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1. Officers (Chairs and Vice-Chairs)

1-    Chair Term: I think that one year is a very short term for chairing the ASO AC. I suggest modifying current term for 3 years, to allow a better planning and execution of the work to be done by ASO AC. If we agree in that change, we have to adapt that the re-election must be only for one period of 3 years with a total mandate of 6 years. (section 4.4.1 and 4.2)

2-    Appointment of Vice Chairs: I think vice chairs may be elected by ASO AC members by relative majority and not designated by Chair. (Section 4.4.3)

3-    Chair´s Casual Vacancy (4.4.5) may be cover by elected vice chairs.

7-    If Chair and Vice Chairs last three years, ASO AC member can conduct the election in January or in any other month during the calendar year. In that case, we have to modify section 5.1.1.1

Regarding Chair term. The Chair’s job is not to lead the ASO AC. It is to ensure that administrative functions are carried out. By design, the Chair has no control. We should be able to change chair monthly if we need to. They’re hear to run the meeting. I would consider a three year term to not be in the spirit of regional independence.

1. Meetings

5-    New ASO AC members must attend an onboarding session in where ASO Chair or Vice Chair introduce them to ASO AC roles and responsibilities, including some ASO AC materials for information purposes.

“we already have something in our procedures: the item 5.1.1.2. mention orientation of new members on December. We might need to remember to include this in our working plan each year. »

6-    We have regular meeting every month, but section 5.1 sates a minimum of 4 meetings per year. I believe it is better to adapt the procedures to current operation with a monthly meeting.

8-    Quorum is at least 1 person from each of the five RIRs and we are respecting this in every meeting, then I suggest erasing the last phrase of section 5.2 that states: “*Unless such rescheduling request has been received, a quorum of 4 regions will be accepted for the ASO AC meeting to proceed*”.

“we had some issues in the past where for consecutive meetings we were lacking representation from one region. The procedures were then updated to allow carry the meeting if one region is missing, and when there are at least 8 AC members. I think this should be kept this way. »

9-    Currently and as standard, we have monthly meetings when we approve past meeting minutes, then I think we can change section 5.4 wording when refers to “After the review period the Secretariat will then post the Draft Minutes to the ASO website with a header explaining the minutes will be approved during the nest regularly schedule ASO AC meeting”, because this “prior approval publication is not needed”

10- Nowadays, teleconferences should be an exception when an ASO AC member has connectivity problems. Therefore, I propose to modify section 5.6 “types of meetings” to reflect that meetings will be held in person or via videoconferences.

11- In the same line, the in-person meeting may be conducted at any of the ICANN meetings, not only in the Community Forum, as well as in a RIR’s meeting or any other relevant community event. In that sense, I think we must modify section 5.6 i to allow a greater flexibility for ASO AC officers to define the better place for a in person meeting every year. In the same line, I believe that one in person meeting for year must be mandatory for the ASO AC but other meetings can also be scheduled if the ASO AC´s businesses requires it.

“it used to be ICANN meetings or a RIR forum. Don’t remember when it changed to mention only ICANN comm forum. Maybe an approach here could be something in the line “The in-person meeting will be conducted, preferably, at an ICANN Community Forum. At the Council discretion, it could be at any other ICANN official meeting or during a RIR meeting” »

Regarding monthly meeting vs. four times per year; the meeting requirement seems excessive. Minimims are better than maximums in my opinion and continuing as is seems reasonable.

For point 8 about the quorum, what do we do when an RIR gets into trouble and can’t have people represent them in ASO AC? I guess that also applies to the f2f meeting in case an RIR gets its funds frozen like in AFRINIC last year. Such occurrences are really bad and hopefully will not occur again, but shouldn’t we at least have some contingency plans in case things go horribly wrong?

1. Global Policy Development

[ASO Operating Procedures - Section 6 - Google Docs](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1L6qgfsLsu9OtVhtrWvfYK2MiCLzXC573YwqZLAl_WBo/edit)

12- Regarding reference to Annex in the Global Policy Development I agree with Kevin suggestions. We must include a precise identification of the Annex refereed in each case- Sections 6.5, 6.6.1 and 6.6.1.1

1. Procedures to appoint and remove members

13- Considering Section 7 Procedures to Appoint Members of Various Bodies. We use as general practice the e-vote alternative, and that is why I suggest to modify section 7.1 to include only e-vote as procedure for appointments ASO AC representatives and officers with the limitation of cases in which there is only one valid candidate in which e-vote will not needed and designation will be made in ASO AC meeting. (section 7.1)

14- In the case of the Solicitation of Interest for appointments (section 7.2), I think it will be useful to clarify that only ASO AC members shall e-vote and participation of third persons such as community members or RIR Staff is only for information purposes.

15-  Regarding the procedure for Removal of ASO Appointed members (Section 8) I suggest adopting the same solution made for appointment. In that sense the e-vote must be the main voting alternative for all the cases. Moreover, I think we can modify section 8.3 that states that “*Only unanimous vote to remove the appointee will result in removal and that as a single vote cast to not remove the appointee will result in the appointee remaining in the position*” because if it is needed a simple majority to be elected it does not sound coherent to request unanimity for removal.

1. ICANN Board of Directors
2. OUTREACH PROCESS

The ASO AC should further improve its outreach of the ICANN Board election process

1a. Secretariat announcements

The secretariat make at least three announcements on the RIR lists and through its normal communication channels in the 3-6 months leading up to the nomination deadline.

1b. ASO AC outreach

The ASO AC members should actively do outreach in their respective communities to encourage suitable members of the number community to apply. (For example include a slide on the ICANN Board election in presentations within their RIR community presentations and actively inform their community of the process.)

1. APPLICATION PROCESS

2a. Application form

An application form should be created to allow for a consistent format with clear instructions for the applicant.

2b. Application requirements

Brief, but clear application requirements should be posted on the ASO website

1. SELECTION PROCESS

3a The board selection process should be divided into the following parts:

                Part 1. Nominee Questionnaire with a subset of the current Nominee Questionnaire

                Part 2. First face-to-Face/ video conference interview

                With a set of predetermined questions developed by the IC.

                Follow-up questions should be allowed if felt that the questions was misunderstood

        or not answered properly by the candidate

                Part 3. First ASO AC candidate deliberation

                The ASO meets and deliberates on the candidates after the allowing for a full

                discussion on how the candidates performed. Internal polling, as is done by the

                ICANN NomCom, should be done to improve the integrity of the process and

                to help ascertain why an ASO AC member supports or does not support a candidate.

                Part 4. Second face-to-Face/ video conference interview

                With a set of follow-up questions determined by the IC as a result of the first

                ASO AC candidate deliberation

                Part 5. Second ASO AC candidate deliberation  
                The ASO meets and deliberates on the candidates after the allowing for a full

                discussion on how the candidates performed. Internal polling, as is done by the

                ICANN NomCom, should be done to to improve the integrity of the process and to

                help ascertain why an ASO AC member supports or does not support a candidate.

                Part 6. Electronic voting and final selection

3b Improved Interview questions

The interview questions should include more questions on ICANN and board governance experience to ensure the candidates are suitable and competent as Board members. (A general effort to improve the interview questions should be undertaken at a later date.)

 4 GENERAL IMPROVEMENTS

4a. Appointment of new ASO AC members

The ASO AC chair should reach out to the RIR boards and ask that new ACO AC appointments are made as early as possible before the end of the year to allow for adequate time for new ASO AC members to fully participate in the election process.

4b. All ASO AC members are expected to attend all interviews and all deliberations

All ASO AC members are expected to share their reasoning behind their support of opposition of a candidate as well as disclose any conflicts of interest.

4c. Due diligence to be carried out at the start of the process

The ASO AC should look into the possibility of having the due diligence process of suitable candidates as early as possible in the process. (This allows for a better timeline for the ASO AC, and it also allows for the elimination of unsuitable candidates before the final selection process.)

FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS TO CONSIDER AT A LATER DATE

o The public ICANN NomCom documents could be used as templates/starting points for the new ASO process.

o A document that had advice on what to look for in a Board member would be helpful.

o The nomination period often occurred during holiday periods. The timing should be evaluated to see if this could be avoided.

o It would be helpful if the ASO AC could have the 360-degree Board Review if the incumbent is standing for re-election.  
o A clear role description with expectations and requirements for the ICANN Board number community seats should be published

o Further work should be done to improve the interview questions

o The ASO AC should carry out a more thorough analysis of the Nomcom process and determine if there are elements in that process that could be helpful to incorporate into the ASO AC process.

 Ricardo’s comments:

Considering the experience from these two processes, it was clear that we didn’t manage the time ideally. We have spent a large amount of time working on the written questionnaire and to arrange the interviews slot

For the interview slots we have to first see dates the IC members are available and then propose a set of dates to candidates.

One thing that we improved, from own humble perspective, was to have interviews on the candidates timezone. But due to the short time, we ended with one interview being in a Saturday afternoon at this last process. That was not ideal.

To address those two points my suggestions were:

* have the questionnaire (written interview) and questions for the video conference interview worked and ready in advance by the whole AC. Currently, this is IC task (although procedures doesn’t say that), and it only starts after IC is formed and then very close to the interview process beginning.
* work on interview and meeting/deliberation dates also in advance. Currently, we only start working on this after IC is confirmed, and again, close to the interview beginning. I understand that some IC members would be only confirmed at the begin of the following calendar year, but I don’t think this would be of a great impact.

Another topic that coincides with Nurani suggestion is the requirement for the whole AC to attend interviews and deliberation. But for that we need to have the interviews and meetings dates set ahead in time so everyone can coordinate their own agendas.

We also need to have a more well defined set of objectives for the interview. What we would like to measure and how to “translate” what we capture from the interviews into a report. Do we need to have scoresheet or any other type of scaling system?

After the 2021 selection process I wrote a report with some observations and some recommendations for procedures update and others for best practices. The document can be read from here [2021 ICANN Board Process Review](https://asowiki.atlassian.net/l/c/GDBPUAX0)

I would like to highlight some I think would of more value to this work:

* TIMELINE. Considering a possible large number of candidates, the current amount of days reserved for interviews could be not sufficient.
* INTERVIEWS TIME SLOTS. Have interviews on candidates best timezone (avoiding weekends and holidays); and to set possible time slots for all interviews way earlier in the process (One possibility is that after finished Nomination phase, so having an initial slate of candidates, the IC start to investigate possible time slots considering each candidate timezone).
* QUESTIONNAIRES. On possible approach would be start the questionnaires (1st, 2nd rounds) elaboration just after nomination period is over. Questions could be worked by AC as a group and should address aspects the group sees as the key points for the position.
* REPORTS and RANKING. There is no information about how reports should be prepared. We could discuss if such thing would be useful in the procedures or not.

A part from procedures, we could also have a GUIDELINE with recommendations and observations that would not need to be in the procedures document but could be in the wiki platform to be checked and reviewed before new elections processes.

Jorge:

I agree with Ricardo and Nurani, and I think that we should include in our procedures, the attendance to the online interview as a requirement for all the AC members (as observers only). Just the IC will be conducting the interview, and they’ll be able to interact with the candidates. Anyway, the IC can receive feedback from the rest of the AC, before, during or after the interviews.

16- Concerning Selection of Individuals to the ICANN Board of Directors (Section 9) I agree with Ricardo’s precedent suggestions.

17- Regarding Outreach of Selection Process, we have to expand it and therefore I believe we can add in section 9.4.1 announcement to be made in RIRs Lists, RIRs meetings and others initiatives coordinated with the NRO- EC for greater dissemination of the opening of selection process.

18- I believe we must include the ability for the QRC to request third party support to conduct the interview round and to evaluate the ICANN Board´s candidates. It is probable that in the incoming years we receive a lot of nominations for the ICANN  Board that will difficult the QRC´s work or timeframe to complete it. In that sense, I suggest that QRC must have the ability to request to the ASO AC the support of headhunters or similar organizations to complement their effort. In case, support is acceptable will be coordinated with the NRO - EC (Inclusion needed in section 9.4.6.1)

19- Selection for ICANN Board members shall be reviewed. I think ASO AC members need to be deeply informed about candidates’ profiles and have enough time to make additional questions to candidates or to clarify emerging doubts. In that sense, we can include an additional week prior to the e-vote to give ASO AC members additional time, after closure of interview phase, to ask additional questions or to request clarification of questions or doubts. In some cases, it is important that ASO AC has the flexibility to request independent investigations about candidates’ profiles or backgrounds.

20- In the deliberation process it is important that the Chair or the Vice chairs do not express opinion in favor or against any of the candidates to avoid influence in undecided ASO AC members.

23- Regarding the Review of Candidates (Section 9.4.9) or ICANN due diligence process, it is better to advance it to a previous phase and not to wait until the end of the process. In that sense, Due Diligence by ICANN may be done to all the candidates that concludes the interview phase.

1. Voting Process specific part ? (linked with §7, 8, 9 and 11)

21- Section 9.4.7.1 Ballots must be reviewed or erased if not objective ranking for candidates can be assured.

22- Schulze counting method shall be reviewed too. I believe it is better to adopt a relative majority method as provided for any other election made by ASO AC members (sections 9.4.7.2 and 9.4.7.3).

24- Finally, regarding Rules of Order we must check which are the last version of the Robert´s Rule of Order Newly Revised (RONR) and to adapt to them (Section 10.1) and to consider that we need four-fifths majority support to pass the amendments to the Operating Procedures (Section 11).

Additional points:

* The ASO AC can be comprised of less than 15 members
* How to deal with abstention?
* When only one candidate?.....

General comments :

4-    ASO AC members terms: It is important that each RIRs designated or elected their ASO AC representatives without interfering in the ICANN Board Selection Process. In that sense, I suggest terms beginning in April and finish in March next year, as we are doing in LACNIC.