ASO AC Teleconference
Wednesday 20 October 2021
12:00 PM UTC
Minutes

Attendees	Observers	Apologies
AFRINIC Wafa Dahmani Zaafouri (WD) Saul Stein (SSt) Mike Silber (MS) – Vice Chair **APNIC** Nicole Chan (NC) Shubham Saran (SSa) Aftab Siddiqui (AS) **ARIN** Kevin Blumberg (KB) – Chair Martin Hannigan (MH) Louie Lee (LL) **LACNIC** Ricardo Patara (RP) Esteban Lescano (EL) Jorge Villa (JV) **RIPE NCC** James Kennedy (JK) Nurani Nimpuno (NN) Hervé Clément (HC) – Vice Chair **Secretariat** Germán Valdez (GV) Laureana Pavón (LP) – Minutes	**ICANN Staff** Carlos Reyes (CR) **NRO EC** Hans Peter Holen (HPH) – RIPE NCC John Curran (JC) – ARIN **Community** Madhvi Gokool (MG) – AFRINIC Srinivas (Sunny) Chendi (SCh) – APNIC Sean Hopkins (SH)– ARIN Angela Dall'Ara (AD) – RIPE NCC Laura Kaplan (LK) – LACNIC	

New action items from this meeting:

New Action Item 211020-1: KB to update Section 6 of the ASO AC Operating Procedures (Global Policy Development), introducing any necessary editorial changes and fixing possible errors and circulate his draft to the list.

New Action Item 211020-2: Each region to send to the Secretariat the name of their representative to the QRC soon so that the QRC can be formally constituted during the 3 November ASO AC meeting.

==================

Agenda

0. Welcome
1. Roll Call
2. Agenda Review
3. Review Open Actions
4. Approval Minutes
         a) 1 August 2021
5. RIR Overview of the Global Policy Development Process
         a) AFRINIC
         b) APNIC
         c) ARIN
         d) LACNIC
         e) RIPE NCC
         f) ASO AC Global Policy Development Process
6. Qualification Review Committee for 2021/2022 ICANN Board Election
7. ASO AC Observers in ICANN Board Election Process
8. RIR Meeting Updates
         a) APNIC 52 Update
         b) LACNIC 36 Update
9. AOB
10. Adjourn
=================

0. Welcome

KB welcomed everyone and kicked off the meeting at 12:05 UTC.

1. Roll Call

GV performed roll call. With thirteen ASO AC members present, and all regions represented, quorum was established.

2. Agenda Review

KB suggested one modification to the draft agenda: adding "ASO AC in the Global Policy Development Process" as agenda item 5.f.

NN noted she would add an item under AOB.

The draft agenda was then approved as written, with the addendum above.

3. Review Open Actions

Action Item 210901-1: KB to send out a draft agenda for the October ASO AC meeting by next week so all AC members can provide feedback. Representatives of each RIR will be present during this meeting to go over the global policy development process in each region. CLOSED

4. Approval Minutes

a) 1 August 2021

HC moved to approve the 1 August 2021 ASO AC meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by SSt. Hearing no opposition, the motion carried.

5. RIR Overview of the Global Policy Development

KB thanked everyone for their presence on the call and introduced the topic by noting that the impetus for including this in the agenda was to so that the ASO AC could understand the procedures used for global policy in each RIR.

a) AFRINIC

MG, policy liaison for the AFRINIC PDP, thanked the ASO AC for the invitation and then shared a slide deck on screen.

MG first explained how AFRINIC handles Internet number resources and policy, and then went on to explain the general global policy development process (an identical version must reach consensus at all five RIRs to become a global policy; developed through a bottom-up, transparent and community driven process; the ASO takes global policies to the ICANN Board for ratification).

Next, she mentioned some examples of global policies still in force and shared how they had been developed following the global policy development in AFRINIC, a nine-step process which is the same process used for regional policies.

She concluded with some notes regarding global policy development in AFRINIC:
- If the text of the global policy has changed during or after the last call period, it is resubmitted to the AFRINIC PDP.
- In case of emergency, the AFRINIC PDP can be processed through section 3.6 of the Consolidated Policy Manual, which allows Policy Development WG chairs to vary the process (but this has never happened).

KB opened the round of questions as follows: Does the author control the policy throughout the PDP or is this done by a different group or entity? At what point of the process is the author finished?

MG replied that there are no clear rules as to whether the author relinquishes control over the policy. What she has observed is that one or more authors submit a proposal and then the discussion happens in regard to the merits of the proposal or in disagreement. If the authors wish to clarify or participate on the mailing list, they are free to do so.

No further questions were asked.

b) APNIC

SCh, who manages the PDP for the APNIC region, thanked the ASO AC for the invitation to present.

While sharing a slide deck on screen, he began by saying that, across all the regions, the fundamental goals and object of the PDP is the same as MG explained (open, bottom-up, transparent).

He explained that in the APNIC region policy development is managed by the Policy Special Interest Group (SIG) which has a charter with a clearly defined scope and manages the policy meetings at APNIC meetings twice a year. He then explained what a SIG is and the guidelines for SIGs in APNIC (an open forum for the community to discuss topics of interest, no entry requirements, the first step to participation is to subscribe to the SIC mailing list).

SCh explained that decisions are made by consensus just as in the other RIRs ("general agreement" taking into consideration comments on the mailing list and at the policy meeting). Chairs consider many sources (mailing list discussions; SIG meeting discussions; show of hands; CONFER, an online tool which members of the community can use to participate remotely).

He described the APNIC regional policy process, which starts with the submission of a proposal five weeks before the conference, then it comes to the secretariat, then to the SIG chairs, who decide whether to accept or reject the proposal. If accepted, it goes on to the mailing list for discussion, then to the conference where it is presented to the community. The chairs open the consensus process. If the proposal reaches consensus at the meeting and the AGM/AMM, then it goes back to the list. If consensus is maintained, the EC endorses the policy, and it is implemented by the secretariat.

The global policy process is similar. As MG mentioned, the global proposal must have the same text going through the five regions. If there is a change, it must go through the process once again, that's one difference. Also, there are very strict timelines in the APNIC region for each step.

KB asked SCh whether the policy proposal goes from the secretariat to the SIG and then the SIG is in responsible for taking the proposal through the process.

SCh replied that the SIG chair is in charge of the process, but that the authors still have some responsibility (e.g., they can withdraw, amend and resubmit, or modify the proposal even a few days before the conference).

SSt asked SCh who is part of the community involved in the process, to which SCh replied that the process is open to anyone who wishes to participate, even to people from other RIR regions.

c) ARIN

JC also thanked the ASO AC for having him and shared some slides. He said that, because much of the information in the slides shared by MG and SCh also applies to ARIN, he would try to focus on the differences of the ARIN PDP.

He explained that the ARIN PDP is open and bottom up; that anyone can participate as long as they follow the rules; policies are developed in a completely open, transparent, and community-based manner; community-elected bodies and ARIN staff facilitate the process. He shared that ARIN's PDP is also used for global policy development.

He then described the steps in the ARIN PDP, which begins when a proposal is submitted by the authors; the ARIN Advisory Council (AC) assigns two of its members to shepherd the proposal through the PDP;

shepherds work with the authors to ensure that the proposal is within scope and has a clear problem statement; AC advances to draft policy status and becomes responsible for updates/edits to the text; the proposal is discussed on the public policy mailing list and at an ARIN meeting; legal review by the ARIN staff; AC advances to recommended draft policy; shepherds present at an ARIN meeting; AC advances to Last Call; AC advances to Board of Trustees, Board of Trustees adopts as policy; staff implements the policy.

JC noted that a proposal is a statement of something that needs to be changed, which may or may not include some text.

KB asked the following question: one of the requirements for global policy is that the text must be the same. Can a policy in the ARIN region reach consensus with differences because the ARIN community believes their wording is the correct wording?

JC replied that a global policy affects how the IANA administrates resources and that something cannot be implemented unless the five RIRs are in agreement, adding that, if this were to occur, he suspects ARIN would take the recommended text and put it through the process once again.

d) LACNIC

Laura Kaplan, Development and Cooperation Manager for LACNIC, observed that her presentation would also focus on some of the specifics.

She explained that the LACNIC PDP is the process whereby the community submits proposals for defining the rules or guidelines that are included in the policy manual, and that these proposals can also become policies that change the PDP itself. She added that the LACNIC PDP is also participative, open, consensus-based, and bottom up and that there are no intermediary groups, committees, etc., so anyone who has an email address can participate.

She presented the lifecycle of a proposal in the LACNIC region: the authors submit a proposal; initial discussion period; the proposal is presented at the LACNIC Policy Forum; the chairs decide on consensus; if a policy reaches consensus, there is last comments period and the chairs decide the final consensus; finally, the policy must be ratified by the board before its implementation. If the chairs decide that the policy has not reached consensus or it is not ratified by the board, it goes back to square 1 (a new draft is required, and a new discussion must begin).

LK shared the components that make the LACNIC PDP different from the PDPs of other regions: 1) a single mailing list (the Policy mailing list); 2) approval based on consensus (a proposal is considered to have reached consensus when it is supported by meaningful opinions, after a broad discussion, and when no irrefutable technical objections remain); 3) there are two community-elected PDP chairs, who can be removed by the board if they fail to comply with the PDP; 4) during the ratification phase, the board has the power to reject proposals that would be harmful to LACNIC; 5) there is an appeals mechanism available to the community (board intervention); 6) LACNIC staff role is to serve as the secretariat in the process (support the chairs, provide answers to the community, guarantee discussions at the Policy Forums, et.).

She concluded by saying that LACNIC does not have a different process for global policy development, as this is a coordination process among the five regions once the proposal is ratified in the LACNIC region.

KB asked LK the same question he had asked the others: Does the author control the process throughout or is there a point when the author stops shepherding the process?

LK replied that the proposal is written by the author and, when the proposal is under discussion, the community has some kind of control mechanism, e.g., they can say propose changes. The author is not the owner. When the proposal is on the list, the idea is for the whole community to be in charge. The proposal cannot complete the process if the community is not on board. That is the main job for the chairs, they can say this proposal is not interesting for the community and talk to the authors to take it off the list.

e) RIPE NCC

AD thanked the others for the previous presentations and proceeded to describe the RIPE global policy development process.

She noted that the same PDP applies to all policy development and shared a link to the process.

AD explained the PDP as follows: the RIPE chair develops this document in collaboration with the RIPE community. The RIPE process is also open, transparent and bottom-up. Peculiarities in the RIPE region: the community is fully in charge of the process. The RIPE NCC Executive Board has an advisory role and no formal veto rights. The RIPE NCC offers administrative support and acts as secretariat for the RIPE community. There are working groups for different subjects. Proposals are presented and discussed on the mailing list of the different working groups and at the RIPE meetings. Only posts on the WG mailing list are considered for consensus determination (by the working group chairs elected by the community, who steer the discussion but remain neutral).

She then explained the different phases and timeline: discussion phase (discussion + documentation), review phase (rough consensus), last call (consensus), each lasting at least four weeks.

As for the global PDP, AD shared that global policy proposals are usually discussed in the Address Policy WG; that anyone can present a global policy proposal, and that the text for a global policy must be identical to the one submitted in other RIRs.

She then explained the differences between the global PDP and the regional PDP in terms of creating a proposal, discussion, review, and last call, adding that a significant difference that, in the case of a global proposal, the draft has to be presented at the beginning of the discussion phase. In both cases, at the end of the discussion phase the RIPE NCC has to create an impact analysis. Also, each RIR must ratify an identical version of the proposed global policy.

KB asked whether the community takes over once a proposal is in WG.

AD replied that not really, that there will be a group supporting and a group objecting the proposal, but the author is expected to address all comments, answer questions and objections, and has full freedom to withdraw the proposal during the process.

KB observed that JC had mentioned that in ARIN a policy can be submitted without the text, while in RIPE the text must be there to start the process.

AD confirmed that this was the case for global policy proposals (regional proposals could also begin the process either with a draft or problem statement) and added that the proposer must work hard to keep the community up to date with what is happening in the other regions.

HPH shared that this is where the ASO plays an important role, as members travel to other regions and take information with them. A lot of this needs to happen in good faith and with the purpose of moving the process forward.

KB agreed that the ASO AC's role in getting something done in more than one region seems incredibly important.

He then thanked everyone for their presentations and invited everyone to take a 10-minute break before continuing with the agenda.

f) ASO AC Global Policy Development Process

KB shared a slide deck with Section 6 of the ASO AC Operating Procedures and quickly presented a first review where he highlighted either of interest or errors, in each case offering his suggestions for their improvement.

After some comments on the text highlighted by KB, it was determined that there was some cleanup to be done and the following action item was decided:

New Action Item 211020-1: KB to update Section 6 of the ASO AC Operating Procedures (Global Policy Development), introducing any necessary editorial changes and fixing possible errors and circulate his draft to the list.

6. Qualification Review Committee for 2021/2022 ICANN Board Election

KB commented that the chairs had discussed the possibility of constituting the QRC as soon as possible, given that candidate names were already coming in. He asked if there were any objections to constituting the QRC now instead of waiting until the end of the nominations period.

No objections were heard, so the following action item was decided:

New Action Item 211020-2: Each region to send to the Secretariat the name of their representative to the QRC soon so that the QRC can be formally constituted during the 3 November ASO AC meeting.

7. ASO AC Observers in ICANN Board Election Process

KB commented that having observers had worked well for transparency within the ASO AC and added that the biggest improvement would be to commit to what they'd like the observer role to be before starting the process.

He mentioned that one option was doing something similar to what they had done during the last round, i.e., observers had the chance to express their comments or concerns on a wiki but could not actively participate in the QRC and IC mailing lists, and the IC could give voice to observers during discussion phases where appropriate.

All agreed, so it was decided that the role of observers would be the same as during the last round.

KB reminded the ASO AC that being an observer is optional but expressed his desire to have as many observers as possible on both the QRC and IC lists, as the more people that can read these, the better.

LL added that at the end of each step there's a huge amount of information to compile, which is easier to do if people follow the process; and that being present during the interviews helps them to get a feel of the candidates.

8. RIR Meeting Updates

a) APNIC 52 Update

AS provided the following update:
During the meeting, the APNIC community elected Di Ma for the ASO AC position for 2022.
Seven proposals were presented during the policy session.
He will send a report to the mailing list.
The next APNIC APRICOT meeting will be held virtually in the Bangladesh time zone.

b) LACNIC 36 Update

RP said that he would also send a report to the mailing list and mentioned the following highlights:
LACNIC 36 was a hybrid meeting, with people participating via zoom and at two in-person hubs, one in Uruguay, the other in Argentina with local attendees.

It was collocated with LACNOG and the FIRST Symposium.

Six policy proposals were presented (though not directly related to address management, e.g., an AUP for the Policy mailing list, some adjustments to the PDP, something about intra-RIR IPv4 transfers, PDP chair election). People could show their approval both via zoom and at the hubs.

The next meeting will also be held in hybrid format, with physical presence in Cali, Colombia.

KB added that the ARIN meeting was starting today and that all policy work would be done next week with an in-person session on 4 November.

He asked LL to provide an update next meeting as his last task before leaving the ASO AC.

9. AOB

NN shares that she would be stepping down from the ASO this year and leaving the seat for the next generation to come forward. She added that she would try to mentor the next person and was doing some outreach to try to find a good replacement.

KB observed that they would definitely miss NN's historical knowledge in relation to the ASO AC. He thanked her for the update and for the outreach she was doing.

10. Adjourn

There being no further business to discuss, LL moved to adjourn the meeting, EL seconded the motion, and the meeting was adjourned at 14:17 UTC.