early March 2025 and end in May 2025.*
    - *The third proceeding will be opened by the ICANN Board. This is a required procedural step in the ICANN Bylaws prior to ICANN adopting a policy. The proceeding should be no less than 40 days. At the end of the proceeding, ICANN staff will develop a summary report. Looking at ASO AC's timeline, we recommend this public comment be opened in June 2025 and closed in August 2025.*

Kevin B: I think everything here matches what we are looking at.

Esteban L: Agree.

Ozan S: This assumes the closure of the first proceeding shortly after ICANN 81. Then the start should be the first week of September.

Kevin B: That's what we are looking at, I hope that having two similar consultations at the same time does not cause fatigue.

Steve S: The consultations are for two different audiences. Our goal is to complement, not to compete.

ICANN SO/AC Engagement

- *Once the timeline is finalized, we recommend that the ASO AC Chair notify ICANN SO/ACs chairs of this work and let them know how they can contribute and provide input to the work e.g., participate through Public Comment).*
- *At various milestones, (e.g., draft principle document, draft ICP-2 version 2 document), we recommend the ASO AC conduct webinars to inform the ICANN community.*

Steve S: We will sleep on the question about ICANN's role and come back to you on that.

Work Session 3/12

Attendees
Same participants as in Work Session 2.

Hervé C. introduced the discussion for this session.

Kevin B: The role of the ASO, especially in light of ICP-2 and our area of responsibility. We are asking RIRs for information. Formality with ICP-2 is critical. At any time in the future somebody might say "we didn't like the process you followed." So, we must focus on our role.

Nicole C: Agree with Kevin B's opinion. The most important thing is to place every party in the correct position, then it will be clear (ICANN has its goal and mission, RIRs have their own responsibilities and purpose). Then ASO can play the role written in the bylaws. I presented a report at APNIC last week for transparency, but no details as the ASO AC is still working. Having opportunities to raise issues or answer other stakeholder's questions is good, but we need to discuss in advance internally to make sure our actions are appropriate.

Kevin B: This is not how we've usually worked, that makes it hard. We must become more familiar with all the formalities, as this is appropriate when talking with other SOs.

Kevin B: What happens when community members ask us how we're doing? Provide our personal opinions? Direct them to the ASO website? We must agree on this. Next question: Can we participate in an internal RIR process? Even if we take our hats off, how would that be perceived? Should we stay out of the RIR processes? We need to agree on this as a body.

Nicole C: I agree. When someone asks for our opinion, it is because they want to provide their opinion back.

Sander S: We are here because the community elected us. If I go to a RIPE meeting and there's some news about what we're doing, I won't have a choice. They trust me, but I don't want to influence them too much. It's inevitable for us to get dragged in, so we need to agree.

Kevin B: We have the website, we have meetings, we have records, what they are trying to tease out is your personal opinion. All the information is there, people can come to their own conclusions and send us their input.

Sander S: I don't necessarily agree with that position. The people who elected me want to know how I am representing them in this process. It's not as black and white. Like it or not we have some sort of leadership position in our regions other than our role in the ASO AC.

Hervé C: I have no problem being objective with the people I meet. I know I am a board appointee, but people know that the ASO is working, trying to solve a problem, that everything is available for people to read, and that anyone can attend our meetings. Everything we've done here will be listed under official presentations on the ICANN website. If there are specific questions, I have no problem saying "This is under discussion, but there will be a step when the community will be involved, consulted, etc." Then people will be confident that we are following a specific process, and we are paying attention to what we do.

Constanze B: I am used to coordinating opinions and bringing them to a result. We discuss here, open up the website, the timeline, we can open up what we do here. I agree with Hervé C.

Ricardo P: I am aligned with the idea that we as ASO AC members even with our hats off we are the ones writing the principles and asking opinions. Whatever way we participate in the comments will somehow be biased. We are expecting different ideas from the community. I am OK to not participate. We can point people to public information.

Esteban L: I agree with Ricardo P. Our responsibility to the community is to bring them the information and then for them to express themselves so that we can prepare our document.

Sander S: I agree. People will come to us, ask questions, they have no idea what we are doing. Our meetings are public, our website is public, we should encourage their participation. I can tell them where to find the minutes but stop before actually voicing an opinion.

Kevin B: We are elected to serve on this body. The problems start when we voice our own opinions.

Sander S: I strongly disagree. If the body reaches an outcome, then that is what we will say. But people come to me because they know me and prefer to come to me rather than go to the website. I cannot refuse to speak to people, but I will not go beyond what is public.

Hervé C: I cannot agree with people starting to express their own opinions. But I agree with saying what is specifically public.

Sander S: we can speak to people, say where the process is, but not put our own opinions in the process. That's where we should draw the line. All speak with one voice, no deviations.

After some further discussion, all agreed not to participate with their own personal opinions.

Before finishing the day's sessions, Kevin B. suggested following up on the mentor-buddy system. Mentoring through the process of how things are done. Suggestion: anybody who has been on the AC for three years can mentor someone. If anybody wants to be a mentee, they should say so. Understanding what the ASO AC is about can take years.

Ricardo P: That's a great idea. Informally I have done this with some new members, I have been very happy to help, so count on me for this.

Hervé C. closed this session and thanked everyone for their participation.