

**ASO AC Teleconference
Wednesday 3 February 2021
12:00 PM UTC
Minutes**

Attendees	Observers	Apologies
<p>AFRINIC Wafa Dahmani Zaafour (WD) Saul Stein (SSt)</p> <p>APNIC Nicole Chan (NC) Aftab Siddiqui (AS)</p> <p>ARIN Kevin Blumberg (KB) – Chair Louie Lee (LL) Martin Hannigan (MH)</p> <p>LACNIC Ricardo Patara (RP) Jorge Villa (JV) Esteban Lescano (EL)</p> <p>RIPE NCC Filiz Yilmaz (FY) Nurani Nimpuno (NN) Hervé Clément (HC) – Vice Chair</p> <p>Secretariat Germán Valdez (GV) Laureana Pavón (LP) – Minutes</p>	<p>ICANN Staff Carlos Reyes (CR)</p> <p>ICANN Board Maemura Akinori Ron da Silva</p> <p>Community: 1</p> <p>RIPE NCC Hans Peter Holen – NRO EC Chair Angela Dall’Arra</p>	<p>AFRINIC Mike Silber (MS) – Vice Chair</p> <p>APNIC Shubham Saran (SSa)</p>

New action items from this meeting:

-

=====

Agenda

0. Welcome
1. Agenda Review
2. Review Open Actions
3. Approval Minutes January 2021
4. ASO AC Virtual Meeting
5. AOB
 - ICANN Board Election Update (CLOSED SESSION)

6. Adjourn

0. Welcome

KB welcomed attendees and started the meeting at 12:05 PM UTC.

GV performed roll call. With eleven members present and all regions represented, quorum was declared.

KB provided a quick update on some of the things he and the vice chairs had been working on, namely, that the chairs will be holding a meeting before each monthly ASO AC teleconference to discuss and prepare the agenda. He asked the others to share any agenda items they would like to discuss 10 days in advance (i.e. the previous Monday) so that the Secretariat could send out the agenda a week prior to each meeting.

1. Agenda Review

KB asked HPP if he would like to present a general update from the NRO EC. HPP agreed.

No further changes were made to the agenda, which was approved as revised.

2. Review Open Actions

Action Item 210113-1: KB to work with GV to prepare a Doodle poll to define the details for the ASO AC virtual f2f meeting, including potential dates, time commitment availability (i.e., see whether ASO AC members would be able meet for 2, 3 or 4 hours, etc.). **CLOSED**

KB observed that the Doodle poll had been sent out, that the time slots included in the poll were quite broad given the global nature of the calls, that the poll considered various dates in April and May, and that the idea was to find out which dates suited everyone the best.

KB noted that they would then decide if they needed 2 or 3 days, keeping each day to 2 hours so the meetings don't take away too much from their daily commitments on any a given day. He added that the sooner this could be done, the better, so they could lock in some dates for this meeting.

FY then asked KB to clarify whether this virtual f2f meeting would include ICANN Board discussions.

KB replied that it wouldn't. He said that one of the questions they would discuss during the closed session was whether the IC or the ASO required specific dates for the election, which they would keep separate and outside the virtual f2f meeting window.

FY asked whether they should also expect some Board process related time before April, such as interviews, internal deliberations, and so on.

KB replied affirmatively, saying that the closed sessions during the standard ASO AC teleconferences could be extended for longer deliberations and they could also potentially discuss reserving additional time slots for deliberation if needed, but separate for that purpose.

FY requested they prioritize slots for the Board election.

NN then asked whether the virtual f2f meeting would be held in lieu of their once-a-year f2f in-person meeting, adding that she did not have a clear understanding of what the purpose of the meeting would be, its specific agenda, topics and other details.

KB said that it would indeed replace the f2f meeting. He added that during the virtual f2f they would do as much as they could in the time they had, which would be more than during a regular AC call. He said that the chair and vice chairs could come up with an agenda, but that it was up to the AC to agree to an agenda and suggest what they would really like to do or not do during that time. He said that if this agenda was minimal, they could cover it in one day; if not, they could schedule in an additional day and perhaps even a third day for breakout sessions.

NN noted that, in her opinion, they were going about this in the wrong way, as she saw no logic in trying to convert the f2f meeting into virtual format. She said she would work with the group on whatever they agreed, but that she believed that a better approach would be to identify what work needs to be done and then schedule the meeting, not the other way around. She said that they certainly have work ahead, but that securing 3- or 4-hour slots which would be in the middle of the night for some members wouldn't necessarily be the best way of going about it.

KB explained that meetings would be at most 2 hours long and that he was trying to be cognizant of the different time zones, the effect of zoom meetings and everything else. He added that many items had been left out of last year's meeting (the procedures, going through and reviewing the global policy development process, etc.). He stressed that the important thing was to prioritize what they needed to do in a virtual vs a f2f meeting and then see if they could fit some workshops or discussions into one, two or three days, perhaps breaking out in smaller groups, etc. He said that the ASO AC had always had a f2f every single year where they had done significant work, and that this had suddenly disappeared. He concluded by saying that they needed to decide if they would rather meet once a month and limit their work to the absolute essential.

NN said that they had not slowed down their work, just moved it online. She added that she was not proposing not doing any work but suggesting prioritizing what they wanted to do and then finding the right format for the work that was required.

HC said they were in agreement in that the priority was the process for the appointment of a director to the ICANN Board, suggesting that perhaps the virtual f2f meeting could take place later in the year, defining an agenda to work on specific topics, e.g., global policy work, perhaps set up a f2f around this work.

KB suggested reviewing the specific timeline for the ICANN Board election during the closed session to make sure that there were no conflicts between the dates in the Doodle poll for the f2f and activities of the teams involved in the Board election process (IC, ASO AC).

Action Item 210113-2: GV to circulate the 2021 Work Plan to the ASO AC and if there are no changes or corrections publish the Plan on 20 January 2021. **CLOSED**

GV confirmed that the was final, adding that he would proceed to publish it immediately.

KB thanked everyone for their work on the 2021 Work Plan.

New Action Item 210113-3: ASO AC chair and vice chairs to confirm the status of the 2020 Transparency Review and, if it is absent, to write this the review and then circulate it. **OPEN**

KB noted that the 2020 Transparency Review had already been published on the wiki and asked the other ASO AC members to please review and provide their comments, commenting that the target was to publish the Review the following Friday.

New Action Item 210113-4 ASO AC to confirm regional representatives to the PPFT. **CLOSED**
All five regions have confirmed their representatives.

KB suggested that any questions that might remain regarding the PPFT could be submitted via email.

Action Item 201104-1: ASO AC to update the policy slide deck, which will be published towards the end of the year, once the five RIRs have held their meetings. **CLOSED**

KB observed that the latest version of the slide deck had been circulated and that, absent any changes, this version would be considered final and given to ICANN this Friday.

Action Item 201104-4: AS to circulate the draft Annual Transparency Review before the December Teleconference. **CLOSED**

3. Approval Minutes January 2021

HC proposed a motion to approve the minutes of the January 2021 minutes, WD seconded the motion, no oppositions or abstentions were heard, and the motion carried unanimously.

4. ASO AC Virtual Meeting

KB mentioned that they had already discussed this when discussing the open action items.

5. AOB

KB repeated that the chairs and vice chairs would be meeting 10 days before each ASO AC meeting to go through the agenda, open action items and things that needed to be done and that they would use that time to consider the possibilities for the f2f meeting.

KB said that, for future ASO AC meetings, if there were any topics which members felt were important to include in the agenda, to please send them to the list. He said that they would try to prioritize (e.g., RIR updates would be low on the priority list) and that if there was a need to discuss certain particularly relevant topics, to decide whether it would be better to do so earlier or later in the year, always trying to use the AC's time more efficiently.

a) NRO EC Update

KB asked HPH if he would like to provide an update on how things were going.

HPH said that since both he and Eddie Kayihura had joined the NRO EC in 2020, they had been talking about having a f2f retreat or strategy session, which, in his opinion, would not be possible in 2021 due to travel restrictions but they were trying to figure out how they could engage remotely.

He explained that there were many documents that had been approved and signed over the years, so they were looking at consolidating them and perhaps updating the NRO MoU and also creating an inventory of all the external relations they had such as with ICANN. He added that they had no intention of introducing major changes, but simply doing some housekeeping.

HPH observed that the NRO EC had no substantial activities planned for the ICANN meetings and that they did not necessarily have any burning issues for that agenda. He also noted that, because all the RIRs had moved their meetings online, community participation had increased more than ever and that this would likely continue during at least the first half of 2021.

HPH said that KB had asked him whether there was any guidance or formal resolution within the NRO EC regarding travel. His reply was that the budget was there, but that the thinking was not to plan for f2f meetings as the rest of the year did not look good for physical meetings.

KB thanked HPH for his update and replied that the ASO AC's ideas on this were in line with the NRO EC's.

LL asked whether there were any specific areas of the MoU they were not happy with and whether they were looking for input from the AC.

HPH explained that they were talking about the NRO MoU signed by the five RIRs and that their thinking was that they would try to incorporate, as an addition to this MoU, some bits and pieces that had been signed after the date of the MoU.

LL thanked HPH for his clarification.

CR said that HPH had noted that there were no issues to discuss with ICANN at this time and asked whether that meant that there was no need for any virtual ASO session with the ICANN Board during ICANN 70, adding that they could coordinate a meeting later if things changed.

HPH said that it was on his list to make sure that he had regular contact with ICANN and that it was more a question of "should we do that during the ICANN meeting or at some other time." He said he would get back to CR regarding this, adding that it had simply been a comment that they don't need to schedule any public sessions at this time.

CR replied that he and his colleagues were always happy to work with HPH and prepare anything off-schedule for ICANN meetings.

KB thanked HPH for joining the meeting and said he hoped to see him at some other sessions over the year.

Before moving onto the closed session, AS expressed his apologies for having missed the January meeting, welcomed the new chair and vice chairs, and thanked the outgoing members of the AC, adding that he really appreciated their work and time.

After confirming that there were no observers on the call and inviting WD to leave the call, the other members of the ASO AC continued with the ICANN Board election update in closed session.

13. Adjourn

MH proposed a motion to adjourn, SS seconded the motion. There were no objections and the meeting was adjourned at 13:03 UTC.