
BARCELONA – ASO Address Council Workshop
Monday, October 22, 2018 – 15:15 to 18:30 CEST
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

AFTAB SIDDIQUI:

Hello, everyone. Good afternoon. I hope we can start now. This is the ASO session. I'm Aftab Siddiqui, the current chair of the ASO AC. We have Kevin Blumberg, who is my vice chair; and Ricardo Patara as well.

This is not an official session, official meeting, for ASO AC. ASO AC has a meeting every month and we had our meeting in October, but because we are here, this is our working session. This is informal. Anybody can talk. Feel free to ask any questions.

Let me just say NomCom Review Implementation Planning Team requested us to have a session with us. This is why we are here. So, over to you now.

TOM BARRETT:

Thank you very much. My name is Tom Barrett. I'm the chair of the NomCom Review Working Party along with Cheryl Langdon-Orr and we wanted to give you an update on the NomCom Review. I understand you also have been through a review recently, perhaps a little different than ours, but it's primarily a seven-step process and we're at step five of that process. So, the first several steps have to do with the independent evaluator. They interviewed dozens and dozens of NomCom members and board members and other former members of the community. They published their draft report in June. It went out

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

for a public comment period. We received about a dozen comments. Then they finally published their final report. That was the first stage we call the assessment phase or stage.

Now we're in the feasibility stage where we look at their 27 recommendations and make some minor changes and look at the feasibility of those recommendations and come up with an initial implementation plan for each of those recommendations.

So, that's where we are today. Did that clicker work earlier?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Are you running the deck?

TOM BARRETT: I was. No worries. Here we go. A little bit of a delay.

So, our plan is to wrap up the feasibility effort hopefully by the end of the year, pending participation of some other folks. We then present our report to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the ICANN board. They do their review. They submit their recommendation to the board. And based on what's recommended to the board, we then start the implementation phase of the project where we develop a detailed implementation work plan and actually implement the 27 or so recommendations that we have.

So, this is basically describing a process I just went through. We've dropped off a copy of what we call our report card which gives a high-level view of the NomCom review. Hopefully, you all have hard copies. I

realize this isn't that readable. But, as a high-level summary, we have about 14 members of the IPT. Half of them have certainly participated and put in well over 90 hours of input on this feasibility study. As part of our work, we've taken the 27 recommendations and split them into five categories.

So, as you can in the hard copy, the first category has to do with skills and training of NomCom members. What kind of skills should they have? What kind of skills do they need to be able to do their job effectively?

The second category has to do with the recruitment effort, and typically that's dealing with an outside consultant.

Third is the assessment or evaluation effort.

Fourth is potential changes to the NomCom charter.

Finally, fifth is how the NomCom interacts with the community both prior, during, and after its process.

So, I think this is actually a great slide. We can highlight a few that might be of interest to this group. In particular, under the charter and communications areas, the NomCom has always been treated as a black box or a mystery within ICANN. It keeps its operations very confidential. But part of these recommendations have started to [inaudible] the fact that it perhaps ... It gets to the point where they reinvent the wheel every year. So, how do we start to build institutional memory into the NomCom while maintaining that confidentiality? So,

that's been a challenge for every NomCom and something this review is trying to address.

So, there are changes here. If you look under the charter category, for example, we're recommending two-year terms instead of one-year terms. There's a recommendation from the independent evaluator that all members vote. So, the ASO I believe has a non-voting member. Is that right? Does anyone know? I know the RSSAC, the SSAC, IAB are all non-voting. It is a voting member. Okay.

So, RSSAC, SSAC, and IAB are non-voting. The recommendation from the independent evaluator was that they become voting members and also be subject to term limits as well.

There are some constituencies within ICANN that think they're not represented on the NomCom. Academia in particular have said, "Look, we should have representation on the NomCom." So, the recommendation is to simply go through a rebalancing exercise and the outcome of which may be no change at all, but certainly they're hoping that they can justify a representation on the NomCom.

As part of that, we also have an empty seat on the NomCom that is normally held by the GAC. But they've never actually filled that position.

So, [inaudible] summary of the charter. There's also some other ideas in here such as having a standing committee. So, again, the problem with the NomCom is they typically have new members every year. They don't share information from one NomCom to the other. So, there's an idea of having a standing committee that will handle issues,

procedures, where they need to deal with the organization or outside consultants. Perhaps they want to recruit more candidates from Latin America or Africa. Well, we should find a consultant who would do that recruitment that's different from the ones we've been using currently out of Europe. Or they have to plan for some skills training to teach the members what is board governance and make sure they understand what their role is when they start to go through the process.

So, that's really a summary that I wanted to give to you in terms of what we're doing in terms of the NomCom review. Again, our goal is to finish up by the end of the year. We would welcome any input you might have on our process. There's a Wiki. You're free to go there and read all the draft documents that we have and suggest, give us some ideas on our initial implementation plan that we're working on, so we welcome that kind of input as well. Yes, please?

KEVIN BLUMBERG:

So, two questions. Is there anything that you foresee in the review that you're doing that impacts us as the ASO who appoints one individual to your body? Is there anything radically changing that we need to be aware of? I'm not seeing anything here. I just want to understand, from our perspective, is there anything that does affect how we appoint somebody to fill that position? I did see you've got down term limits and things like that, but is there anything else that we should be aware of as the ASO?

TIM BARRETT:

Obviously, I think for the NomCom to be successful, everyone who appoints members to it needs to be engaged with why they're sending people to the NomCom. As you know, they're not sending representatives. They're not sending someone who represents the view of this stakeholder group. So, everyone to the NomCom is acting in their personal capacity.

But, nonetheless, I think one of the recommendations here is that there should be a job description that is shared with you saying here's the type of skills they're looking for for people to serve on the NomCom. So, they want to make that a much more rigid process and make sure that's communicated to all the SOs.

I think more communication, the better. Traditionally, the NomCom has always received board advice about what the board is looking for for its candidates and GNSO and ccNSO have done the same. There's no reason why the ASO can't do the same and say, "Here's what we think is missing for governance."

I think the community needs to understand that this is probably, I think, one of the most important functions that take place because it impacts how ICANN is going to be governed in the upcoming years, so everyone should really be engaged with what their NomCom appointee is going to do, make sure they're trained sufficiently and understand their obligations and [inaudible] them as well.

I don't think there's any drastic impact. Like I said, there is a rebalancing exercise. I don't see that impacting the ASO. Two-year term limits

means whoever you're electing [will] serve for two years opinion one, but not a significant impact. Yeah?

LARS HOFFMANN:

My name is Lars Hoffmann. I'm the staff support for the Review Working Party. Just to add to what Tom said, there is no direct impact, I believe, as he said, on the ASO in terms of how you nominate. However, there's a couple of innovations and Tom will surely talk about that. For example, there's the idea of having a standing committee that would support the NomCom in terms of administer support and nothing to do with the selection. They wouldn't have access to any of the information of the candidates but make sure that the independent or the outside assessor is [inaudible], etc.

So, as I said, there's a number of these. So, what probably will help, then, is that there will be some outreach to the community to make sure that those organizations that appoint members to the NomCom have an input before those changes are implemented. So, at some point, probably you, the ASO, will receive a call to provide input on how you think this should work and how you, if at all, want to participate either in those bodies once they're set up and also in the process of how those bodies should actually look in the implementation process itself. Just wanted to add to that. Thanks.

KEVIN BLUMBERG:

And on to my second question, number 25. I'm sure you're aware that the ASO appoints two board seats, 9 and 10. If you look at number 25, it

says “Inform assessments of the NomCom by assessing the performance of the board.” This will be an assessment of all board members or only board members that were appointed by the NomCom? So, that’s part of it. If there is a way to not be duplicative in our work for those seats and have that information during our processes, if we’re doing it for all board members, that might be something that could be very useful. I don’t know how that would work. The question is, is it just for the seats that you appoint or is it for all of the board that this recommendation is going to be looked at?

TOM BARRETT:

So, it’s the latter. What I mean by that is the NomCom, as you know, only appoints half the board. As part of its role, the recommendation is basically saying there should be an assessment of the skills that currently exist on the board and identify what skills perhaps are lacking on the board. So, it doesn’t differentiate between NomCom appointees or SO appointees.

In a way, the NomCom is ICANN’s opportunity to fill the gaps that they’re not getting from the SO appointees. So, it clearly has to have a holistic viewpoint over what does a board need, and perhaps what is it going to need as we see board members become term limited? And there will be gaps that are evident in two or three years.

You need to start training people now, for example, if the audit committee is a two-year learning curve, let’s say. You should be identifying that skill set will be needed.

So, the NomCom is suggesting I think in this review that there will be an annual assessment of the skill set and expertise of the board and where it can be strengthened.

NURANI NIMPUNO:

Just speaking for myself from the ASO, I just want to say that I appreciate the improvement work that is going on. As a member of the ASO AC, as we are asked to provide candidates to serve on the NomCom, I think both having a clearer description of what the work entails and what skill set is required makes it easier for us to go out and seek suitable candidates, not just within their SO or AC, but within our broader community. I think that is key.

I also appreciate the point 16 where it talks about providing feedback regarding the contributions and participations of members for reappointment to the NomCom. At the moment, we have a sense, perhaps, but we can't ... In many ways, we operate on a trust basis, but of course it's very hard for us to know exactly what contributions have taken place. So, having that done in a more structured and tangible way I think is excellent. So, thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I just wanted to know. The evaluation has nothing to do with the ICANN integrity screening which is still under review. It is a separate ... The evaluation will be on the basis of skill set, not the screening.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. Perhaps Lars can take this one. I'm not familiar with the integrity screening effort. This is solely for ... I'm not sure what your question is. Are you talking about the evaluation process of potential candidates or are you talking about evaluation process of the board?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The evaluation of the potential candidates, because as currently, ICANN Uniform Board Member Integrity Screening Process which started last year – no, earlier this year – and the staff report is due anytime soon, in a couple of months now.

But, as [inaudible] they have multiple levels of screening for the ICANN board candidates. So, that screening has nothing to do with the evaluation or it is going to be mixed with the evaluation as well.

TOM BARRETT: So, correct. The typical NomCom cycle, there may be 100 candidates for the board. Not all of them go through the background check [inaudible] entails the integrity screening. So, they narrow their focus through the NomCom process until they get to [20 or 12]. It's that short list that they would put through that type of screening process. So, not all of them go through that.

LARS HOFFMANN: Those are two separate processes. So, the screening process is something that [inaudible] is taking place and the reviewers about the [inaudible] operation of the NomCom. So, what comes into that is

somewhat that there's some improvements to their selection process as well as to the way that the NomCom itself is constituted, essentially, and operates. So, they're separate from this exercise.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But, this evaluation will happen, will be done by third-party consultant as well, not by the NomCom itself?

TOMM BARRETT: Right. The NomCom does not get involved in background checks. That's done by ICANN Legal separate from the NomCom effort itself.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, the evaluation process you're going to do—

TOM BARRETT: So, the IE is recommending continued use of a third-party consultant. [HP] could talk to what happened last year where they decided to try something else, but it's not binding on the NomCom today.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Hans Petter Holen, previous chair of the NomCom, associate chair last year. There are two things going on at the same time and this is the NomCom review. In addition, there has been a parallel review of the screening process for board members, which by the way, the NomCom has done for at least the five years I've been on it and longer. So, there

was initiative to make that uniform across all constituencies and therefore the current practice there.

Now, the NomCom review is [inaudible] because it was done before last year's, so some of the comments in the review were already implemented last year and we also tried something else by actually doing the screening earlier in the process in order to speed up the announcement. Now, that failed miserably for a couple of reasons.

The interesting thing here with these reviews is that it takes a long time before they're implemented, and in the meantime, we tried something else which may confuse as well.

So, what happened last year was that a lot of the people that were to be screened, they hadn't been selected yet, so it was a much bigger exposure there was before the last interview.

The screening company, an external company, was not able to do it in the time that we had set aside, the six weeks. So, basically, we did it way too early with no sort of influence on the selection process.

So, I think the conclusion of last year is that this is something that we simply have to move to the end.

Then, of course, there are different opinions on whether it's good or bad to know after the selection whether somebody has cheated on their CV or committed fraud or whatever, but the chances of that happened is probably very, very low, so it still needs to be done.

So, I don't know whether that clarifies the situation a bit.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: There's a screening for many years [inaudible] this year. I know how it works inside ICANN because [inaudible] for the employees, so it took ... For example, for [inaudible] it took two or three weeks, if I remember.

LARS HOFFMANN: Last year was special because something called GDPR, so the American firm doing the searches in Europe was not able to or willing to do some of the background checks themselves, so they asked the candidates to do it themselves. So, please go to the police station and get a police certificate, which some well-known community members actually tweeted about that and thought it was a kind of waste of time.

In some countries, it takes way more than three to four weeks to do it. In some cases, they had not been successful because [universities] don't answer requests or something like that. So, I think three to four weeks, that would be the norm, but in some parts of the world, it takes much longer. Now Europe has [inaudible] parts of the world, which is interesting.

TOM BARRETT: Any other questions? Well, thank you very much. Again, if you're ... We have a Wiki which is public, so feel free to take a look at our draft documents and if you have some input, we'd love to have it. Thanks.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI:

Thank you so much for your time. Thank you for explaining all these things. Thank you from the ASO. [off mic].

Alright. So, we can start on a session. The first part of this discussion is the review of ASO AC 2018 Work Plan. So, we usually do this in November Monthly Meeting. We are here, so let's do this here.

I hope you can all open up that link. Or do I have to share it? It really looks bad on the camera. That's fine.

So, the first item was the appointment of the SO/AC chair and the vice chair. We did that on time. There's 2018, yes.

PPFT was formed as well. There was in January again, reappointment of [PPFT]. Who is the PPFT? Jorge, Fiona, Jason – sorry. Yeah, Fiona, Jason, and Rajesh. We had one request that came from the LACNIC region. So, [inaudible] has happened.

Second thing is timetable for the 2018 meetings. We decided to do first week of ... [inaudible] first Wednesday of the month unless it is coinciding with any other meeting. So, that was it. But, time was 11:00 AM UTC. So, this is discussed later on in the agenda. So, that was it. We had to cancel one meeting only. All the meetings were on time.

ASO AC work plan, that was done. [inaudible] process for the ICANN board seat 9. It was one time. We appointed Ron da Silva. Seat 10, we had some changes in seat 10 because of that ICANN review process. But anyway, the nomination phase is out. People are discussing it. It's already on the mailing list and on the [inaudible] website and [inaudible] as well.

So, I have one question on that one. When the ASO sends the announcement out from the secretariat, do we send it to all address policy mailing list and every RIR? Do you have any [inaudible] from any other RIRs? Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, this actually came up in the ARIN region because an e-mail hadn't gone out because – and the North American region is obviously excluded because there is already a seat from there, but that doesn't mean that somebody cannot nominate and I believe that has now been clarified and fixed where it's now gone out. So, that was the only region that I know of where it hadn't gone out and it's now gone out.

LOUIS LEE: If I may clarify that. This is Louis Lee, ARIN region. At the time that I gave the update at the ARIN meeting, the announcement had actually gone out in the previous month. So, I even misspoke about not going out to the ARIN region when in fact it had already gone out.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: If it hasn't been on our policy or announcement mailing list, can you just forward it to the respective mailing list? Is that possible?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, what happens is we send the announcement to the various RIR lists and then they send it out, the communication staff.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: The policy staff of those, right, or whoever they are.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think it's the communication staff, yes.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: So, I've seen it on the APNIC mailing list, so if I can find it. So, next one was the appoint members to ICANN NomCom and other groups as required. So, we had reappointed Rajesh for the NomCom. Other groups, no other request came in for this year, yet. But we have two pending but we can discuss it later on.

Global policy tracking. [Note] global policy was [inaudible] update the SO/AC operating procedure as needed. We are still in the process of updating the operating procedures.

Participate and conduct outreach efforts at the ICANN meeting. That's what we do at every ICANN meeting.

Provide regular updates to the numbering communities, review the SO/AC 2018 activities. This is what we are doing right now. [inaudible] call for an AC member to volunteer to prepare the active review of the work. That was [inaudible] year. The draft should be [inaudible] meeting for comments and discussion. In December, accept the ASO AC.

So, the reason I was just reviewing point by point was just to make sure that there is no ambiguity in any of what we plan to do this year and we haven't. We have touched base on all of them. So, the only thing that's remaining is just to review, send out to the mailing list and then we can discuss it on the mailing list.

Now, which I can say thankfully Louis has already started one thing today is the action plan for 2019. Everybody must have seen an e-mail from him yesterday highlighting that we have to review the ASO AC mailing list as part of the action plan 2019. We need to review who's on the mailing list and update it accordingly.

So, that is one additional thing apart from what we have been doing already, so my request to everyone is to send your updates or feedback if you think something else should be added.

Now, the final thing as part of this agenda item is review the transparency of the AC's work. So, this is what we decided earlier this year. It's on the work plan 2018, this is part number 14. Review work plan [inaudible] and where improvements can be made of the transparency of the ASO AC in terms of meetings. Subgroup committees, mailing lists, etc. Make adjustment as necessary.

So, this was just an open item. We put it there this year just to find out if any – sorry, Nurani, something?

NURANI NIMPUNO: Sorry. I'm just a little bit confused. Are we talking about the ... Have we moved on to already looking at the 2019 work plan that [inaudible] from Louis.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: No, it was ... Sorry. [inaudible]. I didn't get your point.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Is that what we're looking at now? Are we looking at the 2019 work plan already?

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: No.

NURANI NIMPUNO: No. Are we reviewing the 2019 work plan?

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Just reviewing the 2018. The 2019 action plan was an item. I said there's already one mailing list started by Louis. If you want to provide more further feedback on that one, it's already started by Louis. That's what I was saying only.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Okay. Is there a mailing list, did you say? No? I thought that's what I heard.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think you meant just a mail thread. A sort of mail thread.

NURANI LIMPUNO: I see, I see. Okay. Right. There was an e-mail by Louis about the 2019 work plan, but that's now what we're discussing here now.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Not at all.

NURNAI LIMPUNO: Okay, good. Then, I'm with you.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: I said mailing list, it's on our AC core mailing list.

NURANI LIMPUNO: Okay.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: So, sent by Louis on the AC core mailing list which is available there, if you want to provide more feedback. We are not discussing the 2019 action plan at all. It was just an item there, so I just [inaudible]. I hope that's clear.

The second thing we need to work on is the review of the transparency of the AC's work. Again, somebody has to pick it up. It's going to be a review. So, however you want to do it. What went well? What didn't work out well? What improvements we need to make in our action

plan? It's something I would like to know from others. Any takers on that one? Any suggestions on that one? How should we take it? How should we start working on that one? I would love to hear from all of you who is here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: When is that ... Meeting to be done for November as well?

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: November. It has to be done in November so that we can review, approve, accept in December.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Can you repeat the question, Aftab? I'm not so sure if you're asking one of the items, if it worked or not, in the 2018 plan or in the overall planning process?

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: So far, I just reviewed all the points which we already have done. So, review the ASO AC 2018 activities was number 12. So, I was just reviewing from top to bottom. The 13th point is the work plan 2019 and I said Louis already started one e-mail. We don't have to do the work plan right now. If you have more updates or wanted to provide more updates or feedback, that e-mail thread already started Louis. You can provide back. Number 14 is the review of transparency of our [board]. We haven't started that at all. It has to be done in November.

[KEVIN BLUMBERG]: The transparency report, is that new? Because I don't remember for last year.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Yes.

[KEVIN BLUMBERG]: So, that came out of our review, out of the ASO review, doing this transparency?

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: No.

[KEVIN BLUMBERG]: So, could you give just a little bit of history to that transparency?

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Yes. So, it came out of – we appoint people to different groups, subgroups, committees, within the ASO AC. So, it's just like who did what, where they were involved, they played any role, they did something. This is something we need to be clear about. That's the transparency. We put it there earlier in the year and it was not only for the appointments. It was for the whole review of our work in general, that if we did something which was unnecessary, we spent time on something which was not required, we should have done this much

better, we should have presented this in front of ICANN board. Whatever we have done in this year, just a review on that one. Not from the action plan perspective, but okay fine, it was part of the action plan, but it shouldn't be there. It's unnecessary. Having a BPDF, is required? Yes, it is required. But we have to have a say on this one, right? Things like that. Whatever we have done. We have ... Let me give you an example.

We present ... We have an open public session in the face-to-face meeting. We provide ASO update. Whatever we have done so far, is it working? How can we improve it further? That's one of the things we do in ICANN. We appointed someone to the NomCom. How can we improve it further or do we have to take feedback from them? Do we need monthly feedback from them? Do we need any feedback from them? It's just to review whatever we have done. We have appointed NomCom. That's part of our action plan, but did we do anything to review that? No.

[KEVIN BLUMBERG]:

So, just a comment to that. 30 days from November to report it in December for something that is new, a new process, a new review internally is probably an unrealistic expectation. While I would love for it to be done in December for 2018, I think allowing time ... Because we have to formulate how this is going to look, what we're going to do. Being more liberal with the amount of time given and saying that 60 days is probably more appropriate for this, for next year we should probably set it to October to keep it in the year. But, for this year at

least, I think we need to be more realistic about the time that it's going to take to do this.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay. Let's pick ... 60 days is not enough. Then we should be able to do it by next face-to-face meeting.

[KEVIN BLUMBERG]: You said it was 30 days.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: I mean, yes. No. It says in November it starts. There's no end date. We should start in November, but if we're able to do it before next face-to-face meeting, then why not? Before we accept the new work plan, we have to do it.

[KEVIN BLUMBERG]: So, yes. Having it at the February meeting which gives us enough time to have it for the face-to-face in March would be appropriate. It has to be signed, sealed, and delivered, because otherwise, how do we accept it in March if we haven't had time to accept it. That's my personal ...

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Yeah?

NURANI NIMPURO:

Thank you. I'll make a few general comments if we're talking about 14, but I'd be happy to comment on some of the other ... Okay. Then, I'll start with the other. This is not obviously for this year, but for the year ahead.

Under 11, we say provide regular updates to the numbering communities. I think we maybe a little bit prescriptive in how each of the RIR representatives need to do it. I take the example of the RIPE community. I would love to give an update at every RIPE meeting. I know that some of you do it. But we don't simply get the agenda slot for it. So, we see it as our responsibility to give regular updates to the community, including the attendance record. But we do our best, basically. So, I think maybe we can reword that in a way that works. So, that's one minor detail.

When it comes to the transparency of the ACs, it's a little bit unclear to me what I presume this is in relation to the work that came out of the review and some of the discussions we've had today about opening up mailing lists and meetings and things like that. And I think there's certainly more things we can do there and I think some of that good work is underway, but let's not lose sight of that.

As for the NomCom appointments, I do think that we could learn a little bit there and give ourselves a little bit more time. It was very rushed this time. Also, I think given the excellent work that the NomCom is doing in improving its processes and improving, making it clearer what competence you need to have to serve on it, etc., I wonder if we might be asked what work we did, what outreach work we did, to find suitable

members of the NomCom and that's something I think we should keep in mind for next year, that we can answer that question properly and that we can show a record of outreach and selection, and that we can also show that we look at the performance and see what we can do for the coming year.

My final comment. I think the review of the transparency of the AC's work I think is a little bit broad. Perhaps we can look at how we define this in the 2019 work plan and actually define it a little bit clearer, look at specific things that we want to do, so that we can actually look back and see if we managed to do it or not.

Now, reviewing the transparency, we can say that we've reviewed it because we had a quick chat about it, but let's try to be a little bit more specific about it. Also, so that we can actually improve our work and see that, okay, we didn't get to that this year, but we'll get to it next year or we manage to cover all bases. That's my comment. Thanks.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI:

I absolutely agree. One point I just want to say is the part of the transparency review is let's pick what can be improved from the existing work plan we have. You pointed out NomCom appointment. Absolutely. Let's start working with the processes we have already and review how can we update, how can we modify, or leave it as it is, if it is absolutely fine. So, just a review of the ...

So, the review so far was, well, we did our job. That's it. Move on. Next year. But, I think it's time to say, well, we did this task, but let's ask how was it. It was good, bad, perfect. So, I [inaudible].

NURANI NIMPUNO: Sounds good. I have one more comment, but I'll let other speak.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: It's you, so you have to say it.

NURANI NIMPUNO: I do think we can look at our interactions at the ICANN meetings and I think we can again give ourselves, plan a little bit more ahead. I think the, especially our public session at the ICANN meetings, they're always difficult. They've always been difficult. We've had rooms where we've basically been talking to ourselves, but I think all that is also a consequence of how much preparation work we do. So, I think if we put a little bit more effort in preparing some of the sessions, then thinking about if there are particular themes we want to have, if there are other stakeholders we want to invite to our sessions, if we want to make them more interactive by having panels or more educational. I think there's a lot we could do. I don't think we should give up on having those sessions. I think if we don't make them interesting, no one will come. But just because no one will come doesn't mean that we can't make them interesting, so let's try to make them interesting. Thanks.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: So, on that topic, I cannot disagree on that one, but the problem is we have a voting task in hand. We do policy development. That's the only task we do, right?

NURANI NIMPUNO: It's exciting, Aftab.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: It is exciting when we do it in the RIRs. You know that, how lively those discussions are. But we don't do the policy development here. We can debate about the policies. That's the only focus we have as an ASO AC. We can talk about a lot of things, but should we be talking about a lot of other things than what our mandate is?

NURANI NIMPUNO: I'm certainly not suggesting that we should have sessions on AI because AI is [inaudible].

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Block chain. I said block chain.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Block chain or whatever you want. But, I think that doesn't mean that we can't have interesting sessions. But, if we don't do the work, they're not going to be interesting and then we'll end up having the same reports every time. And I think it's our duty, actually. Otherwise, why are we here?

So, we are here to engage with the ICANN community, not outside our mandate. We're not here to talk about all sorts of other interesting things. Our work is interesting enough. We can be a little bit creative in how we organize the sessions, but it requires a little bit of work and a bit of preparation. So, that's what I'm saying. If we think a little bit ahead ...

And we have managed to have session with full rooms before when we've invited others from other stakeholder groups, for example, so it's not impossible.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI:

So, let's target 2019 face-to-face meeting we will be having a public session, right? This is well in advance. I guess we know who will be the ASO AC next year. I think 13 people already confirmed. We still don't know about two, but most of us are here and we know who will be there as well, so we can target from now.

Again, you emphasized it as well. I would like to emphasize it again. Our mandate is very limited. We have to work within the mandate, and that is policy. Herve?

HERVE CLEMENT

Yes. As you underlined, I completely [inaudible] completely know that our mandate is very limited on a specific subject. I completely agree. After that, as Nurani outlined, I think it could be interesting just to speak informally on subjects [we can] because we are coming from different communities. Perhaps we can take benefits from the fact that we are

coming from different communities, different regions, to share some different aspects.

I don't have a specific idea on specifics we can talk about, but it can be the opportunity. So, I [inaudible] to speak about, so it's something we can think, just to [inaudible]. I don't know if [there are things] you are talking about, the 2019 review we have to prepare, so there are some pending issues we are talking about for different [inaudible]. But to be more perhaps effective, it could be good to have an agenda for each subject, if possible, if it makes sense to other – some target to some agenda. I think it would be pretty helpful.

KEVIN BLUMBERG:

I would love to have more of the time at these meetings filled with content. But I also know that right now there is a review going on and there is a lot of dialogue going on within the NRO EC at ICANN as to the relationship and to add content that tries to improve our relevance but does not necessarily help with what the key agenda, the key requirements of the ASO is, is just sort of filling things up for relevance sake.

Again, if it's useful, great. But, I know that there's this review going on and there's a lot of discussions going on at the same time that I'm not privy to and I don't want to be in a situation where it looks like I'm trying to make myself seem relevant when what's needed is a very narrow scope moving forward.

So, I don't know where that's going. I guess we'll find out in 2019. But, we are having this meeting today where normally we wouldn't have had a workshop. There were enough of us here. Let's have a workshop. Great. I don't know what else we can add that is part of our mandate. I would love for some RIR updates and things like that maybe. That would be great. But, that's not our mandate as the ASO AC.

JORGE VILLA

Okay. Jorge Villa here. The main problem is that we need to show others what the numbers means for the rest of the Internet ecosystems because it's not limited to our scope here inside SO AC. If all the communities understand what the numbers mean, they say, "Ah, okay." It's interesting to know how they work, what they are doing or the whole policy process means.

Okay. [They] have a better sense for the rest of people. Maybe we need to do different things. Maybe to create a brochure or something that everyone can read something about numbers, start talking.

That's the numbers. Who are the guys behind these numbers? Maybe people trying to reach any of us and start talking and start [inaudible]. I don't know.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI:

So, on your point, Kevin, I absolutely agree there's a review going on, and as part of the recommendation 18 is that we have to consult the community and come back and see how we have to engage with ICANN. But, by the time it happens, it happens.

Right now, we have the next public session will be in ICANN 64. So, let's start working on that session. Let's see how we plan it, right? If there's a review before that and we decide to cut down our engagement or shorten our session, public session, or limit our session, then we'll do it. But not limit ourselves at this moment.

And we are only talking about doing something within our mandate. The mandate is policy and we will talk about the policy. There are interesting stuff in the policy happening.

In every region, the policy sessions are the most interesting sessions in every RIR. How come they are not interesting in ICANN? We don't debate about the policies. We just update the policies here. So, probably that's why it's not interesting.

Anyway, we can come up with a solution or an idea. It's not a solution. We can come up with the ideas. Brajesh?

BRAJESH JAIN:

Actually, in the ICANN context, ASO ACs are not the empowered community. So, as part of the empowered community, there are certain rights and responsibilities which come on ASO AC. So, the [inaudible] says that how do we sort of discharge that function, or we say that we do not engage in that. So, that is something we need to really carefully consider.

Definitely, we need to engage with ICANN community more, emphasizing the importance of numbers and IP addresses because when the communication takes place, IP address is the first thing which

security agencies come across and that calls for engagement with the address community, with the security agencies, and then GAC comes into play on that. Thank you.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay. Just to clarify, ASO is the empowered community. It's not the SO/AC.

BRAJESH JAIN: I understand that. But ASO AC is a function of ASO, [inaudible] members.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay, fine. That's clear.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Are you taking ideas?

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Alright. So, we understand amongst ourselves why the policy part of the meeting is so engaging and interesting, because we see the motivations behind it, behind the policy changes that are being driven. It's sort of a marketing problem here. It's not obvious what the reasons are to make these tweaks in policy. So, if we bring it more to what motivates them.

For instance, if you title a session say, “So, I want to buy an IP address.” That would draw a few people. But, then, you bring it back to, okay, this is why we are making these policy changes for, say, transfers. What are we doing to ease transfers? What are we doing to make transfers actually work well from one organization to another? Why do we wrap things around authenticating organizations, perhaps, to make sure that IPs don’t get pulled away from somebody that actually has a certain set of rights for those IPs?

You might not want to go dive into ownership versus other rights right then, but it gives more context as to why the work is important.

KEVIN BLUMBERG:

So, I don’t believe that I am mandated to talk about policy within my region. That is for the purposes of they are an advisory council to deal with policy in their own region.

That being said, we just had a group from the NomCom come and update us. Why can we not have individuals from the other RIRs as part of it, providing updates to us about what’s going on within the RIRs, whether it be from the staff talking about technical updates or the market or whatever it may be. But, we don’t need to be doing the presentations, but we need to be facilitating those presentations to us because it benefits us and we can have the subject matter experts doing it.

I don't want to overreach my bailiwick of responsibility, but I do think that it is absolutely valid to bring in others as part of what we do to help inform us over time. And that would help the community.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI:

So, that means you want NRO's involvement in that session as well, right? So, one thing is marketing the policies in a more catchy way, and second thing is involving the NRO itself to provide more feedback and more updates during the public session, right? Jorge?

JORGE VILLA:

Okay. Maybe we can change the name of the session. Maybe we can create a number space. Maybe it's not limited to our policies. The number space, okay, we can talk about what's happening in the numbers community as a whole. We can provide a broader scope.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI:

[inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Thanks. Let me see if I understood Kevin. Kevin, it seemed to me you were saying that as one of the ARIN people on the ASO AC, you are not empowered to tell the whole ICANN community about what's going on in ARIN, but maybe the SO/AC could have some kind of an open meeting where you instead of inviting someone to tell the ICANN community about what's going on in ARIN, instead you invite someone to tell the

ASO AC what's going on in ARIN. We just happen to do it in a big room where we invite other people. Was that the suggestion?

KEVIN BLUMBERG:

I would be uncomfortable being a definitive source of information on policy in the ARIN region. I have an understanding of it and I provide as one of the three ASO AC members some information and light to the other members of the ASO AC. But, I believe that it would be appropriate that the people who are empowered to talk about policy in the ARIN region be the ones talking about the policy here.

While I could do it, I don't feel that it is appropriate for me to do it and that's the difference.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI:

Okay. Just a follow-up on that, a follow-up question on that one. Then, I believe that's every region's issue than it is the address policy's. Chairs or co-chairs in RIPE region are probably ... The policy chairs and co-chairs in APNIC region are the absolute people who can provide the feedback.

But, we are the community. We debate about the policy from the ground. We talk about it. We are the reason sometimes policies are approved and sent back to the mailing list for the discussion.

I understand you are coming from the Address Council perspective, but I think anybody from the community can provide update and we have the mandate to provide the policy update at this meeting.

ALYSSA MOORE: Sorry, that was my question. Do the RIRs give you the mandate to provide those kinds of updates to the ICANN community? Are you empowered to do so by the NRO?

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Thank you for your question, but can you identify yourself?

ALYSSA MOORE: Sorry. Alyssa Moore, Canadian Internet Registration Authority and ARIN Advisory Council.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, I didn't mean to get us into a session of defining the agenda for the next potential public session and I think we all act in different capacities and I fully respect if Kevin doesn't feel comfortable speaking on behalf of ARIN. And I don't think we need to discuss the exact details of what should be in such a session. But I think there have been lots of good ideas here.

I think all of us do outreach. That's why we're here, right? We're community members. If I can't explain to someone how we do policy in my region, then I don't think I should be here.

But that doesn't mean that I need to be the only one who explains how that works at the next sessions. So, let's find ... We can find interactive ways of doing it. The ASO AC members might have RIR staff members.

They might have the NRO AC. We might use the fabulous communications department of some of these RIRs to put together this great educational video, whatever.

I think there have been some good ideas here. I just wanted to open the possibility of it and also make the point that if we put in a bit of work, we have all organized sessions at various meetings around the world. We know if we organize them well, they will be good. If we don't, they will be bad. So, that's all I'm saying. Let's think about it. Let's see what we can do for 2019.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI:

I absolutely agree and [inaudible] mentioned the public session when I said the transparency and we need to know what we can do better and how we can do better and what didn't work out well this year. So, it's not what we have to do better. What didn't work out well so that we can improve? So, we have to do the [interaction].

I need to come back with your answer. When community elects us, we have a very specific mandate, which doesn't involve us representing the whole policy team from our RIRs. But, as I said, we are the community. We are part of the community. I am absolutely fine presenting all the policies from the APNIC region here, but it doesn't mean that I have the explicit mandate from the community. I wasn't elected by the community to come here and talk about the policy only. I have a very specific role. It is defined under the ASO MoU and that's what I have to do. But, yes.

PAUL WILSON:

Good afternoon, everyone. Paul from APNIC. We're spinning wheels a bit, I think. But, let's just recap. The mandates are confusing because the mandate of the ASO or AC is global policies only, right?

In the past, various people have been slapped on the wrist by various other people for straying outside of that, so I don't blame anyone for being a bit hesitant. But, that's actually left in interfacing with and reporting to the ICANN community on other matters. It's been left to RIR staff which is a little bit ironic because RIR staff have come in and have been commenting on and reporting on policy matters which are outside the ASO AC scope, but which we probably would not normally do in our own region because normally, policy, we shift that out to community members as much as possible. It's one of the strange confusions here.

An example of that would be reports into the Public Safety Working Group about policy processes and policies at RIRs which have been given by RIR staff rather than by AC members, but again, it's because AC members are not empowered to do that. So, that's something that may be sorted out in the coming [inaudible] of the ASO review.

But, speaking personally, I think there's been – and I wrote something on the APNIC blog about this some time ago. I think there's been enough call from the ICANN community over the years for inputs from the numbering community on various matters for us to try and find better ways to do that. We've tried to find ways to do that in the past that haven't been terribly exciting or successful as measured by

attendance, but maybe we should survey the ICANN community or do something like that, which unfortunately we didn't do very proactively in the ASO review. Surveying the ICANN community about what would be useful would be another way of trying to work out what is a better way to perform what seems to be necessary which is to find a rich interface, a rich enough interface into the ICANN community to represent number community issues, if not the number community itself. Thanks.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: As it is coming out of NRO EC chair, I would expect that NRO is going to commission that survey.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I was speaking strictly in my personal capacity. These are not issues that have been recently discussed by the NRO EC, so these are personal remarks [inaudible] representing APNIC.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Taken as it is. Yes. Rather than going in circles, it was just for the sake of ideas. I'm glad that some ideas came out. The whole purpose is to make it [inaudible] ... Well, again, as Paul mentioned, the mandate is a very strict word, I would say, as well. It's a gray line. Let's stick to what we have been doing so far, but make it more interesting.

Provide the policy update, but in a much more marketable manner, as [Louis] suggested. And let's start discussing about it on the mailing list we have and let's see if we can come up with more good ideas.

So, any final comment on this one? Then we can move forward. No? That's good. So, I'm just stopping on the ... So, that's the action plan, 2018. I'm just talking about number 14 right now because there are a few things which we have to discuss again at the end of the session.

So, we have one more thing, the review of all the ASO ... It's going to be review of all the ASO recommendations. There were a few recommendations coming out from the ASO review and we have worked on almost all of them. I said almost all of them because we worked on two recommendations earlier in the session, earlier today, because this is not a formal meeting, so we cannot say that we have agreed on all the recommendations.

We have text to review and that will be done on the mailing list. Once we review these last three recommendations, I will be able to say that we have taken action on all the recommendations we promised this year that we will try to resolve. That includes ... Let me go from the top. That includes recommendation number 9, the ASO AC should implement term limits for the position of chair and vice chair. Recommendation 15, ASO AC meetings should be open to the public except for discussions regarding the selections of individuals for ICANN Org. Recommendation 10, the ASO AC should ensure that the duties of the ASO Council Chair and ASO Council Vice Chair needed to be added to the ASO AC operating procedures.

16 was for its internal communication and for most matters related to the operators, ASO should favor the use of publicly archived mailing list. This is what we discussed earlier this morning.

Then, recommendation 6 and 7 was related to the GPDP.

So, these were the recommendations the NRO AC suggested that the ASO AC should be working on that one and we have taken up this. It was a continuation of what we did last year and we moved forward and taken action on all the recommendations.

So, if you think something is still pending, please raise so that we can work on this one. Any points? No? Okay.

So, the next phase for that one is once we all agree as the ASO AC because all these recommendations require changes in our operating procedures, and to make any changes in the operating procedure we need approval from all the ASO, 11 yes votes from the ASO AC members to make that happen.

So, once that is done, the second phase will be a vote. So, all recommendations with their existing text going on for a vote, and then that will be sent to the NRO AC for approvals. Once that is done, then we can move forward with all the recommendations and their implementations. So, any question on that?

[KEVIN BLUMBERG]:

So, I guess we'll do another red line of the changes that we want to incorporate and then work on that until we're satisfied that it's ready to

get voted on and have one change that goes to the NRO AC. We're not going to send individual changes to the NRO AC piecemeal.

I guess my only question is if the expectation is that this is enabled and live and done for the face-to-face, when do we need to complete our work on this? Because the EC is going to need time, depending on the complexity of the changes that are made to review and come back to us. And I know that we did a lot of work earlier in the year, sort of stalled. We haven't done a lot in regards to some of this since earlier in the year. I guess I'm trying to ask when realistically does the AC need to have this wrapped up and agreed upon to be able to send to the EC?

AFTAB SIDDIQUI:

Okay. So, the thing is when we agreed on a few recommendations, the idea was to move on with that recommendation and then work on the other recommendations. So, once all the recommendations are done, I'm happy to send it again to the ASO, all the recommendations and what was the outcome of that one. Then we can review one by one and then we go for a vote. But, if we have already agreed, I believe it's not going to take a long time for the ASO AC members to review it again.

KEVIN BLUMBERG:

So, just going back to the discussion that I remember in March, we agreed on the principles. That was ... I'm not going to say the easy part, but we agreed on the principles. But the text of the procedural changes was not necessarily agreed upon. I'm thinking of the chair, vice chair documentation as an example, and that needs to be clarified.

So, yes, the recommended principles we've agreed to, yes, we support this. But, the actual nuts and bolts of what was written to go into the procedures has not been agreed to, to my recollection.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay. ASO chairs, ASO AC chairs and the vice chair, we had a very long discussion on that one. We discussed all the nitty-gritty, what statement should be there, what shouldn't be there. So, do we still have doubts on that one?

KEVIN BLUMBERG: Yeah, and it's been six months since I last saw the last revision and maybe that would be helpful. I was using that as an example, just asking about the text. Until we see the redlines and can put it to rest, I think, yes, we agree in principle, but it's the text that ultimately matters in terms of getting it moved forward.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: So, next thing I can send. So, recommendations 6,7 which Herve is going to send the update which you have already done, yes, right? Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I just say yes to you [inaudible].

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay. You said yes [inaudible]. I have already sent the recommendation 16 text which we have in front we can review. I will send all the

recommendation text, so it's the Google Doc. I'll send it. If people still think that we need to review the text, then feel free to review it. If you think it's good enough, we can go for a vote, right?

I was under the impression that we already agreed on the text. It doesn't make any difference another 7 days or 15 days period. We can debate on the text if it is not up to what we think it should be.

So, let me ask one question. If you think we agreed on a principle, then what is going to be the next step?

KEVIN BLUMBERG:

If I can see it in the red line and people can go back and forth if there's an issue, that red line is going to get fixed very quickly and then there has to be a time out. We need this done. So, does that mean that it's voted ... We take it to the October meeting and let everybody on the ASO AC because not everybody is here – this is just a workshop. Take it to the November meeting. Remind everybody that the red line is there, that it's important, that we've got a timeline on this. Allow it for 14 or 21 days to allow people to have comment back and forth and then send it to e-vote, if there's no more work that needs to be done on it.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI:

I'll send the text. I just want to highlight on this one, [whoever is here]. We started this process last year. I mean, Filiz started this process. So, we need to conclude it by this year. That's what I want. We don't want to continue it again and again and again.

So, I will send the text. Let's review it for the last time. I would emphasize review it for the last time. And if you have any ... I'll send it as early as possible by tomorrow, so that we can discuss it in the November meeting.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: October.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: November. October is gone. So, November meeting. And then we can just go for e-vote and then accept the changes. If there are some [inaudible] issue, of course, we don't have to forcefully agree on certain things. If you don't agree, then why not, go ahead.

I'll send this document. I'll share it with everyone. Take your time and just put your comments in the document so that we can move forward. Any other comments on this one? No one? Okay. All good. Can we have a coffee break or something? No coffee break. I do want to take five minutes. Can we take a 10 minute break?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: If you say five, you get ten.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Yeah. Five and come back in ten. Thank you. So, we can start in 30 seconds, 20 seconds, 10 seconds. 10, 9, 8,7, 6, 5,4,3, 2, 1. Great, so we

can start now. There was no coffee available, but anyway, we can still start.

So, last thing before we go for open discussion is the ASO AC meeting timing with respect to the different time zones and what's happening. Kevin would like to take that one.

KEVIN BLUMBERG:

So, we received a request from an ASO AC member to look at adjusting the timeline of the meetings. Based on just back of napkin numbers, we didn't believe that there was actually very much modification that could be done to support the fact that we're a global body all over the world. [Hermon] got a list of all of the different time zones that all of the different ASO AC members are in, which actually unfortunately solidified the fact that the current time for the meetings is probably the only time we could have them, maybe with a one-hour variance like we've done, 12:00 or 11:00.

The issue is that if we move Europe to outside of business hours, then Asia is right in the middle of the morning, etc. So, unfortunately from my read of it – and I would love feedback from other people – I don't believe the time of the meeting, based on us being a global body, can really be adjusted. I think it was worth doing that exercise of seeing the current ASO AC in its makeup – and I apologize to Louis for the time that the west coast of North America gets, but I believe that it's probably the only time that will work consistently.

I would recommend that we do ... As part of when the RIRs are electing and appointing, they are made aware that this is the time and really there is little flexibility and I think that is going to be an ongoing thing. I don't think there is ever going to be flexibility with this time and I think people should be aware before they put their hand up to be on the body that calls can be at very unfortunate times for some people and at great times for other people, depending on where in the world they are.

So, that was my feedback and I know this will come up as part of a finalization for next year, but I was hoping that there would be a different time slot we could look at, but I don't believe there is at this point.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Okay. Thank you, Kevin. To be honest, I have done [inaudible] regarding the response we are giving. So, regarding the time zone of everybody. So, as I can understand for Louis, you have to attend the meeting something like 3:00 in the morning or 4:00 in the morning, something like that. So, perhaps, [inaudible]. But is it possible to find a slot where for nobody it's something between midnight and 6:00?

KEVIN BLUMBERG:

So, if we shunt it anymore, then what will happen is Asia-Pacific will move into that timeslot and we'll be back to somebody else. So, for Louis to be at, as an example, at 6:00 AM, we now need to move—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] be in 1:00 AM.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: Yeah, Asia-Pacific will now be at 1:00 AM. So, that's the problem is any way you slice it, if we move ... We're right no inconveniencing mostly Louis because he's west coast. He's the worst. Then, east cost North America is 6:00 AM or 7:00 AM depending on daylight savings. But, any move will put other regions into that midnight to 6:00 AM time zone. So, right now, it's the least inconvenient for, unfortunately, just Louis. But, to move anybody would now shunt Asia-Pacific, of if we did it even six hours or eight hours, then we'd be moving Europe even farther and/or Africa even farther into late at night. So, that's ultimately the problem is any change would have a negative effect.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: First of all, about the 5:00 AM thing, I think Louis [inaudible] preferred that time because we changed it after consulting with him and it was better for him because it wouldn't get into his daytime worktime business hours.

I slightly disagree that we can't move it to anywhere else. I think we should try to see if we can share the agony and maybe rotate it a little bit to see if we can, say, the US participants a little bit from here, a little from there. I think, for us, it's easy to say because we are in the middle. Africa and most of Africa and Europe.

The other thing, I keep saying this all the time, but I'm repeating myself. I think the most important party in this arrangement more than the

regions or sharing the agony is the secretariat. Secretariat needs to be up and also with brains. So, whatever works for secretariat [inaudible] responsible to adjust ourselves towards that a bit. I think the last time that was said was also a good time for secretariat.

I'm more than happy to discuss it again if that will help someone else to adjust because we can. We had that in the past. We can again. I think it's not a really bad idea to move it a little to help the region that gets it really bad all the time. Thank you.

KEVIN BLUMBERG:

I'm happy to do a slide rule and look at all of the numbers. Secretariat is actually now, actually ... I believe [Herman] at 8:00 PM local time, 9:00 PM local time, and Suzanna you're at 3:00 AM, 4:00 AM local time because you're on the west coast. So, if we made it, as an example, three hours earlier, then [Herman] would be eating dinner with us and Suzanna would be ready to go to sleep as well.

Again, I'm happy to do it. And just for the record, Louis was not the one who brought up the issue.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

But, what time was it suggested, if I may also—

KEVIN BLUMBERG:

There has been no suggestion. The only suggestion was that one of the ASO members ask that it not be during their business day, and to make that change would require a 4-6 hour shunt. To do a 4-6 hour change

would be a significant inconvenience to a larger group of the ASO and that's why I didn't feel that ... I could not come up with a suggestion of what would be reasonable. I thought actually what we had now was probably as close to as the most reasonable that we have, between the secretariat and the majority of members of the body.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

[inaudible], ASO secretariat. Yes. The thing is more or less what Kevin said. The majority of the ASO AC members share a very small span of ours. Basically, people from Latin America, Europe, and Africa. Very similar. And that's the majority.

Then, we move to the Asia-Pacific and then we have a diversity in the time zone. We can share the pain. I'm happy to do it, but that big majority will be taking the call very early in the morning, basically, or very late at night.

I drafted a table. I will send it to the list so you can cover a quick look of what it means, every hour change for all the people. It just happens, a coincidence, that ... Well, so far, we are being depending on the good will of Louis, which is on one extreme, minus eight UTC. And Aftab who is plus eleven UTC. So, basically those two are the ones who are paying the price. Coincidentally, the secretariat is a very similar time zone. [inaudible] Suzanna is the same as Louis.

The solution is not easy. Happy to send information and continue the review. But, it will be up to I think that big majority to be willing to take the calls in a not very friendly time, [inaudible].

AFTAB SIDDIQUI:

Thank you, [Arman]. I just wanted to highlight that when we got the request, we discussed it internally. We said we cannot discuss with the ASO AC, all the members, because we just want to make sure that it's not us that's stopping this. We want to make sure that it is absolutely clear to everyone that we are trying to resolve it. We are not trying to corner a region. We are not trying to corner somebody that it is their business hours so that we cannot – we don't want to change it.

For me, 10:00 PM is as bad as 11:00 PM, as bad as midnight. If one hour or two hours is going to make things easier for somebody else, I'm happy to do it.

I don't speak for anyone, but knowing everyone here, I think everybody will do the same. If it's going to make some simple things for anybody else, if 5:00 AM is much better for you than 4:00 AM, then sure. Why not? But, it's going to be secretariat same time zone, right? So, if we have to rotate, I don't mind as well. It's just once a month. I can live with it. It's okay. Nurani and then Carlos.

NURANI NIMPUNO:

Thank you. I'm just going to say, from my experience on sitting on these types of global committees, I think all of the global committees have had these discussions and we've never managed to find anything that is perfect. We can do our best.

I'm not going to speak to this particular what works for me as opposed to what works for Louis, although I'm very grateful that you get up at

that time and I don't have to. But, from experience, having a fixed schedule works a lot better for most people, both because it means that you can speak to your employer or your family or whatever the football team you're coaching or whatever, and you know exactly what your commitment will be for the year.

The other thing, from experience with rotating schedules, it causes confusion and you simply will have less attendance because of it.

Having said that, I'm happy to share any pain in the group. I don't have a perfect proposal. I think let's try to do what is practical. In my experience, having a fixed schedule is more practical. I'm happy to try something else if people have great suggestions. I think anyone who looks at the different time zones will go, "I can't come up with a perfect solution for this." That's just the nature of things.

CARLOS REYES:

If it's helpful, as Nurani mentioned, most groups have dealt with this, and the GNSO Council in particular has had this dilemma this year. The chair is in Australia as well and the staff is Los Angeles and Europe based. I'm happy to reach out to that team to find out what windows they have found because they do rotate every other month. There's some predictability to that. It's not entirely fixed, but that has worked for that group. I'm happy to reach out to them for their experience.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI:

It's good to have feedback from other groups. It's good to have feedback from there as well. I'm also not in favor of rotation. If I have to

bear the pain once a month, I should know what time that is. That's it. So that I can put my alarm or make sure that I am having two cups of coffees right next to me before the meeting starts or I put my kid to bed before I start my discussion, otherwise he'll keep bothering me later on.

So, it's a dilemma. Everybody has to face it. That's a part of the global community. We have to live with it. We cannot run away from it. But, the request came in. We have to, as we said, we're going to respect that request as well. Just try to discuss it. If there is any solution, let's go for it. If there is no, sorry, we tried. Kevin, you want to say something.

KEVIN BLUMBERG:

Yeah. Nurani, I agree 200% with you. As it is, with daylight savings, there's one shift of time and that one hour can cause confusion for me. It has to be a fixed schedule, especially with it being as early as it is. I need it very consistent. That is probably the most important thing. When it is doesn't matter as much as it's always the same time. I absolutely second that.

BRAJESH JAIN:

Even I feel that to fix time is better. Rotating will be a difficult situation, and of course it's an adjustment of our [inaudible] which helps. That should be considered. But it should be fixed, not rotating.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI:

So, as we stand, as Kevin said, other than four ASO AC members today, all the other 11 have daylight saving. So, we are already moving

daylight savings. We are already moving our meeting one hour ahead or going back. It's moving a bit but it's moving in a wrong direction for Louis and Suzanna.

So, one thing was we move from 12:00 PM UTC to 11:00 AM UTC. the only question I have is 12:00 PM UTC was more less painful for you than the 11:00 AM UTC? Okay. So, this is one thing we can discuss. Now it's more to [Arman]. It's going to be ... Brisbane doesn't ... Queensland doesn't change the time. They don't have daylight savings. They don't have farmers in Queensland. It's going to be 10:00 PM for you.

We don't have to make any adjustment right now. It's for an idea. It's just if we can still discuss it on the mailing list come up with something else. So, [Arman], if you can just share that table and see what one hour is going to make difference and what two hours is going to make a difference. It will be much easier for the other ASO AC members to decide and why January we find out who else is on the ASO AC. As I said, we don't know about at least two members that who will be on the ASO AC moving forward in 2019. So, that will clarify as well? We know about the remaining. I'm still here. You're still here. And Louis still here. And Suzanna is here. So, we are the four people who are sharing the pain right now.

But still, [inaudible] let's see if we can come up with something. Please share that table with us. You want to say something?

KEVIM BLUMBERG: Yeah. Just one last thing. The one thing that we didn't do as part of this was change the day of the week. There's always a Saturday and whatever. That was me being funny.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: It wasn't.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: It wasn't funny? Sorry. Saturday 3:00 AM. Bars are still open in some countries.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: [inaudible] outlaws.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: I don't believe anybody has suggested changing the day of the week. I think, from a conference perspective, the day that is picked allows things to work from when people are traveling, etc. That was just not part of this discussion and I don't know if it needed to be part of this discussion. It was only the time of the day. Leave the day of the week the same.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: So, yes. Just to clarify, the question was for only the time, not for the day. So, day is fine. Hump day is already ... For us, day is almost over, starting for the remaining of the world trying to catch up with us. Anyway, that's fine.

It's just a discussion just to figure out if there is any better way to do it. There are places which I hope we don't have anyone from Fiji or New Zealand. Otherwise, it will be a tough task. Hawaii is minus one or two? What time zone they are in? Three hours behind California. It's much better for us, yeah. We are in the [inaudible] time zone, then.

Anyway, as we stand today, we just have to deal with two conflicting time zones. If we can come up with a better solution, that would be great. There is no best solution, as we have discussed. It's going to be painful for some people, so let's share the pain if we can and respect the time zone.

This brings me to one more suggestion. When we decide to have a meeting at a particular time zone, everybody else has to respect that as well. We have to be on the call. If Louis can make it at 3:00 AM and Suzanna can make it at 3:00 AM or 4:00 AM, then why can't we make it at 10:00 PM or 9:00 PM or noon or something? We have to respect each other's time zone in that manner.

But, it's just an exercise. Let's see what comes out of it.

So, that's all from my suggested agenda items. Now we have ten minutes of open mic, whatever you want to discuss. It's open for all of you. Any takers? I'll give ten seconds more. You can take it, Kevin, if you want.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: I don't [inaudible].

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: We do have a meeting. We have a presentation [at the] board in the morning. We have updates coming in from the region. [We've got] an update to the board. That's it. Then, we have a session with the NRO AC. That's all.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Do we want to preview the list of topics for the meeting with the board. No? Okay.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: For the board, I just shared the presentation.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [The draft]?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's good. No need to spend time on it here, then.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: As I said, it's just generic updates about the policies in one year, even though we provided the updated in San Juan, but let's say this is 2018, that was 2018 for us. One year, that many policies were discussed. That many still under discussion. That many were withdrawn. Here are the policies. You want to read it, here's the link for that. You can read it. If you want to ask any questions, please go ahead. That's it. This is the

update. It's not our face-to-face meeting. It's going to be next ICANN where we will be doing more catchy presentation, more marketable presentation [inaudible] this one. I'm going to put that one how [inaudible] before.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Yes. That's it. If there is no further question, that's all from the work session. If Paul wants to say something? Great. That was [inaudible]. Please, Kevin?

KEVIN BLUMBERG: I just want to say one thing. Thank you, everybody, for coming today because this is not our face-to-face in March but I think that it's great for the ASO AC members that are in attendance at ICANN to get together like this formally informally. It's good for us as a group. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. You've shown me up, Kevin. I should say the same. Thanks very much to the AC members on behalf of the NRO EC. The efforts to be here and all the work that's gone in beforehand are very much appreciated, of course. Thanks.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: And the effort will be celebrated during the dinner.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: As always.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: So, thank you very much. Then we can call this unofficial work session adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]