

**ASO AC Teleconference
Wednesday 2 February 2022
12:00 PM UTC
Draft Minutes**

Attendees	Observers	Apologies
<p>AFRINIC Mike Silber (Mike S.) – Vice Chair Saul Stein (Saul S.)</p> <p>APNIC Nicole Chan (Nicole C.) Shubham Saran (Shubham S.) Di Ma (Di M.)</p> <p>ARIN Kevin Blumberg (Kevin B.) – Chair Martin Hannigan (Martin H.) Chris Quesada (Chris Q.)</p> <p>LACNIC Ricardo Patara (Ricardo P.) Esteban Lescano (Esteban L.) Jorge Villa (Jorge V.)</p> <p>RIPE NCC Hervé Clément (Hervé C.) – Vice Chair James Kennedy (James K.) Sander Steffan (Sander S.)</p> <p>Secretariat Germán Valdez (German V.) Laureana Pavón (Laureana P.) – Minutes</p>	<p>ICANN Board Alan Barrett (Alan B.)</p> <p>ICANN Staff Carlos Reyes (Carlos R.)</p> <p>ARIN Sean Hopkins (Sean H.)</p>	

New action items from this meeting:

New Action Item 220202-1: The Secretariat to publish the final version of the 2021 ASO AC Work Plan Review as it appears in the ASO wiki.

New Action Item 220202-2: The Secretariat to publish the final version of the ASO AC Work Plan for 2022 as it appears in the ASO wiki.

New Action Item 220202-3: The Secretariat to publish the final version of the Annual Transparency Review report 2021.

New Action Item 220202-4: ASO AC members willing to volunteer and be part of the core team that will work on the review of the ASO AC Procedures to confirm their participation. Deadline: meeting to be held on 9 March.

=====

Agenda

0. Welcome
1. Agenda Review
2. Review Open Actions
3. Approval Minutes January 2022
4. ASO AC Procedures Review
5. AOB
6. ICANN Board Election Update (CLOSED SESSION)
7. Adjourn

Closed Session

1. Due diligence review Status
2. IC “Shepherd”
3. Interview Phase Timeline
4. Written Questionnaire
5. Video Conference Questionnaire Interviews

=====

0. Welcome

Kevin B. welcomed everyone and opened the meeting at 12:03 UTC.

German V. performed a roll call and quorum was established. He noted that the appointment of an ASO AC member representing the AFRINIC region was still pending.

Several members wished those who celebrate a happy Lunar New Year.

1. Agenda Review

No further items were brought up for discussion and the agenda was approved as circulated.

2. Review Open Actions

Action Item 220112-1: HC to make the final edits to the 2021 ASO AC Work Plan Review over the next 7 days, after which there will be a 7-day comments period. If no objections are raised, the review will be approved and published by the Secretariat in 14 days. **CLOSED**

Kevin B. asked Hervé C. regarding the status of this action item.

Hervé C. explained that there were some remarks from Ricardo P. and some edits by Mike S., who is both a native English speaker and a lawyer. He added that the document is now complete and ready to be published.

Kevin B. thanked Hervé C. for shepherding the work on the 2021 ASO AC Work Plan Review and the following action item was decided:

New Action Item 220201-1: The Secretariat to publish the final version of the 2021 ASO AC Work Plan Review as it appears in the ASO wiki.

Action Item 220112-2: The ASO AC will have a 7-day period for making modifications or additions to the 2022 ASO AC Work Plan (grammatical, typographical, not substantial), after which there will be a 7-day comments period. If no objections are raised, the review will be approved and published by the Secretariat in 14 days. **CLOSED**

Kevin B. asked Mike S. whether he had done some edits to the 2022 ASO AC Work Plan, and Mike S. replied that he had indeed done a general cleanup of the document.

No additional comments were heard, so the following action item was decided:

New Action Item 220201-2: The Secretariat to publish the final version of the ASO AC Work Plan for 2022 as it appears in the ASO wiki.

Action Item 220112-3: The ASO AC will have a 7-day period for making modifications or additions to the Annual Transparency Review report, after which there will be a 7-day comments period. If no objections are raised, the report will be approved and published by the Secretariat in 14 days. **CLOSED**

Kevin B. noted that there had been some comments from Martin H. and that some typographical errors had been cleaned up. He then mentioned a question posted on the ASO wiki: Is the Annual Transparency Review report supposed to review what we did in 2021 or what we plan to do? Kevin B. replied that it is a fluid document historically used for the AC to put in any concerns they may have and to suggest possible improvements to ASO AC transparency.

Kevin B. asked whether the ASO AC was ready to approve the Annual Transparency Review report 2021 with the typographical corrections suggested by Martin H.

No objections were heard, so the following action item was decided:

New Action Item 220201-3: The Secretariat to publish the final version of the Annual Transparency Review report 2021.

Action Item 220112-4: GV to send out a reminder of the dates/times and Zoom links for the ASO AC meetings scheduled for 2022 so that everybody can add these to their calendars. **CLOSED**

Germán V. shared that this reminder was sent to the AC mailing list on 14 January.

Kevin B. noted that the Secretariat uses something that supports iCalendar. Considering that the Secretariat sometimes makes adjustments and additions (e.g., time slots for in-person ASO AC meetings), he suggested that ASO AC members would benefit from subscribing to this calendar.

Action Item 220112-5: Each region to select one member to serve on the PPFT and send their names to the mailing list in the next seven days. **CLOSED**

At Kevin B.'s request, Germán V. confirmed the names of the members who will be part of the PPFT: Mike Silber (AFRINIC), Shubham Saran (APNIC), Martin Hannigan (ARIN), Ricardo Patara (LACNIC), and James Kennedy (RIPE NCC).

3. Approval of minutes – January 2022

Hervé C. suggested some typographical edits to the minutes, and these will be included.

Sander S. observed that he had been reading the minutes and found the use of members' initials somewhat confusing because several members' initials include SS.

Kevin B. asked if it would be possible to use first name and initial to simplify reading for persons outside the AC. Would that be preferred?

Alan B. observed that the key to decode members' initials is listed on the first page of the minutes.

After some discussion, Kevin B. asked whether the AC would prefer including each member's first name plus the initial of their last name when referring to them in meeting minutes.

All agreed and it was requested that the change be implemented starting with the January minutes.

Hervé C. moved to approve the January 2022 NRO AC meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Sander S., no objections were heard, and the motion carried.

Kevin B. asked everyone to review the minutes once again to make sure that the new format (first name + last name initial) makes them more easily readable.

4. ASO AC Procedures Review

Kevin B. explained the following: Last year there was a failed vote to make some inconsequential, editorial changes to the global policy development portion of the ASO AC procedures. There are many new members on board and the ASO AC needs to review its procedures as a whole. He asked the following question: How substantive a change do we want to make?

He added that there are three options: 1) leave everything as it is; 2) make minor changes to keep the procedures current; 3) do an entire rewrite of the ASO AC procedures, which have undergone multiple changes throughout the years and now include some inconsistencies (e.g., voting). Rewriting the procedures is a lot of work, and twelve out of fifteen votes are needed for their approval. He then opened the floor for discussion.

Hervé C. said he is in favor of an in-depth review for various reasons. First, new persons, new eyes. Second, this year the ASO AC may have more time, as there is no board election next year.

Ricardo P. agreed with Hervé C., adding that perhaps this time the AC might adopt a mixed approach, taking advantage of the new eyes but bringing the comments from members who are no longer serving on the AC. He said that the AC needs to do a full review of the whole document, but perhaps they could start by attacking the most important points identified last year and asking new members for their input.

Sander S. seconded the idea of taking a deep look at the whole document to ensure consistency. It is important to view the document as a whole at some point, although this does not need to be the first step

Mike S. said he likes Ricardo P.'s suggestion. The AC should do a complete analysis to determine where procedures can be improved, then look at those that can be solved quickly. Those that require more work can be split into two work streams so there are no unnecessary delays.

Kevin B. agreed. He then stressed that one of the things the ASO AC needs to keep in mind when looking at the procedures is that they were written at a different time. The ASO AC has how been working virtually for more than two years, yet many procedures were based on the assumption of having in-person meetings. For example, historically, all five regions had to be on the call for a meeting to be recognized, but this changed a few years ago and now a call can be held with members from just four out of the five regions. Many numbers such as these need to be reviewed: "In a virtual environment, do we count people who do not vote in an electronic tally as part of the fifteen ASO AC members? How many people should vote and how many votes are required to reach the bar? These numbers made sense many years ago, but do they still make sense today?"

Saul S. said that the ASO AC is very different now that the members have not met in person for so long.

Kevin B. mentioned another example: the ASO AC procedures don't really address the committee's current situation where there are only fourteen appointed ASO AC members. ASO AC procedures are written as if we have fifteen members. Moving forward, if the ASO AC has something more substantive to do, there might be an issue if we are missing a vote. These are the type of complexities that were not envisioned in the initial procedures.

Shubham S. supported the idea of spending some time revisiting the ASO AC procedures.

Kevin B. shared his opinion that this work cannot be done on a monthly call, using the mailing list, or posting to the wiki.

Mike S. agreed that a review of the ASO AC procedures is not something that can be done simply on the mailing list or the wiki. He added that, for him personally, it would be difficult to commit to this task until the ICANN Board election is over, as that could create some additional time commitment.

Kevin B. suggested starting the review of the ASO AC procedures in April, after the appointment phase.

Saul S. agreed with Mike S. and said he would be happy to help and that the key might be to divide the document into sections and to focus on one section at a time.

Sander S. said he would be happy to provide a new set of eyes.

Mike S. noted that inconsistency might be a risk but agreed that not everybody can commit to participate in the entire process.

Kevin B. said that the problem has been with the things that are not in the procedures or with those things for which there is too much/too little wiggle room. The ASO AC needs to look at different scenarios and see if things still apply today, discuss what the issues are before even starting to write the procedures. He reminded the others that while approving new procedures require almost the majority of the votes, they still have to go the NRO EC for final approval.

Saul S. dropped from the call at this time.

To conclude the discussion, the following action item was noted:

New Action Item 220201-4: ASO AC members willing to volunteer and be part of the core team that will work on the review of the ASO AC Procedures to confirm their participation. Deadline: meeting to be held on 9 March.

5. AOB

Carlos R. said he wanted to confirm that last month the ASO AC had discussed meeting with the ICANN Board during ICANN 73.

Kevin B. replied that the NRO EC will confirm which ICANN meeting would be most appropriate. He thanked Carlos R. for following up on that.

After confirming that there were no observers on the call, the ASO AC continued their discussion in closed session.

14. Adjourn

There being no further business to discuss, Mike S. moved to adjourn the meeting. Sander S. seconded the motion, no objections were heard, and the meeting was adjourned at 13:07 UTC.