

ASO AC Teleconference

5 February 2020

12:00 PM UTC

Minutes

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

New Action Items From This Meeting

- New Action Item 200205-1: Secretariat to implement the approved changes to the ASO AC Operating Procedures (update the names of the new mailing lists).
- New Action Item 200205-2: KB/JV to request that the NRO EC briefs the ASO AC on the Inspection Request the ASO [NRO EC] had issued to ICANN regarding the sale of .org before ICANN 67.

Agenda

0. Welcome
1. Agenda Review
2. Review Open Actions
3. Approval Minutes January 2020
4. Seat 9/10 Election Procedures Review
5. ICANN 67 Preparation
 - a) ASO AC f2f Agenda
 - b) ASO AC Week Activities

6. 2019 ASO Work Plan Review
 7. 2020 ASO Work Plan
 8. Annual Transparency Review
 9. AOB
 10. Adjourn
-

0. Welcome

GV performed the roll call and declared quorum. AS welcomed the attendees.

1. Agenda Review

There were no changes or additions to the agenda.

**MS left the call at 12:06 UTC.*

2. 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 > > CLOSED.**

AS noted that he had re-circulated the notes from the ICANN 66 closed session before today's call and that the Seat 9/10 Election procedures would be discussed in more detail during the ICANN 67 Meeting in Cancun.

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

HC commented that he had sent a comment to the mailing list noting:

“Comment Phase” includes candidate selection for Interview as well. The dedicated period overlaps 2 years meaning that the ASO AC won't be necessarily comprised of the same members at the beginning and end. Not critical but we have to pay attention to it.”

AS agreed that this was a valid concern. However, the current timeline had been based on what was in the current ASO AC Operating Procedures. The ASO AC might want to come up with a new timeline during the F2F meeting at ICANN 67 and change the procedures accordingly. He asked the ASO AC to thoroughly review the existing procedures and make note of any issues so something new could be designed or improvements made.

-
- **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 > CLOSED.**

AS noted that he had shared the agenda shortly before the call. There were some issues that would be discussed later in the agenda (see agenda item 5).

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

AS noted that this would be discussed later in the agenda.

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

BJ proposed the motion to approve the Annual Transparency Review 2019. HC seconded the motion. There were no objections. Motion carried.

AS asked the Secretariat to post the Annual Transparency Review 2019 on the ASO website.

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

GV noted that the Secretariat was still working on this.

AS commented that this action had been in progress for quite a while: it was important to get the site implemented as the ASO AC was in need of a collaboration tool.

GV noted that the Secretariat would try to have this implemented in time for use at ICANN 67.

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

KB proposed the motion to approve the 2019 ASO AC Work Plan Activity Review. SB seconded the motion. There were no objections. Motion carried.

AS asked the Secretariat to post the 2019 ASO AC Work Plan Activity Review on the ASO Website.

**MS rejoined the call at 12:21 UTC.*

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

KB noted that, during the F2F meeting at ICANN 67, the ASO AC might want to make changes to the 2020 ASO AC Work Plan. He asked if the Work Plan and other documents could be amended after they had been posted online.

AS commented that documents could certainly be edited after being published.

LL proposed the motion to approve the 2020 ASO AC Work Plan. BJ seconded the motion. There were no objections. Motion carried.

AS asked the Secretariat to post the 2020 ASO AC Work Plan on the ASO Website.

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

GV noted that the NRO EC had approved the changes that the ASO AC had requested. The ASO AC Operating Procedures could now be updated.

New Action Item 200205-1: Secretariat to implement the approved changes to the ASO AC Operating Procedures (update the names of the new mailing lists).

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

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

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

AS noted that one comment had been received from HC. He added that this action item would be discussed in detail during the F2F meeting at ICANN 67.

- **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 > *CLOSED*.**

AS noted that the description of the Global Policy Development Process (GPDP) Review Session had been circulated to the mailing list. It had previously been noted that this description should be carefully worded.

After some discussion the ASO AC decided that point two of the draft text should be removed from the description:

“2- Determine whether the GPDP is serving the purpose to facilitate the Global Policy for numbers community.”

AS noted that he would send a new version of the description to the mailing list. The deadline for providing the session description to ICANN was Friday, 7 February. He asked everyone to review the final proposed text on the mailing list within the next two days.

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

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

AS noted that he had provided feedback on this to the NomCom RIWG. He thanked the ASO AC for its input and thanked JV and KB for helping to draft the text.

3. Approval Minutes January 2020

HC proposed the motion to accept the minutes from the January 2020 teleconference. BJ seconded the motion. There were no objections. Motion carried.

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

4. Seat 9/10 Election Procedures Review

AS noted that this agenda item would be discussed during the F2F meeting at ICANN 67.

5. ICANN 67 Preparation

- a) ASO AC f2f Agenda
- b) ASO AC Week Activities

AS noted that he had circulated the ICANN schedule on the mailing list. He noted that, based on this finalized schedule, some of the ASO AC sessions now clashed with other important sessions, which might affect the audience for the ASO Public Information session.

KB commented that it was hard to gauge the importance of other sessions. However, there were several other sessions that were now overlapping with the ASO Public Information session. It might now be hard to attract an audience to this session with so many competing sessions going on at the same time.

After some discussion, the ASO AC decided on the following:

Monday:

- 10:30-12:00: ASO AC Working Session 1 – Closed Session (Seat 9/10 Election Procedures Review).
- 13:30 – 15:00: ASO Joint Public Information Session.

Tuesday:

- 09:45-10:45: Joint Meeting ICANN Board and ASO.
- 15:15-16:45: ASO AC Working Session 2 – Open Session (continue discussion on Seat 9/10 Election Procedures Review).
- 17:00-18:30: ASO AC Monthly Meeting.

Wednesday:

- 10:30-12:00: GPDP Review 1.
- 15:15-16:45: GPDP Review 2.

AS noted that he would send this new proposed agenda to the mailing list. It would need to be finalized and communicated to ICANN by Friday 7 February.

HC commented that the output from the sessions on the Seat 9/10 Election Procedures would be to produce an updated process. He thought that more time might be necessary to do this.

AS noted that the notes from the closed session held during ICANN 66 form a good starting point but the points discussed needed to be further elaborated and leveraged. He would discuss this further with KB and JV and circulate more details to the mailing list. He asked the ASO AC to

thoroughly review the ICANN Board Seat Election Process ([section 9](#) of the ASO AC Operating Procedures) so that everyone was on the same page.

- **GDPD Review Session**

AS noted that he and KB, JV, MS and HC would come up with a policy proposal that could be passed through the current GDPD procedure as a trial so that any loopholes that might need to be fixed became apparent. There had not been a global policy proposal for quite some time.

BJ volunteered to be part of this team.

AS noted that, as BJ had served on the Policy Proposal Facilitator Team (PPFT), he would prefer that he reviewed the process of the trial policy proposal using his insight.

BJ agreed.

KB explained that there should be as few people as possible knowing what the trial policy proposal would be. If everyone had looked at the proposal in advance then it might be difficult to work through it. This way, it would allow the ASO AC to go through the procedures in the most efficient and interesting way, which was why it had been decided that only one representative per region should take part in deciding which trial proposal should be used.

6. 2019 ASO Work Plan Review

This was discussed under Action Item 191204-1.

7. 2020 ASO Work Plan

This was discussed under Action Item 191204-2

8. Annual Transparency Review

This was discussed under Action Item 191113-7.

9. AOB

- **ASO Inspection Request**

NN asked if there had been any update on the Inspection Request the ASO had issued to ICANN regarding the sale of .org.

GV noted that there had not yet been any response.

AM noted that ICANN was in the process of preparing a response to this request.

AS asked whether there would be an update before the ICANN-ASO Board session.

AM noted that he was unsure of the timeline.

KB commented that, while the issue was raised by the ASO, it was the NRO EC that specifically raised it. Any updates that the ASO AC might receive would be whatever was made publicly available. He did not believe that there was anything the ASO AC should be specifically concerned about.

AS noted that the issue was out of the ASO AC's jurisdiction.

FY agreed: it was not within the ASO AC's jurisdiction. However, not everybody understood the distinction between the ASO, the ASO AC and the NRO EC. She continued that it would be good to be prepared so that the ASO AC could answer in alignment with the NRO EC in case it received questions about this. She added that, for example, in the RIPE Cooperation Working Group, questions had been raised and no one was able to make the distinction that that the ASO AC was not involved and that this was led by the ASO leadership, which was the NRO EC. Some things might be very clear for the ASO AC but the rest of the community did not have that clarity.

BJ agreed with FY and noted that community members had approached him asking about the ASO position and why the request had been submitted. It was difficult to explain the reasoning behind it.

AS noted that, if approached, ASO AC members should clarify if they are being asked about the ASO AC position or the NRO EC position.

BJ noted that people were asking about the rationale behind the request. There was a lot of confusion within the community regarding ASO and ASO AC.

NN commented that it would be appropriate for the ASO AC to ask the ASO leadership, the NRO EC, for a background briefing as the request had caught the attention of many people in the community. She continued that she had previously asked for the NRO EC to give an update. She asked if this topic would be brought up in during the ASO-ICANN Board session and if so, it would be good for the ASO AC to know more information about this beforehand.

HC also agreed with FY: he had had to explain to people that the ASO AC was not the same as the NRO EC. He added that it was important for the ASO AC to be aware of the context of this request so it could answer any questions about it.

KB noted that this issue came back to the ASO Review and the confusion between the ASO, the NRO, the NRO EC and the ASO AC. He continued that the ASO AC had nothing to do with this request. However, it should be made very clear what the ASO AC's role - or lack thereof in this particular case - was. It would be helpful to have access to public updates so that people could be pointed to the right information, even though the ASO AC was not part of process.

MA noted that it would make sense to have this issue on the agenda of the ASO - ICANN Board session.

AS commented that the ASO AC had a very restricted jurisdiction. He suggested that a note be posted on the ASO website noting this and that the inspection request was issued by the NRO EC (ASO) rather than ASO AC. He continued that the confusion between ASO/NRO was documented in the ASO Review (Recommendation 18) and this was supposed to be fixed. He noted that he had not seen any outcome on this from the NRO EC: the feedback was given but nothing had been done.

FY clarified that no one was saying that the ASO AC should have been involved: the ASO AC knew its scope and jurisdiction. The inspection request was an action by the NRO EC, who made a public statement and wrote an open letter. However, she continued that, as the ASO AC dealt with the same community members and appeared in the same circles at ICANN meetings, the ASO AC was asking to be informed and briefed about that request and the NRO EC's intentions. She noted that the ASO AC was not suggesting that it should have been involved but it was part of good coordination efforts to be informed. She suggested that the NRO EC be officially asked to send a briefing or attend the next teleconference to provide some clarification, preferably before the ICANN 67 Meeting.

AS noted that, while he agreed with the above comments, he had a clear conflict of interest [as an employee of the Internet Society]. He asked whether anything would be solved if the NRO EC sent an email or attended a call.

KB agreed with FY: there would be nothing wrong with the ASO AC requesting a briefing from the NRO EC. He noted that he had seen several comments in the community where the NRO EC members had given updates and information on the inspection request.

AS agreed and noted that, to get the information in time for the ICANN 67 meeting, the briefing would have to be done by mail. He noted that, as he had a conflict of interest, he would ask the Vice Chairs to send the request to the NRO EC.

New Action Item 200205-2: KB/JV to request that the NRO EC briefs the ASO AC on the Inspection Request the ASO [NRO EC] had issued to ICANN regarding the sale of .org before ICANN 67.

- **Policy Proposal Facilitator Team (PPFT)**

LL noted that he would be ARIN's representative on the PPFT.

10. Adjourn

KB proposed the motion to adjourn. LL seconded the motion. There were no objections. Motion carried.

The meeting ended at 13:15 UTC.

-END-