

## ASO AC Teleconference

15 May 2019  
12:00 PM UTC

### Minutes

Attendees	Observers	Apologies
<b>AFRINIC</b> Wafa Dahmani Zaafouri (WZ) Noah Maina (NM)  <b>APNIC</b> Brajesh Jain (BJ) Aftab Siddiqui (AS) - Chair Simon Sohel Baroi (SB)  <b>ARIN</b> Kevin Blumberg (KB) – Vice Chair Louie Lee (LL) Jason Schiller (JS)  <b>LACNIC</b> Esteban Lescano (EL) Ricardo Patara (RP) Jorge Villa (JV) – Vice Chair  <b>RIPE NCC</b> Nurani Nimpuno (NN) Filiz Yilmaz (FY) Hervé Clément (HC)  <b>Secretariat</b> Susannah Gray (SG) – Scribe German Valdez	<b>AFRINIC</b> Ernest Byaruhanga (EB)  <b>ARIN</b> Sean Hopkins (SH) Richard Jimmerson (RJ)  <b>ICANN Board</b> Akinori Maemura (AM)  <b>ICANN Staff</b> Carlos Reyes (CR)	<b>AFRINIC</b> Omo Oaiya (OO)

### New Action Items From This Meeting

- NEW Action Item 190515-01: GV to run mock election using the Schulze Method and report back to the ASO AC.
- NEW Action Item 190515-02: AS to draft text on subscriptions and posting rights for ac-discuss to be posted on the subscription page and welcome message.
- NEW Action Item 190515-03: GV to ask the NRO EC to define which RIR staff should have posting privileges for the new publicly archived ac-discuss mailing list.
- NEW Action Item 190515-04: AS, KB, JV and BJ to draft and circulate text on expected time commitments for the ASO's NomCom representative and, subsequently, launch a call for volunteers from the Numbers community to fill this position.

## Agenda

0. Welcome
  1. Roll Call
  2. Agenda Review
  3. Review April 2019 Minutes
  4. Review Open Actions
  5. Implementation AC-DISCUSS and AC-INTERNAL lists
  6. Mock Election (Test of Schulze Method)
  7. 2020 NomCom Representative
  8. New ASO Website
  9. ICANN 65 Preparation
  10. AOB
  11. Adjourn
- 

### 0. Welcome

AS welcomed the attendees.

### 1. Roll Call

GV performed the roll call and declared quorum.

### 2. Agenda Review

BJ added an agenda item to AOB: *NomCom Update*. This was subsequently added to Agenda Item 7.

KB added an agenda item to AOB: *Discussion on Departure of NRO Chair*.

### 3. Minutes Review

HC proposed the motion to accept the minutes from the April 2019 ASO AC Teleconference. KB seconded the motion. There were no objections. Motion carried.

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

### 4. Review Open Actions

- **ACTION ITEM 190403-1: GV to call for volunteers to participate in a mock election to test the following features of the voting tool: anonymous voting, vote confirmation, vote tracking/verification, comment provision and ranked voting for more than two candidates > *CLOSED*.**

AS asked for clarification on vote tracking.

JS explained that vote tracking refers to voting where there was a ranked ballot with more than two candidates and where a multitude of preferences can be indicated.

GV noted that he had made a call for volunteers to participate in a mock election to test the Schulze Method. The tool, Lime Survey, was provided by LACNIC and had been used in the past for the ASO AC's ICANN Board Seat Election process.

KB asked GV if he could track the time spent on setting up a Schulze Method election versus the time spent on setting up a simple election. It would be useful for the ASO AC to understand how long each one takes so it can understand the complexities involved.

**NEW Action Item 190515-01: GV to run mock election using the Schulze Method and report back to the ASO AC.**

---

- **ACTION ITEM 190403-2: GV to investigate whether Zoom Conferencing would work for future (public) ASO AC teleconferences and report back to the mailing list > *Open*.**

GV noted that he had sent a report regarding Zoom to the mailing list. He added that ICANN, ISOC and most of the RIRs are using the tool and that it would meet the ASO AC's needs. He continued that there were two options: use of ICANN's Zoom account or use of an RIR Zoom account. CR had provided input on the use of ICANN's Zoom account and had confirmed that ICANN could provide support, could pass the host function to the Secretariat so it could run the calls, and that confidentiality could be maintained during sensitive discussions.

GV added that he had informed the NRO EC that the ASO AC was planning to move from Webex to Zoom and it had welcomed this proposal, which would be further discussed during the NRO EC F2F on 25 May. He concluded that, after this meeting, it would be clear which option would be implemented. It should be publicly noted which organization was providing the Zoom account for transparency.

BJ noted that the ICANN NomCom uses ICANN's Zoom account for all of its confidential calls.

KB noted that it would be good to use Zoom for the June teleconference so it can be tested with just the ASO AC in attendance before the calls were opened up to the public in July.

JS agreed with KB. He asked how funding would work if the ICANN Zoom account was to be used instead of an RIR Zoom account.

AS noted that it was for the NRO EC to consider funding and decide which option would be used.

CR explained that ICANN provides Zoom facilities to support the community and that he had been allocated a Zoom account for the ASO to use. The account was not currently in use, as the ASO had not yet asked to use it.

AS asked GV to report back on which Zoom account option the NRO EC decided upon.

---

- **ACTION ITEM 190403-3: GV to circulate a timeline for switching to the new mailing lists (Recommendation #16) > *CLOSED*.**

GV noted that new mailing lists had been created and that ICANN and the RIRs had confirmed their observers. He noted, however, that there was currently an issue with the archiving of sent mails, which the RIPE NCC was already investigating.

HC noted that, in the list of observers, there was an error in Marco Schmidt's name.

BJ asked if there was a limit on the number of observers. He noted that each RIR had a different amount of observers.

AS responded that there was no need to limit the number of RIR staff observers.

KB noted that observers should use an RIR email address wherever possible rather than a personal one to facilitate with yearly membership vetting. He added that the ASO AC should define which date the ac-coord list would be disabled.

NN noted that she trusted the RIR CEOs to decide which staff from their organization should be added as observers and that the Secretariat would work with the RIRs to find the most efficient way to maintain the list. She added that it did not matter if observers used personal or role account.

AS noted that there should be a documented list of any non-RIR staff who are subscribed as observers.

JS asked if there was a limit on the number of subscriptions.

AS noted that Mailman can handle a lot of subscriptions.

JS asked if the current observers had posting rights.

AS noted that currently, all observers can post.

JS noted that he had no concerns with having many non-posting observers subscribed to the list. However, the ASO AC should make sure that the list did not become dominated by posting observers.

AS noted that, so far, there had been an understanding that the observers do not usually post to the mailing list.

JS suggested that this could be formally documented.

AS suggested that this could be noted on the ac-discuss subscription page and in the welcome message. If people want to get in touch with the ASO AC they can send a mail to the Chairs or to the NRO EC.

**NEW Action Item 190515-02: AS to draft text on subscriptions and posting rights for ac-discuss to be posted on the subscription page and welcome message.**

GV noted that this text could also be added to the auto-responder for the closed ac-coord list.

AS noted that there was ongoing discussion in the APNIC region on whether the Chair of the Policy Special Interest Group (SIG) should be subscribed to the ASO AC mailing list.

FY noted that the ASO AC had not agreed that anyone could subscribe to the ASO AC's mailing list as an observer. Only RIR staff can be observers on the closed list. She explained that, in the past, no Policy SIG Chair or Working Group Chairs were allowed to subscribe to the closed list. There had been requests, which were refused. The ASO AC still needs to have a closed mailing list for certain discussions and the only observers should be RIR staff. She concluded that the ASO AC should be the ones to decide who should be subscribed to its mailing lists.

NN agreed: anyone can request to be subscribed, but it is the ASO AC's decision to approve that request or not.

KB noted that the private list, ac-internal, was for a specific purpose and there was a specified list of people subscribed to it. Regarding the publicly archived list, ac-discuss, he thought that the ASO AC had discussed that observers would not be able to post. A limited subset of people, such as the NRO EC, the ASO-appointed ICANN Board members, ICANN support staff and RIR staff, that need to interact with the ASO AC could have posting rights, similar to what was currently in place for the ac-coord mailing list. It was important for the ASO AC to understand who would be able to post and who was responsible once posts were made.

AS suggested that the NRO EC be asked which RIR staff members should have posting rights.

JS noted that the following language should be used: posting observers and non-posting observers.

GV noted that previous discussions concluded that the ac-discuss list would not be open for general subscription. It was also decided that only the ASO AC, designated RIR staff, ICANN support staff and ASO-appointed ICANN Board members would be able to post. He asked for clarification that the ASO AC now wanted the NRO EC to define who should be given posting privileges.

KB clarified: the NRO EC should define which staff have posting rights because once a staff member posts to the list they are speaking on behalf of the RIR.

GV asked if the ASO AC wanted to have this addressed before the ac-discuss list came into effect.

AS suggested that only the NRO EC, ASO AC, ICANN support staff and ASO-appointed ICANN Board members be given posting rights for ac-discuss initially. A note should be sent to the NRO EC asking which RIR staff members should also have the right to post.

**NEW Action Item 190515-03: GV to ask the NRO EC to define which RIR staff should have posting privileges for the new publicly archived ac-discuss mailing list.**

KB proposed the following motion:

***Barring any technical concerns with the public archiving as noted by the Secretariat, the ac-internal and ac-discuss mailing lists will be launched on 29 May 2019. The ac-coord mailing list will be disabled at the same time.***

BJ seconded the motion. There were no objections. Motion carried.

GV noted that the Secretariat had prepared an announcement regarding the mailing lists and the RIR Communications teams were ready to distribute it within their regions.

- 
- **ACTION ITEM 190311-1: GV to investigate voting tool options and report back during the April ASO AC Teleconference > CLOSED.**

This was discussed during ACTION ITEM 190403-1.

AS clarified that when the ASO AC started to use Lime Survey, it will use this tool every time a vote needs to be held.

JS clarified that Lime Survey would be used for both Schulze Method and simple majority votes. He added that there should be a comment field so that people can note their reservations or concerns during an election.

GV clarified that the ASO AC had already used Lime Survey in the past for majority voting, for the ASO AC Chair, for the NomCom delegate and ICANN Board Seat 9/10 elections. The tool had not changed and could be configured for different options, for example to add a comment field.

AS noted that Lime Survey had not been used to vote on changes to the ASO AC Operating Procedures.

NN noted that Lime Survey was the voting tool that the ASO AC had always used. She thought that the ASO AC was overcomplicating things. Lime Survey was used in the past for far more complex and sensitive situations than changing Operating Procedures. She did not understand why it needed to be tested again and extra burden be put on the Secretariat when the tool had been used so many times in the past.

AS noted that this action item came about due to issues with using Doodle for voting on procedure changes.

NN noted that the concern with Doodle was that it was not a suitable tool for voting. She added that the Schulze Method had been used on Lime Platform previously for the ICANN Board Seat Elections. The Schulze Method with multiple candidates would not behave differently on this platform compared to another platform.

GV noted that there had only been two candidates in the previous test. The Schulze Method should now be tested using multiple candidates.

KB noted that the ASO AC should agree that only this platform would be used for all voting needs going forward.

- 
- **ACTION ITEM 190311-2: AS/KB/JV to discuss and suggest a process for planning the 2020 ASO open session > CLOSED.**

JV asked if the ASO AC had any comments or concerns about the ASO session that took place at ICANN 64. He noted that the next ASO session would be held in 2020 at ICANN 67. He added that, in terms of process, it would be similar to last year and a small group would be convened to work on this. The planning team would contact the NRO EC and ask if it had anything it wanted to add to the agenda for the next session.

KB noted that it would be a good idea to have a definitive timeline and have enough time to reach out to the NRO EC. He thought the scope of the session was good and that it should not be expanded as it might lead to scope creep. He added that the time commitment for the organizing team was high.

- 
- **ACTION ITEM 190311-4: GV to send the ac-coord subscription list to the NRO EC so they have an overview of who is on the list > CLOSED.**

- 
- **ACTION ITEM 190311-5: GV to send a final mail to the ac-coord list noting that the list would soon be closed and that members should sign up to the new ac-discuss list > OPEN.**

See ACTION ITEM 190311-6.

---

- **ACTION ITEM 190311-6: AS/KB/JV to propose text for the new mailing list footers and circulate to the mailing list for a 10-day review period > OPEN.**

AS noted he had sent this to the mailing list earlier in the day. He asked the ASO AC to review the text and provide any comments, as this text must be finalized before the ac-discuss mailing list could go live.

---

- **ACTION ITEM 190311-8: AS to re-circulate the text relating to the ASO AC's F2F meeting on the mailing list for further discussion> OPEN.**

AS noted that he had sent this text to the mailing list in March but did not recall any response so would circulate it again. The text should be finalized before the next F2F meeting in March 2020.

## 5. Implementation ac-discuss and ac-internal Mailing Lists

This was discussed under action item 190403-3.

## 6. Mock Election (Test of Schulze Method)

This was discussed under action items 190311-1 and 190403-1.

## 7. 2020 NomCom representative

BJ gave a status update on the latest ICANN Board NomCom Activities.

KB asked if the ASO AC was required to provide a representative to participate on the NomCom.

AS noted it was part of ICANN Bylaws: all SO/ACs appoint a representative.

BJ noted that the ASO was allocated one voting seat. The participant does not need to be an ASO AC member.

KB asked if the ASO or the ASO AC was responsible for the selection: if the former, the NRO EC should be asked to select the representative. He added that it was a huge time commitment for the representative and it affected ASO AC business as that person was often committed to NomCom sessions for the entire ICANN Meeting, which was why this role had been opened up to community members in the past.

AS noted that the Bylaws stated that it was the ASO AC's responsibility:

*"9.2. (b) The Address Council shall nominate individuals to fill Seats 9 and 10 on the Board."*

NN noted that, in the past, the ASO AC has selected non-AC members for this role. She noted that she had emphasized strongly during the last selection round that the ASO AC should conduct outreach and launch a public call so that anyone could apply.

HC agreed with NN and noted that the ASO AC should agree on a process for this.

JS agreed with NN and HC. Outreach should be conducted within the numbers community specifically. He added that information about the time and travel commitments should also be made available.

AS noted that there was already a process in the Operating Procedures for selecting the NomCom representative: *6. Procedures to Appoint Members to Various Bodies*. It was noted in this section that non-ASO AC members could also volunteer. He added that the only part that was missing was the time commitment, which needed to be made clear during the outreach stage.

BJ gave overview of time commitment and requirements, noting that each year, the NomCom members must attend all three ICANN Meetings, at least one multi-day intersessional, 6-8 conference calls and interviews with candidates.

KB noted that, in terms of the timelines, the ASO AC would need to have its representative selected 60-90 days before ICANN 66 in case visas needed to be applied for. The call for candidates would be going out over the quieter summer months so the process needed to be started as soon as possible, preferably by 1 June.

AS noted that he would put together a document noting the time commitment necessary and would circulate for comment. Once finalized a call for volunteers could be put out to the Numbers community. He noted that ASO AC members would still be able to apply.

BJ noted that ICANN expects to be informed of the NomCom representatives 6-8 weeks before ICANN 66 and that the ASO AC should have its candidate chosen by mid-August.

**NEW Action Item 190515-04: AS, KB, JV and BJ to draft and circulate text on expected time commitments for the ASO's NomCom representative and, subsequently, launch a call for volunteers from the Numbers community to fill this position.**

## **8. New ASO website**

SG gave an overview of the proposed new ASO website. She noted that she had circulated a draft new menu hierarchy/navigation and asked for feedback. She continued that the structure was not going to be radically different but that the Secretariat was proposing to split the ASO and ASO AC specific information to make the division between responsibilities clearer. No information would be removed but some pages might be merged to improve flow and logic. Redirects would be implemented if current urls change. She added that the look and feel would be similar to the new NRO website.

HC noted that the proposed new menu structure looked good. He commented that the Policy section might need to be renamed because the ASO AC deals only with global policy but that he would take a deeper look and provide more feedback.

KB noted that, if pages were moved around, it must be ensured that dead links were forwarded to the new pages. He asked if the Secretariat was planning to get feedback F2F from those ASO AC members present at the ICANN 65 Meeting.

SG noted that implementing redirects for any broken links/moved pages were already part of the project specifications given to the developer. She added that she would not be attending ICANN 65 but that GV and the RIR Comms Teams were holding a meeting there and could set up an informal meeting with any ASO AC representatives to gather feedback. Work on the website would start soon after this.

NN noted that the proposal looked good and that she understood that there were many requirements for the site that needed to be taken into consideration.



## **9. ICANN 65 Preparation**

AS asked those attending ICANN 65 in their ASO AC capacity to inform GV. He noted that he would not be present and that KB would be representing the ASO AC Chairs.

## **10. AOB**

- **Discussion on Departure of NRO Chair**

KB noted that it had recently been announced that the Chair of the NRO would be leaving his position as CEO of AFRINIC and asked who would act as NRO Chair in his absence.

AS noted that the Vice Chair, which is Axel Pawlik, would take over as Chair in this circumstance.

GV noted that the NRO EC had a face-to-face meeting next week during the RIPE 78 Meeting and more information might be available after that.

## **11. Adjourn**

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

The meeting ended at 14:08 UTC.

*-END-*