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0. Welcome

Kevin B. welcomed everyone, and the meeting began at 9:05.

1. Roll Call

Roll call was performed, and quorum was established.

2. Agenda Review

Kevin B. moved to approve the agenda as circulated, the motion was seconded by Esteban L., no comments were heard, and the motion carried.

3. Review Open Actions

Action Item 220511-1: GV to confirm with AFRINIC when a person will be appointed to take the place of Wafa Z. (whose resignation will take effect on 15 May 2022) on the ASO AC. OPEN

GV shared that he asked AFRINIC about the appointment but there is no official update

Action Item 220309-1: Hervé C. to start preparing a timeline for the core team (Hervé C., Saul S., Mike S., Sander S., Esteban L., James K. and Ricardo P.) to work on the review of the ASO AC Procedures. OPEN

Hervé C. presented the following update:

- Germán V. and the RIPE NCC created a specific mailing list for the Procedures Review core team to communicate.
- The Procedures Review core team have already exchanged some ideas on the list.
- Some work has been done, there is an agenda, a complete review of the procedures is due, so this year the ASO AC can take the opportunity and renewed momentum to go as far as possible.
- The core team has identified a list of topics and actions.
- The team will review some proposed changes that were discussed a couple of years ago but did not move forward.
- The simplest way is for Hervé C. to send a report on what the core team has discussed to the ASO AC after this meeting.

Hervé C. invited comments, and Germán V. noted that he has two concerns regarding the Schulze method.

Germán V.’s first concern is that, as the procedures are written right now, if an election results in a tie, the tie must be broken by a random process. However, the ASO AC has not defined what this random process should be. His second concern relates to the calculation for the Schulze method itself. At the moment, the ASO Secretariat is performing the calculations manually and validating them with a third-party online calculator. For transparency and accountability, he mentioned he may ask the NRO EC for some support for an online calculator that can provide truly certifiable results before the next election cycle.

Hervé C. thanked Germán V. for sharing his concerns and agreed that they should work on them.
Hervé C. summarized the topics that should be reviewed as follows: 1) questions around voting processes; 2) the fact that the procedures do not consider the impossibility of in-person meetings; 3) the need to adjust the references pointing to the MoU; 4) adding a discussion to review the ASO AC selection process, specifically regarding timing and agenda preparation responsibilities of the AC and IC/QRC.

Hervé C. observed that if the ASO AC decides to deal with all these topics, the structure of the procedures may have to be redefined. To optimize the time needed for the review, the core team will list and review all activities individually and collectively, assigning specific work to each member. The idea would be for the team to have this ready for the July ASO AC meeting.

Kevin B. thanked Hervé C. for his work and that of the core team and noted that there is another agenda item to discuss the procedures review in case anybody has additional comments.

4. Approval Minutes May 2022

Hervé C. moved to approve the minutes of the May 2022 ASO AC meeting minutes as circulated, Esteban L. seconded the motion, no objections were heard, and the motion carried.

5. ASO Procedures Review Update

Kevin B. suggested possibly looking at different election scenarios. For example, what happens in a scenario where there is only one candidate? What is the procedure if there are 20 candidates? Is there any differential? The ASO AC had some very varied appointments over the past couple of years, perhaps take some of those scenarios and see what our procedures would look like if we had 20 candidates. Would things be different? Just something to keep in mind: impart real world scenarios based on the ASO AC’s experience.

Regarding the Schulze method tie break, Kevin B. observed that this was a known issue, and that at the time the ASO AC had decided that the Secretariat should decide the winner through whatever tie break method it deemed appropriate in terms of randomization. He agreed that this was not well documented in the procedures. As for transparency and accountability (i.e., the possibility of acquiring a calculator which Germán V. mentioned earlier), this should not be included in the procedures review but instead the Secretariat could look into it separately, as it is part of the day to day.

Hervé C. thanked Kevin B. for his suggestions of considering past and potential scenarios.

Kevin B. thanked the Procedures Review core team for their work.

6. ASO Appointment to ICANN NomCom Wrap Up

Kevin B. noted that this appointment has been completed.

Germán V. confirmed that the appointment was complete, that the election finished within the expected timeline, that all parties have been notified, and that the Secretariat has published the announcement on the website.

At Kevin B.’s request, Germán V. confirmed that the NomCom has a two-term limit.
Kevin B. mentioned that this will be Brajesh Jain’s second term, so the ASO AC should start the process to find people who would like to be nominated next year.

Esteban L. suggested that it is a good idea to prepare the next candidate for the NomCom, adding that they should all do more outreach for the position in each of their communities.

Kevin B. agreed. He noted an issue: RIR meetings that occur at the beginning of the year are too late (e.g., the nominations for this year’s NomCom closed 48 hours after the ARIN meeting). He suggested that doing outreach at the last meeting this year rather than the first meeting of 2023 might help and proposed starting in September/October this year, then nominations could still open following the usual timeline.

Esteban L. agreed with Kevin B.’s idea — begin the outreach sooner. He added that perhaps they could include something in the procedures in that sense, to work in a better way and attract more candidates from the RIR communities.

Hervé C. agreed.

7. RIR reports

a) RIPE 84 Report

James K., cochair of the Address Policy WG, said he would provide three primary updates:

- There was a pre-policy proposal discussion on removing IP version for policy that mandates IPv4 peer assignments be registered in the RIPE database. This would give IPv4 holders the option to register their assignments in RIPE database or not.
- There’s a group of community volunteers reviewing the RIPE IPv6 policies — which are now 23 years old — to see if they are still valid, if there are parts that are no longer relevant and so on. Most of the work will be done on the mailing list (agree on particular problem statements), then formal policy proposals will be drafted if needed.
- IPv4 waiting list: there was an open conversation on how IPv4 address space should be distributed. Discussions are ongoing on the mailing list.

Hervé C. added that this had been the first hybrid RIPE meeting, that it had been well attended, that there had been more in-person than remote participants, that there was great energy, that people were happy to meet again, and that it felt like a relaunch of different projects. All in all, it was a pretty successful meeting.

Kevin B. thanked James K. and Hervé C. for their updates.

8. AOB

Esteban L. mentioned that he will be travelling to ICANN 74 and will be available to meet with the other ASO AC members who participate in the meeting.

Hervé C. and Kevin B. noted that they will also be attending. Kevin B. asked anybody else who will be travelling to ICANN 74 to reach out so they can catch up.

9. Adjourn
There being no further business to discuss, Hervé C. moved to adjourn the meeting, Esteban L. seconded the motion, no opposition was heard, and the meeting was adjourned at 12:33 UTC.