

ASO AC Teleconference

15 January 2020
12:00 PM UTC

Minutes

Attendees	Observers	Apologies
AFRINIC Noah Maina (NM) Mike Silber (MS) Wafa Dahmani Zaafouri (WD) APNIC Brajesh Jain (BJ) Aftab Siddiqui (AS) - Chair Simon Sohel Baroi (SB) ARIN Kevin Blumberg (KB) – Vice Chair Martin Hannigan (MH) LACNIC Esterban Lescano (EL) Ricardo Patara (RP) Jorge Villa (JV) – Vice Chair RIPE NCC Hervé Clément (HC) Nurani Nimpuno (NN) Filiz Yilmaz (FY) Secretariat German Valdez (GV) Susannah Gray (SG) – Minutes	ARIN Richard Jimmerson (RJ) LACNIC Gianina Pensky (GP) ICANN Staff Carlos Reyes (CR) ICANN Board Ron da Silva (RdS) Community: 0	ARIN Louie Lee (LL)

New Action Items From This Meeting

- **New Action Item 200115-1: AS to circulate the ICANN 66 Closed Working Session document to ac-discuss.**
- **New Action Item 200115-2: ALL to review the Board Member Selection Procedure timeline and provide feedback before the February teleconference.**
- **New Action Item 200115-3: AS, KB and JV to circulate session description text for the ASO AC open Work Sessions (Monday) to the ac-discuss list before the February teleconference.**
- **New Action Item 200115-4: ALL to review the draft Annual Transparency Review and provide feedback before the February Teleconference.**
- **New Action Item 200115-5: ALL to review the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group (RIWG) questionnaire and provide feedback by 27 January.**

Agenda

0. Welcome
 1. Agenda Review
 2. 2020 ASO AC Chair Election Results
 3. 2020 ASO Vice Chairs Appointments

 4. Review Open Actions
 5. Approval Minutes December 2019
 6. ICANN 67 Preparation
 - a) ASO AC F2F Meeting Days
 - b) ASO AC Activities
 7. 2020 ASO AC Teleconference Schedule
 8. 2019 ASO Work Plan Review
 9. 2020 ASO Work Plan
 10. Annual Transparency Review
 - 11 2020 ASO AC Appointments
 12. ASO ICANN Board Procedures Review
 - 13 AOB
 - 14 Adjourn
-

0. Welcome

SG performed the roll call and declared quorum. AS welcomed the attendees and thanked the new members, MH and MS, for joining the call.

1. Agenda Review

HC requested that the ASO's [*inspection request*](#) regarding the Internet Society's proposed transfer of ownership of PIR be added to the agenda under AOB.

2. 2020 ASO AC Chair Election Results

GV noted that the election process had complied with the agreed schedule and the results were posted to the *ac-internal* mailing list, where the tokens could be verified. He continued that no challenges had been received and if there were no objections from anyone on the call, AS would serve as ASO AC Chair for 2020.

There were no objections. AS was confirmed as the ASO AC Chair for 2020.

The ASO AC congratulated AS. AS thanked HC for standing in the election and noted that he looked forward to working with the AC over the coming year.

3. 2020 ASO Vice Chairs Appointments

AS asked KB and JV to accept positions of Vice Chair for 2020. KB and JV accepted.

GV noted that the Secretariat would publish an announcement regarding the Chair election and appointment of the Vice Chairs shortly.

4. Review Open Actions

- **Action Item 191113-1: ALL to review the notes from the ICANN 66 closed working session and provide feedback, questions and additional comments on the Seat 9/10 Election procedures > *IN PROGRESS*.**

AS noted that he would forward the notes again so that the new AC members could see it. The main discussion point was on the Seat 9/10 election process.

KB suggested that this discussion should now be moved to *ac-discuss*, with a couple of items removed.

There were no objections.

New Action Item 200115-1: AS to circulate the ICANN 66 Closed Working Session document to *ac-discuss*.

-
- **Action Item 191113-2: AS to develop a timeline and process for the items outlined in Action Item 191113-1 > *IN PROGRESS*.**

AS noted that he had circulated a draft Board Member Selection Procedure Timeline on 4 December. He asked the ASO AC to review it and provide feedback.

New Action Item 200115-2: ALL to review the Board Member Selection Procedure timeline and provide feedback before the February teleconference.

-
- **Action Item 191113-3: AS/GV to inform the ASO AC of sessions of interest to the Numbers community at ICANN 67 as soon as possible > *IN PROGRESS*.**

AS noted that the block agenda was still quite open. He had requested that the ASO Open Session be moved from Thursday to Wednesday, 11:30, as ICANN 67 ended on Thursday.

CR noted that the full schedule would be published on 17 February.

GV noted that the ASO Dinner would take place on Wednesday evening.

-
- **Action Item 191113-4: AS to lead the discussion on the ICANN 67 ASO AC session agenda and scheduling over the next three teleconferences > *IN PROGRESS*.**

AS suggested that the same format that was used at ICANN 64 be used at ICANN 67 for the ASO Open Session: NRO update, IANA update and ASO Policy Update.

KB noted that the two ASO sessions on Monday were marked as private. One of these sessions would be for the Mock Global Policy session. He thought that these two sessions should be marked as public. He continued that the Mock Global Policy session should be open for all as it was useful to the community.

AS agreed that both sessions could be open. Details of what was happening in the sessions would need to be published.

BJ suggested that, as there were new members of the ASO AC, the first session could be private and the second open.

NN commented that, in line with the ASO Review, the ASO AC had agreed to keep all sessions and meetings open by default, unless confidential matters needed to be discussed. She added that it was good practice to publish agendas as early as possible. However, the ASO AC had committed to reviewing and improving the ICANN Board Seats 9/10 selection process and most of this discussion could be public. There would be some sensitive matters that would need to be discussed in private so some time should be set aside for that.

AS noted that the ASO workroom was also available on Tuesday if the ASO AC needed more time for private discussion. He noted that, during Monday's sessions, there were two items on the agenda: the ICANN Board Seats 9/10 selection process and the Mock Global Policy session. He noted that, during the meeting at ICANN 66, there had been some reservations on discussing the ICANN Board Seats 9/10 selection process in public. There were two 90-minute sessions available so he suggested that the first one remain closed: a summary of what was discussed could be noted during the second open session for the benefit of observers.

NN noted that this topic was discussed in detail during the ASO AC Teleconference in November and she had thought that the consensus was that the sessions should remain open except for when confidential discussion was needed. She would prefer that the ASO AC didn't backtrack on that unless someone had new input.

AS asked what the consensus was.

KB summarized that the consensus was to keep the discussion open unless a specific prior situation needed to be discussed. For this to work at ICANN 67, he suggested that a list could be made of any issues that would need to be discussed privately and a shorter session be held for that. He added that he agreed with NN: the consensus was to keep everything as open as possible. Having a closed session to discuss the entire Seat 9/10 selection process defeated the commitment to transparency.

AS noted that he had no objection to both sessions being open. However, there would be past references and there would be observers who were current or past Board members or those looking to be future Board members.

MS noted that he was reluctant to have the session on Mock Global Policy published on the meeting schedule, as people might not understand what the ASO AC was trying to achieve. It might be misinterpreted as the ASO AC setting global policy instead of just walking through the process. Regarding the Seat 9/10 selection process, he continued that there were positives and negatives to both the public and the private sessions and wondered if the session could be split.

AS noted that this was also his suggestion but there had not been consensus on it. He suggested that the 90-minute session be split, with the first 45 minutes used for private discussion.

MS noted that the ASO AC might not be able to do this for the ICANN 67 sessions: breaking a 90 minute session into 45 minutes might not work as the amount of time that the transition takes would cause time to be lost. The ASO AC should strive to improve this for the next F2F meeting.

AS noted that the schedule was still in draft format: changes could be made. He added that 45 minutes would likely be enough time.

KB agreed with MS and suggested that additional time be scheduled. A 60-minute closed session and a 90-minute open session should work. One 90-minute session cannot be both open and closed. He suggested that AS and the Vice Chairs discuss further and see where more time could be found for the closed session. Regarding the Mock Global Policy session, he agreed that the title and the wording was important and should not be ambiguous.

NN noted that the sessions were being approached wrongly: Instead of looking at the schedule blocks and squeezing things into them, the ASO AC should first discuss what it wanted to achieve and then ask for slots that work with their plans. She agreed with MS and reiterated that no one was arguing that every part of the discussion on the Seat 9/10 process should be open but that a good balance needed to be found. The ASO AC should not, by default, fall into secrecy but should strive for openness and transparency.

NN added that, during the F2F meeting at ICANN 66, the ASO AC had agreed to hold an open session to discuss the mechanics of the Seat 9/10 process. Everyone was aware of the sensitivities and should not bring up confidential matters during the open session, which would be possible with the ASO AC members' responsibility, professionalism and good chairing. She noted that the sessions should remain open but that the ASO AC should also prepare a list of issues that needed to be discussed privately.

AS concluded that the two sessions would remain open. He and the Vice Chairs would work on the session descriptions and would circulate it to the list.

New Action Item 200115-3: AS, KB and JV to circulate session description text for the ASO AC open Work Sessions (Monday) to the ac-discuss list before the February teleconference.

-
- **Action Item 191113-7: AS to circulate the draft Annual Transparency Review before the December Teleconference > *IN PROGRESS*.**

AS noted that he had circulated the Annual Transparency Review to the mailing list. Jason Schiller (JS) had made some comments. He had incorporated them and had sent an updated version.

New Action Item 200115-4: ALL to review the draft Annual Transparency Review and provide feedback before the February Teleconference.

-
- **Action Item 191113-8: Secretariat to set up a Confluence site for the ASO AC > *IN PROGRESS*.**

SG noted that the Secretariat was still discussing this with the RIPE NCC. There were some issues with where the site would be hosted.

AS noted that, as the ASO AC needed to collaborate on some important items, it would be helpful to get Confluence set up as soon as possible. He added that he could send a note to the NRO EC with a request if that would be helpful.

SG noted that the Secretariat would get back to the ASO AC with an update as soon as possible.

-
- **Action Item 191002-01: GV to open a support ticket with Zoom regarding the recurring issue of no microphone option being available for some users upon joining and report back to the ASO AC on progress > *CLOSED*.**

AS noted that this had been done: Zoom support had noted that there was no support for the microphone feature on certain browsers.

- **Action Item 191204-1: ALL to review the Draft 2019 ASO AC Work Plan Activity Review and provide any feedback by 20 December 2019 > *IN PROGRESS*.**

HC noted that he had shared v3 of the Draft 2019 ASO AC Work Plan Activity Review on the mailing list. This version incorporated LL's comments and comments received during the 4 December teleconference. He believed the document was now complete and asked the ASO AC to take a final look.

- **Action Item 191204-2: ALL to review the Draft 2020 ASO AC Work Plan and provide any feedback before the end of 2019 > *IN PROGRESS*.**

AS noted that the Draft 2020 ASO AC Work Plan had been shared by LL.

HC noted that he had made some comments in the document.

AS asked the ASO to review and provide feedback before the February teleconference.

- **Action Item 191204-3: AS to send a note to the NRO EC reminding it of the ASO AC Chair Election process and to ask that Board-appointments to the ASO AC occur earlier in the year > *CLOSED*.**

AS noted that some of the RIR Boards did not appoint their representatives to the ASO AC until very late in the year. He reached out to the NRO EC regarding this, raised the ASO AC's concern and it was noted by the NRO EC.

- **Action Item 191204-4: AS to inform the NRO EC that the ASO AC had voted to implement editorial changes to the ASO AC Procedures to update the names of the new mailing lists and ask for approval to implement > *IN PROGRESS*.**

GV noted that this topic was an agenda item for the NRO EC teleconference on 14 January. Three out of the five members approved the editorial changes but two are still pending to approve. He would follow up on this.

- **Action Item 191204-6: AS to lead discussion on the Annual Transparency Review during the January ASO AC Teleconference > *IN PROGRESS*.**

AS noted that he had sent an email regarding the Annual Transparency Review. He noted that his only concern was the role of the ASO AC in the ICANN Empowered Community as there was nothing in the Operating Procedures to cover this. He asked the ASO AC to review his mail for discussion during the February teleconference.

- **Action Item 191204-7: GV to open the ASO AC Chair e-voting period as soon as the new ASO AC members had been added to the mailing list in January 2020. The voting period is to be opened by 5 January 2020 > *CLOSED*.**
-

- **Action Item 191204-8: ALL to review and comment on the 2020 teleconference schedule by 11 December > *CLOSED*.**

GV noted that the ASO AC calendar had been published on ASO website. There had been discussion about the date of the May teleconference on the mailing list but an agreement had been reached.

- **New Action Item 191204-9: AS to circulate the ICANN Board Election Process notes on the ac-discuss mailing list > *CLOSED*.**

AS noted that he had circulated a basic draft. He noted that he and the Vice Chairs would work on a more detailed version.

5. Approval Minutes December 2019

HC proposed the motion to accept the minutes from the December teleconference. SB seconded the motion. There were no objections. Motion carried.

AS asked the Secretariat to publish the minutes on the ASO website.

6. ICANN 67 Preparation

- a) ASO AC F2F Meeting Days
- b) ASO AC Activities

This item was discussed under open action Item 191113-4 and would be discussed further on the ac-discuss mailing list.

7. 2020 ASO AC Teleconference Schedule

This was discussed under open action item 191204-8.

8. 2019 ASO Work Plan Review

This was discussed under open action item 191204-1. AS reminded the ASO AC to provide any final feedback before the February teleconference.

9. 2020 ASO Work Plan

This was discussed under open action item 191204-2. AS reminded the ASO AC to provide any final feedback before the February teleconference.

10. Annual Transparency Review

This was discussed under open action item 191204-6. AS reminded the ASO AC to provide any final feedback before the February teleconference.

11. 2020 ASO AC Appointments

AS noted that the ASO AC had made one appointment for 2020: the ASO representative on the NomCom. He noted that he had forwarded a mail from the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group (RIWG) asking for feedback. He and the Vice Chairs had formulated some answers to the WG's questionnaire and asked the ASO AC to provide feedback over the next couple of weeks.

BJ noted that the Chairs had suggested that the question relating to two-year appointments should be discussed.

AS noted that the ASO AC followed what was stated in the ICANN Bylaws (one-year appointment, see section 8.3), and that enabled it to assess the appointee's performance. If the ICANN Bylaws were changed, however, the ASO AC would not have any option but to appoint someone for a two-year term.

BJ clarified that the RIWG was asking for suggestions that could be presented to the Board for a possible Bylaw Change.

KB noted that the ASO AC would need to further discuss multiyear appointments. The wording of the response to this question could be edited but the point was to understand why the change was being proposed and to let the RIWG know that the ASO AC would need to discuss any change further. He continued that another important question was regarding changes to the timelines. He noted that the ASO AC needed to receive any changes to the timelines during the prior year so that calendars and procedures could be fully prepared.

NN noted that the discussion comes from the NomCom Review Implementation Plan that was approved by the Board in March 2018. This should not be new for the ASO AC but it had not been discussed previously. She added that the ASO AC appointed someone to the NomCom and so this information could have been passed to the ASO AC earlier. The ASO AC should try to improve on this in the future.

NN continued that the report notes that a one-year appointment, even if renewed for a second year, might not allow for sufficient learning and engagement of members. It also notes that a two-year term would require fewer selection processes by the organizations that appoint members to the NomCom and greater accumulation of institutional knowledge for NomCom members due to longer term times. She noted that it would be good to understand the NomCom's motivation for wanting to lengthen the terms. She added that there was a lot to learn for NomCom members so there could be an advantage in having longer terms. She asked if BJ could let the ASO AC know what the NomCom itself had discussed regarding this.

BJ noted that the NomCom had not discussed this. He explained that, for all voting members, there is a two-year term limit with a cooling period of one year. There was no limit for non-voting members.

MS noted that he had previously served on NomComs as well as engaging with the ICANN NomCom while serving on the ICANN Board. He noted that this recommendation was designed to prevent incumbency: some SO/ACs appoint the same people every year. The second issue was that being on the NomCom was a relatively steep learning curve and it could be useful to have a second term. He continued that the ASO AC should decide whether to take the recommendation as binding or whether to take it as a recommendation but choose to appoint on a year-by-year basis. However, until a decision was made, the ASO AC should continue to appoint on a yearly basis. He would work on some minor edits to the wording used in the response.

New Action Item 200115-5: ALL to review the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group (RIWG) questionnaire and provide feedback by 27 January.

12. PPFT

The following ASO AC members would be part of the Policy Proposal Facilitator Team (PPFT):

- APNIC: BJ
- LACNIC: EL
- RIPE NCC: HC

AFRINIC and ARIN would notify the list regarding their representatives shortly.

13. ASO ICANN Board Procedures Review

This item was discussed under open action Item 191113-4 and agenda item 11. *2020 ASO AC Appointments.*

14. AOB

a) ASO Inspection Request

AS noted that the NRO EC acting as the ASO used the Empowered Community Powers to send an inspection request to ICANN regarding the Internet Society's proposed transfer of ownership of PIR. There was no discussion regarding this with the ASO AC or the ASO AC Chairs. He noted that this was not an issue as the Community Power exercised had nothing to do with the ASO AC. Unfortunately there was no NRO EC representative on the call to provide an update.

NN asked if this was an agenda item for the ASO – ICANN Board Session at ICANN 67.

GV noted that he would get back to the ASO AC on that.

15. Adjourn

BJ proposed the motion to adjourn. HC seconded. There were no objections. Motion carried. The meeting ended at 13:25 UTC.

-END-