ASO AC Teleconference
Wednesday, 3 May 2023
12:00 PM UTC
Minutes

Attendees	Observers	Apologies
AFRINIC Saul Stein (Saul S.) **APNIC** Nicole Chan (Nicole C.) – Vice Chair Di Ma (Di M.) Gaurav Kansal (Gaurav K.) **ARIN** Kevin Blumberg (Kevin B.) Chris Quesada (Chris Q.) Nick Nugent (Nick N.) **LACNIC** Ricardo Patara (Ricardo P.) – Vice Chair Jorge Villa (Jorge V.) Esteban Lescano (Esteban L.) **RIPE NCC** Hervé Clément (Hervé C.) – Chair Sander Steffan (Sander S.) James Kennedy (James K.) **Secretariat** Germán Valdez (Germán V.) Laureana Pavón (Laureana P.) – Minutes	**AFRINIC** Madhvi Gokool (Madhvi G.) **ARIN** John Sweeting (John S.) Eddie Diego (Eddie D.) **RIPE NCC** Angella Dall'Ara (Angella D.) **ICANN Org** Ozan Sahin (Ozan S.) Steve Sheng (Steve S.)	

New and updated action items from this meeting:

Updated Action Item 230313-1: Hervé C. to check with each RIR when a policy proposal is marked as global and whether it is vetted before it comes to the ASO AC. Also, to check what are the next steps once a policy is marked as global. Hervé C. to compile all the answers in a document and share it with the ASO AC. **ONGOING**

New Action Item 230503-1: Hervé C. to reply to the NRO EC that the venue selected for the second 2023 f2f ASO AC meeting is APNIC 56 (Kyoto).

New Action Item 230503-2: All Procedures Review working groups to upload their texts to the wiki. All members of the AC to read the texts proposed for the different sections and provide comments on the wiki by 18 May.

New Action Item 230503-3: Germán V. to look for the documents related to the calculations from when the AC decided to use the Schultze counting method for ICANN Board elections and send these documents to Kevin B., who will share with the others what his concerns are re the abuse of instant run-off voting in cases where the number of voters is low.

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

Agenda

0. Welcome
1. Roll Call
2. Agenda Review
3. Review Open Actions
4. Approval Minutes
    a) 5 April 2023 Teleconference
5. ASO AC Second f2f Meeting
6. ICANN 77
7. ASO AC Procedures Review Update
8. ICANN Nom Com Election Update
9. RIR Meeting Update
    a) ARIN 51 Update
10. AOB
11. Closed Session
    a) ICANN NomCom Election
12. Adjourn
====================

0. Welcome

Hervé C. welcomed everyone to the meeting at 12:03 UTC.

1. Roll Call

Roll call was taken and quorum was established.

2. Agenda Review

After welcoming everyone to the meeting, Hervé C. went over the agenda while it was shared on screen.

No additional items were included, and the agenda was accepted as written.

3. Review Open Actions

Action Item 230405-1: Germán V. to publish the draft notes prepared by the Secretariat of the five ASO AC working sessions during ICANN76 (Cancun) as notes on the ASO AC website. **CLOSED**

GV explained that the document is now published on the list of ASO AC meetings with a clear note that they are not minutes but merely notes taken during the discussions in Cancun.

Action Item 230405-2: Hervé C. to inquire with the NRO EC about the possibility of the ASO AC holding a f2f meeting in September during the APNIC meeting in Kyoto or at an alternative venue prior to September. **CLOSED**

Action Item 230405-2 item will be discussed under agenda item 5.

Action Item 230405-3: Hervé C., James K. and Gaurav K. to work on concrete wording for the procedures on quorum and decision making before the last week of April. The ASO AC to review and discuss this text during the May ASO AC teleconference. **CLOSED**

Action Item 230405-3 Will be discussed under agenda item 7.

Action Item 230313-1: Hervé C. to check with each RIR when a policy proposal is marked as global and whether it is vetted before it comes to the ASO AC. Also, to check what are the next steps once a policy is marked as global. **ONGOING**

Hervé C. noted that he had sent the question to the policy officers of the different regions, who provided some interesting and complete answers. Generally speaking, in each region, during the PDP the authors mark a policy as global as per the rules on the definition of a global policy (policy officers, dedicated working group, etc.). There is also a second point which is to alert the region's representative on the ASO AC that there is a global policy proposal under discussion. He asked the policy officers present on the call if they had anything they would like to add.

Angela D. said that Hervé C.'s summary was correct. In the RIPE region, there is PPFT officer that informs the ASO AC that there is a global policy proposal, we then wait for confirmation that the same policy proposal has been submitted in all RIRs before accepting it as global.

John S. said that it was basically the same at ARIN. The policy must have something to do with PTI or the IANA, otherwise it goes back to the author. In John S.'s experience, any global policy that deals with PTI or the IANA usually comes from the ASO AC.

Updated Action Item 230313-1: Hervé C. to check with each RIR when a policy proposal is marked as global and whether it is vetted before it comes to the ASO AC. Also, to check what are the next steps once a policy is marked as global. Hervé C. to compile all the answers in a document and share it with the ASO AC. **ONGOING**

Action Item 230111-1: The Secretariat to make the mailing lists more visible on the ASO website and include a list of all non-open (private) mailing lists and publish the list on the ASO website for transparency. **ONGOING**

Germán V. said that they had discussed including a link in a new banner of the ASO website, that the ARIN staff has been very helpful, and that the banner is almost ready. The design is in line with the style of the ASO website and should be ready by the end of the week.

4. Approval Minutes

a) 5 April 2023 Teleconference

Esteban L. called a motion to approve the minutes of the 5 April 2023 ASO AC teleconference as circulated, Kevin B. seconded the motion, no objections or abstentions were heard, so the motion carried.

5. ASO AC Second f2f Meeting

Hervé C. explained that he had inquired with the NRO EC if it would be possible to have a second f2f ASO AC meeting to work on the procedures review and other topics, mentioning APNIC 56 in Kyoto as a possible venue and the EC replied that they would support a second f2f meeting in Japan. However, due to costs, the NRO EC asked us to evaluate whether it would be possible to hold this meeting at ICANN 77 in Washington DC (June 2023). Germán V. then organized a poll (displayed on screen) to find out AC members' availability for the two options, both in person and online.

Kevin B. noted that that some people still need to complete the poll ICANN 77. He also observed that ICANN 77 in Washington is in direct conflict with NANOG 88 and that for some AC members it might not be feasible to obtain a US visa in the 45-60 days until ICANN 77.

While the members discussed their availability to travel to Washington and Kyoto, the availability table was updated live on screen.

Hervé C. concluded that Kyoto is more feasible in terms of attendance and then proceeded to inquire about the agenda/goals for the second f2f meeting. He mentioned that the AC should discuss the procedures in June to have them ready to present to the EC, so one of the objectives for Kyoto would be to complete the update and have a final version of the procedures. He asked if there are other strong reasons to organize the meeting in Kyoto.

Being general rather than specific, Kevin B. replied that there are some documents that should be discussed holistically, all the docs that the AC is responsible for (including ICP-2). He suggested that the AC review what documents these are to see whether other documents need to be reviewed and, if so, those documents should be included in the agenda.

Esteban L. stated that the September f2f meeting would be a very good opportunity to start and perhaps finish the discussion about which skills and goals we are looking for when we select an ICANN Board member. That will be a new exercise for us, as we agreed in Cancun, it will be a good point to discuss prior to opening the board selection process.

Kevin B. and James K. agreed.

Ricardo P. also agreed with Esteban L. and added that it would be a perfect time to start working on the preparations for the following year (e.g., questions for the candidates, interview schedule, etc.).

Kevin B. pointed out that time zones are critical when talking about remote participation, so the chairs need to know well in advance who will be attending the Kyoto meeting remotely to schedule the meetings at a time that will guarantee the highest possible participation.

Hervé C. asked the following question: If we are discussing remotely and considering time differences among ASO AC members, is it necessary to have our discussions during ICANN 77?

Kevin B. replied that 12:00 UTC in Washington DC is the same time that it is now.

Saul S. re time zones, Kyoto is well ahead of almost everybody else, so it might not be that practical.

Kevin B. agreed: a meeting at 9:00 am in Kyoto might be possible, while at 1:00 pm Kyoto might not. It is important to know exactly who will be participating remotely to schedule ASO AC sessions.

Hervé C. thanked everyone for their input and noted the following action item:

New Action Item 230503-1: Hervé C. to reply to the NRO EC that the venue selected for the second 2023 f2f ASO AC meeting is APNIC 56 (Kyoto).

6. ICANN 77

Hervé C. asked whether there is anything relative to the ASO AC we would like to exchange with ICANN during ICANN 77. If so, we can perhaps plan a single session at 12:00 UTC.

No activities were proposed for ICANN 77.

Ozan S. observed that today is the last day to request a session at ICANN 77, so if the AC would like to meet in Washington, the sessions should be requested today.

Hervé C. replied that the ASO AC will not need any specific block during ICANN 77.

All agreed.

7. ASO AC Procedures Review Update

Hervé C. thanked those who have already submitted text (two documents). He observed that the AC might discuss these documents on the mailing list between now and June and then have a motion to approve this text to send it to the EC after the June meeting.

Ricardo P. said that Hervé C.'s was a good idea, but suggested establishing another checkpoint, perhaps give the AC fifteen days to read and provide comments so that we can have a clearer idea of whether the document is ok and we are close to a version that can be approved at our June meeting. Also, Ricardo P. sent the board appointment procedure to the mailing list. The idea is to have all the information in our wiki so that people can comment and provide suggestions.

Esteban L. agreed with Ricardo P., i.e., it would be better for everyone to work on the living documents or on the wiki.

Ricardo P. said his idea was to have the AC read and provide comments within 15 days. He suggested that the working groups could make sure that the documents are in the wiki and then send the URLs to the mailing list.

New Action Item 230503-2: All Procedures Review working groups to upload their texts to the wiki. All members of the AC to read the texts proposed for the different sections and provide comments on the wiki by 18 May.

Esteban L. then shared that he and his group had worked on three different sections, including how votes would be counted for elections the proposal is to eliminate the Schulze counting method and instead use instant run-off voting (IRV)]. He and James K. then explained the text and solutions they have proposed, along with their goals and the reasoning behind it (living document: https://docs.google.com/document/d/17UpX3DZSgK93JXeTUjAVq15UXWEOQFk0nfOHZk58Zvs/edit#heading=h.wvjztb2ev8uq).

All discussed various aspects of the document and agreed to continue to wordsmith the text.

Kevin B. observed that, historically, it had been decided that instant runoff voting can cause issues if there are not many voters and can easily be manipulated. Also, we cannot have a seven-day e-vote in every case, so there should be a mechanism for time sensitive scenarios where we could use something like show of hands.

Sander S. shared that he does not see how IRV could be abused if there are few voters and asked Kevin B. if he could point to a written-down example.

James K. suggested taking this issue (abuse of IRV) offline to see exactly what the concerns are. Esteban L. and Kevin B. agreed.

Kevin B. asked Germán V. if he still has the documents related to the calculations from when the AC decided to use the Schultze counting method for the elections.

New Action Item 230503-3: Germán V. to look for the documents related to the calculations from when the AC decided to use the Schultze counting method for ICANN Board elections and send these documents to Kevin B., who will share with the others what his concerns are re the abuse of instant run-off voting in cases where the number of voters is low.

James K. clarified that IRV is merely for elected positions, not for every decision of the AC.

Esteban L. agreed. He added that there are different types of decisions (e.g., setting the ASO AC meeting calendar, approval of minutes). Elections are different, and we are defining a general process for elections (ICANN Board, NomCom, or any other that might be needed).

James K. said he would add to the Google doc a basic scenario that he ran with only four voters and two candidates. IRV works better than a simple first-past-the-post count.

Hervé C. and Esteban L. then explained the reasoning behind the proposed changes to the section on meetings (the number of people required to hold a meeting and make a decision, initially half + 1 is enough, but if we do not reach that number, at a subsequent meeting the threshold might be reduced).

Saul S. brought up his concern that decisions might be made with a region not being involved at all.

Kevin B. replied that this is all about notice. If notice is given, people not showing up can disrupt the process. As long as notice is given, then representation should not be an issue. In any case, everything we do goes for vetting afterwards, whether by the RIRs or by ICANN. There is a checks and balances system in place.

Nick N. asked what the NRO EC's procedure for approval is, and Kevin B. replied that the EC decides by absolute majority.

Nick N. then asked how the AC would handle fractions (round up or round down).

Steve S. recommended being tight on the language (simple majority is not the same as 50%+1). In the ASO AC's case, half plus one would be 9 if rounded up.

Nick N. agreed that they need to tighten the language.

Esteban L. also agreed and added that it might be a good idea to have a definition within the text to avoid misinterpretations.

After some further comments, Hervé C. thanked everyone for their work and input and said they would continue the discussion via the mailing list.

8. ICANN Nom Com Election Update

Germán V. explained that the approved timeline has been followed, that the Secretariat sent reminders as per the timeline, and that the nomination period ended on 25 April. He then went over the deadlines and important dates for the election, which should end with the results being announced around 26 May.

Ozan S. said that he would like to comment on some changes at ICANN. He explained that, just as other ICANN structures, ICANN NomCom also went through an organizational review a few years ago. The review team came up with some recommendations, including a few that may be of interest to ASO AC members. Currently some groups like the RSSAC have non-voting members, but the review committee suggested that all groups should have voting delegates. The other suggestion is that these members should serve for a two-year term. Ozan S. then shared the link to the public comments procedure (https://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/proceeding/bylaws-amendments-and-documents-to-implement-the-nomcom2-review-17-04-2023) and the red line document with the proposed amendments to the Bylaws (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/proposed-bylaws-amendments-10apr23-en.pdf). He finished by saying that these changes are still under review and will then be subject to community action, approval, and rejection action.

Hervé C. thanked Ozan S. for the information.

9.- RIR Meeting Update

a) ARIN 51 Update

Kevin B. provided noted that, similar to other meetings, the ARIN meeting in April focuses on policies and updates from the board. It is a longer meeting because it is not collocated with NANOG. Seven or eight policy proposals were discussed, many of them "clean up" policies. The policies did not bring up significant concerns, it was a pretty quiet meeting on the policy side.

John S. added that ARIN 51 the report would be out by the end of the week. Kevin B. will share this report with the AC as soon as it is published.

Kevin B. then suggested that it would help to review the PowerPoint that is used for the ASO AC update, as this document has not been re-written in years. It is time to improve it to avoid sharing the same slides every meeting.

In Kevin B's opinion, it was a very successful meeting, with about 100 people in the room, which seems to be the norm post pandemic.

Regarding attendance, Chris Q. added that for these events we should count virtual attendees, of which there are increasingly more.

Kevin B. agreed, noting that there were approximately 80 virtual participants at ARIN 51.

Nick N. congratulated Kevin B. on his excellent presentation.

10. AOB

Kevin B. observed that during the ARIN conference he took the mic because he was getting annoyed with the number of emails he was receiving from ARIN. After some thought, he concluded that the ASO AC is part of the problem. We do not realize the impact that sending follow up upon follow up has. We need to be cognizant that these messages are going out to all members. In the future we might consider whether it is important to send them to everyone as well as the number of emails we send.

Hervé C. thanked the observers for their participation. After verifying that only ASO AC members and the Secretariat remained on the call, the ASO AC continued their discussion in a closed session.

12. Adjourn

There being no further business to discuss, James K. moved to adjourn the meeting, Saul S. seconded the motion, nobody opposed or abstained, so the meeting was adjourned at 13:54 UTC