EN

SAN JUAN – ASO AC Annual Meeting, Part 1
Tuesday, March 13, 2018 – 09:00 to 12:00 AST
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Good morning ASO AC Annual Meeting, Part 1. Open Session. Room 209-A, from 9 a.m. to noon.

CARLOS REYES: Hi, Jorge. This is Carlos. Can you hear me?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Testing, testing. One, two. Testing. One, two. This is a test. Testing, testing – oh yeah. Technology works, yes.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: We'll start in one minute.

All right, everyone. Let's start. Thank you so much for being here and right on time. Thank you for that. Just for clarity, this is the Address Supporting Organization Address Council Open Session. I hope you are in the right session.

I'm Aftab Siddiqui. I'll be chairing today's session. Just to start with, again, thank you, everyone. I just need to check with Herman and Carlos if we have remote participants logged in – remote ASO AC members.

CARLOS REYES: Yes, we have Jorge Villa, and I have a report that Jason Schiller will join us a bit later today.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay. We'll review that in roll call as well again as a moment ago. Let's start with the roll call.

HERMAN: From AFRINIC, Fiona Asonga?

FIONA ASONGA: Present.

HERMAN: Thank you, Fiona. [inaudible]? No [inaudible]? Brajesh Jain?

BRAJESH JAIN: Present here.

HERMAN: Thank you. [Henry Kasifi]? No? Aftab Siddiqui?

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Yes, I'm here.

HERMAN: Thank you. From the ARIN region, Louis Lee.

LOUIS LEE: Present.

HERMAN: Thank you, Louis. Jason Schiller is joining later.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

HERMAN: [Glavin Blumber]?

[GLAVIN BLUMBER]:   Present.

HERMAN: Thank you, [Glavin]. From the LACNIC region, Ricardo Patara?

RICARDO PATARA: Present.

HERMAN:	Thank you. Harmut Glaser?
HARMUT GLASER:	I am present.
HERMAN:	Thank you. Jorge Villa, who's here remotely.
	Okay. We are working with the audio from Jorge. He's confirming in the chat that he's following the meeting.
	From the RIPE region, Filiz Yilmas?
FILIZ YILMAS:	Present.
HERMAN:	Thank you, Filiz. Nurani Nimpuno?
NURANI NIMPUNO:	Present.
HERMAN:	Thank you. Herve Clement?

HERVE CLEMENT:	Yes. Present.

HERMAN:	Thank you. For the start of the meeting, we have eleven ASO AC members present. All the regions are represented, so we have quorum.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI:	Okay. Thank you, Herman. Let's start with the agenda review. It's already – oh, this one.

KEVIN BLUMBERG:	[inaudible]

AFTAB SIDDIQUI:	No it's – oh yeah. Thank you, Kevin. Just to give one highlight of this session, this is the very first time we are having an open public session. I would like to clarify a few things for the observers. We have observers in the room.
	As I said, this is an open session. Anyone is welcome to join, but we would request that you fill up the attendance sheet so that we know who is our audience is. Herman will pass on the paper. Just give the information, as much as you'd like.

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

As part of this open session, you are here to observe. Unfortunately, we don't be able to give you any open mic sessions. If you have any question, you can ask us later on, during the tea break or the lunch break.

After that, Herman, can you start with the ICANN and RIR observers?

HERMAN: Observers from AFRINIC staff?

ALAN BARRETT: Alan Barrett.

HERMAN: Alan Barrett. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

HERMAN: [inaudible]. Thank you. Any other observers from AFRINIC? Then from APNIC. Observers, staff from APNIC?

PAUL WILSON: Paul.

HERMAN: Paul Wilson.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

HERMAN: Staff only. Sorry.

CRAIG NG: Craig.

HERMAN: Craig. Thank you. Observers from ARIN?

MICHAEL ABEJUELA: Michael Abejuela.

HERMAN: Michael Abejuela, Cathy Handley, [inaudible], and [Leslie Novio]. Thank you.

                         Observers from LACNIC? Oscar Robles. Observers from RIPE?

[AXEL PAVLICH]:   [Axel Pavlich].

HERMAN: [Axel Pavlich]. Thank you. Richard Leaning, [Mark McFallon]. Staff. Okay. And our beloved board member.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

HERMAN: From ICANN staff?

CARLOS REYES: Carlos Reyes.

HERMAN: Thank you. ICANN Board members?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] present and Ron da Silva will be present from time to time. We have some conflict schedule with the board activity, but we'll try as much as we could to be with you. Thank you.

HERMAN: Thank you. [inaudible]. That completes the record of [servers].

And John Curran from ARIN is reporting through remote participation. And [inaudible] [Hopkins] as well. Thank you.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Thank you, Herman. As I explained about the observer participation, now we'll move back to the next item, which is agenda review.

Can you increase the font size of this? Oh. If somebody wants to add something to Any Other Business, the agenda review was also published on the website as well. So you must have seen it. If anybody wants to add anything in the Any Other Business, just let me know.

All right. Any questions on that one?

FILIZ YILMAZ: Are you going to walk through the agenda now? Or is the question: do we have any comments over the whole agenda? Or is the question about having Any Other Business?

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: An agenda review was posted on the website. If people have reviewed it, that's good. If they haven't, I can go ahead and review every item. If they want to add Any Other Business to the agenda item, I'm happy to take it as well.

ICANN COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

FILIZ YILMAZ: I do have a comment.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Sure.

FILIZ YILMAZ: Okay. Maybe this is the time then. I'm wondering why we have the ASO review. The parts or the topics put in the closed part of the agenda. What's the rationale for that?

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Can you repeat your question again?

FILIZ YILMAZ: Can you scroll down? This is why I wanted you to go through the review of the agenda because –

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Actually, I cannot.

FILIZ YILMAZ: Okay. Whoever can then. I saw the e-mail from you, Aftab, if I'm not mistaken, that the ASO review would be discussed in the closed session later today in the afternoon. Maybe that has

changed, but I'm not [inaudible]. This is the reason I'm raising this comment right now.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: That e-mail suggests that this is the text that we will discuss on the Recommendations 9, 10, 15, and 16, which will become part of our operating procedure.

FILIZ YILMAZ: All right. My question is: what's the rationale of discussing that in the closed session?

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: We will discuss all the recommendation items in the open session. All of them.

FILIZ YILMAZ: Right.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: But the text will be discussed in the closed session because it's just to make sure that we have already agreed on most of the text in the past, before we decided to open the session.

One of the recommendations is a suggestion to open the meeting. We have already followed it. It's just a clean-up of the text, which we are discussing in the closed session. Nothing else.

Again, that will be minuted and it'll be available for public consumption. So it's not like we're hiding something if that is the case.

FILIZ YILMAZ: I just don't understand the rationale behind discussing the text in the closed session.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: If you want to discuss it in the open session, let's put it on the AoB list: [review why] we are discussing it. Right?

KEVIN BLUMBERG: We've got until noon today, Filiz, for the open session. That's just the ICANN way it was done. I'm happy to go as long as needed, but that's why in some cases we put things there. It was looking at policy text, as Aftab said, and it got moved there. We moved stuff back from the closed session as much as possible. Right now, we're at overtime on this meeting.

Just in terms of the numbers, for the open part, again, just based on what was in the agenda of it, I'm happy to go through and

spend time on the text. It was just how to split things up. That's all.

FILIZ YILMAZ: May I respond to that? My understanding of having open and closed sessions based on the recommendations coming from the ASO review is to increase transparency and openness, not for agenda management. If time management doesn't mean whatever that can't be due to time reasons that can't be discussed in the open session, should we push the closed?

I think, if anything we can discuss in front of the open part with the audience, with the observers, we should discuss it in the open session and only limit the time for the closed session if there's an actual need.

So my suggestion is to push whatever you need to push from the closed to the open and leave shortened the closed part due to time management. If we need still a closed session part, we will do it still, but it will be, instead of three hours, one hour maybe.

Does this make sense? I'm sorry, but I just don't understand why we would not discuss anything we can discuss in the open part.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: Filiz, we haven't agreed. We've agreed to implement it, but we haven't actually agreed as a body on how we will implement it. So I guess it's a chicken and an egg. Are we all going to, in this room, agree that we're 100% open 100% of the time for everything. Agree to that in a vote and then move on? Or are we going to work towards implementing text on the aspects of what is open, what is not, and how it's done in the closed session? We have not yet implemented. We are in the process of implementing.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: May I add to that? Why are we having an open session right now?

FILIZ YILMAZ: Yes, why are we having an open session. We agreed to have an open and a closed session. Why may we not have put it in our operational procedures? We agreed with the recommendation in principle, and we're already doing it here.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: The agreement in principle means that we have made that principle part of our operating procedure. We haven't, have we? Please correct me if I'm wrong.

FILIZ YILMAZ:	Then why do we have a closed session and an open session today?
AFTAB SIDDIQUI:	It's an attempt to make sure that, yes, we are going in the right direction, and, yes, we want to implement it. Let's try. Let's see how it goes. We have nothing to hide. We are doing it in the open session. We are already reviewing all the recommendations. Not a single one is missing. You have seen the document as well. We are reviewing all the recommendations. Just the text of the recommendation of 9, 10, 15, and 16 were moved to the closed one, just because of the time. All the recommendations are part of the open session. Again, the closed session is minuted and will be shared with the public.

Again, as I said, there is nothing to hide. The only problem was time. We have done this before. Operating procedures take a lot of time. Adding anything or subtracting anything takes a lot of time.

Again, I'm saying that, if we have time, I'll be happy to put it on AoB, and we'll discuss it. I have no problem with that. If still you want to add something, please go ahead.

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

FILIZ YILMAZ: For the record, I do. I think anything that can be discussed in the open session should be discussed in the open session. Thank you.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: And that's what I have said. All right. Any other comment on the agenda? All right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Yeah. Again, as I said a moment ago, this is a first attempt for an open session, and we have observers. A lot of people are new here. I would like to start with the introduction of all the ASO AC members here so that people in the room and people online are aware of who we are and to which RIR we belong.

I'll start with myself. I've explained it in the beginning as well. I'm Aftab Siddiqui. I am the ASO AC member from the APNIC region. This year, I'm the Chair of the ASO AC. I would like to start from the Vice-Chairs. Kevin?

KEVIN BLUMBERG: Hello. I'm Kevin Blumberg. I'm the appointed position from the ARIN region. I've been on the ASO now a year-and-a-half or so,

replacing John Sweeting at the time, who was replacing Ron da Silva. I owned a little company in Toronto, Canada, called The Wire. We're an Internet service provider. I'm on the board of the Toronto Internet Exchange, and I've been involved in the overall community for nine or ten years now and look forward to working with all of you.

RICARDO PATARA: Hi. Ricardo Patara here. I'm an elected member from the LACNIC region. I work for our organization in Brazil called NIC.br. We are the ccTLD registry there but also the NIR (National Internet Registry). I'm also part of the LACNOG Board. LACNOG is an operator group in the region. I'm, with Kevin, the Vice-Chair for 2018.

HARMUT GLASER: I am the appointed Address Council member for LACNIC. Each board appoints one member. I am the appointed member. I am looking around. Probably I'm the oldest in age and the longest Address Council member in time. So it's time to go to the beach and enjoy a vacation. Nice to meet you.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Thank you, Harmut. Louis and then we'll do the [round over there].

LOUIS LEE: It appears that we're doing this by seniority now because I'm the second-longest serving AC member. My name is Louis Lee. I come from the ARIN region. I am currently the Peering Coordinator and IP Address Manager for Google Fiber, a little startup ISP in the U.S. Before that, I was at Equinix, a data center provider and Internet exchange operator, and prior to that, an ISP called Netcom.

[ALVIE CLEMONE]:   [Alvie Clemone]. I am part of the new kids on the block regarding the ASO AC. I was appointed at the end of the last year by the executive board of RIPE NCC. I am part of Orange and am responsible for the group and the management of IP resources for Orange [Grobani] for all the affiliates of the group is Europe and Africa.

I've have participated in all the RIPE meetings since 2010 and try to participate regularly in AFRINIC meetings. So I'm pretty aware of policy developments and other things like that around IP management.

FILIZ YILMAZ: Filiz Yilmaz, representative to the council. I've been involved since 2001, starting as a staff member at RIPE NCC. I'm now in

my second term in the council. This is my fifth year. Before that, I was involved with the Secretariat. I work for ICANN, RIPE NCC, Akamai Technologies, and before that, back in Turkey, with the organization that brought the Internet to the country. Thank you.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Hello, everyone. I'm Nurani Nimpuno. I'm a RIPE region representative to the ASO. I might not be as old as some, but I do like the beach just as much as you. I have been involved with the RIPE community for a very long time. I work for Asteroid International. We build Internet exchange points wherever there's a need. Before that, I worked with Netnod, who ran exchange points, and one of the DS route name servers. I've been involved with ICANN in various formats over many years. Good to see everyone. Thanks.

BRAJESH JAIN: Brajesh Jain, community-elected, APNIC, representative for the SO/AC. This is my first time in the ASO AC. As a day job, I'm the operating Internet service provider in India and also Vice-President of the ISP Association of India.

I would like to compete with Harmut, at least on the age part. Thank you. We need to exchange some notes.

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

FIONA ASONGA: Hello, everyone. My name is Fiona Asonga. I'm the AFRINIC Board appointee to the ASO. This is my eighth year on the ASO. My full-time job is Chief Executive Officer of the Telecommunications Service Providers Association of Kenya that runs the Kenya Internet exchange point and a lot of other things that they do for the community, both within ICANN and in other forums. Welcome. Let's have a conversation.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: All right. Thank you. Herman, do we have audio from Jorge?

So let's test it.

CARLOS REYES: Hi, Jorge. This is Carlos. Are you able to introduce yourself?

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: We need to make some adjustments so Jorge can be heard in the room.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Please do so because that is a requirement.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: To complete my introduction, my day job is that I work for the Internet Society as a Technical Engagement Manager for the Asia-Pacific region. So that's me.

Thank you, everyone for the introduction. Again, that was something new. We wanted to do it just to make sure that everybody is aware of who we are and can put names to faces and associations of our daily jobs. That's good enough.

Moving forward to the next agenda item, that is the approval of minutes for February 2018. If you have reviewed those minutes, which I think you all have, if you have any questions on that, please ask before we ask for the accepting of those minutes.

Any questions? No questions –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I move that we accept.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay. We have a motion to accept the meeting minutes of February.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I second it.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: We have a second. Do we have any objections?

Anyone abstaining? You are not allowed to abstain or object, Harmut.

Okay. So no abstentions? No objections?

All good. Motion accepted. Thank you. Herman, you can mark those minutes as accepted.

Now the update on the open action items. Yes, thank you. Action Item #18020701: Herman to reschedule the March teleconference on the shared ASO calendar.

HERMAN: That's been completed.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: That's why we are here. Okay. Thank you. Action #18020702: Aftab Siddiqui to provide a template for the regional ASO updates to ensure consistency in the format. That has already been done. I have an update from four regions. One is missing. So you can mark that as complete as well.

Action Item #18020703: Aftab, Fiona, Nurani, Kevin, and Ricardo to provide updates from their region for the ASO update during the ASO public session at ICANN61. It's related to the previous action item. The template was sent. I already have an update

from the APNIC region, AFRINIC, LACNIC, and ARIN. I'm expecting an update from RIPE later today. So that is done as well. You can mark that as complete.

A new action item was #18020704: Aftab to consolidate past discussion on Recommendation 16 and improve transparency into a document to facilitate decision-making. That is done also and has been sent to the mailing list for ASO AC members to review. I think it's okay to mark that complete as well. If somebody has any objection on that, I'll take that.

Everyone got the mail? It was on the ASO AC core mailing list, right?

Perfect. So we can close that as well.

Action Item #18011002: Herman to follow with the NRO EC regarding the subgroup on the ICANN Empowered Community's request for legal advice.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Action is in progress. I have awarded the request from the ASO AC to the EC. Open for discussion in later days.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay. In the next meeting, probably.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Mm-hmm.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay. So this will remain open.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. The EC will have a meeting here [and] a face-to-face meeting as well in ICANN. So I'll ask to add this topic as part of the agenda.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay. Thank you. All right. Action Item #17110803: Aftab will draft responses to Recommendation #9. The ASO AC should implement term limits for the positions of Chair and Vice-Chair. Recommendation #10: The ASO AC should ensure that the duties of the Address Council Chair and the Address Council Vice-Chairs need to be added to the ASO AC operating procedures and sent to the ASO AC mailing list. That's already been done. The e-mail was sent earlier this morning and includes Recommendation #9, 10, 15, and 16. The text of these recommendation will be discussed in the second session. That is the closed one. That was the whole discussion this morning.

Any questions or comments on the open action items?

No? We can move forward. The next part of the agenda is the ICANN activities. I just need to highlight that as part of the ASO AC. Of course, the important task we have is supporting the global policy development process and electing members on different ICANN bodies. One of the most important bodies is the ICANN Board. We have appointed other ASO AC members on different ICANN bodies. In this session, we will get the update from them on what is happening in their respective bodies.

The ICANN Board election, just to give you a highlight – if you can increase, Herman, the font size. This time we have to elect am ICANN Board member for Seat #9. The process is already underway. These are just the timelines. The nomination phase started last year, from the 2nd of October to the 17th of December. The nominees' names and bios were published on the ASO AC website. The comment phase started from the 18th of December until the 18th of March. It's still under the comment phase.

The interview phase started from the 17th of January to the 18th of March. The selection phase is from the 19th of March to the 18th or March. We'll hand over the name to ICANN by the end of the selection phase. Then it's up to ICANN for their due diligence and then the announcement. So these are our timelines. We are following up with the timelines. We are on track. If you haven't seen the nominees, please go have a look. If you know the nominees, please provide your feedback on the ASO website.

So that was a quick update for the ICANN Board election. The next is – sorry. Yes?

BRAJESH JAIN: One of the questions that is just coming up in the discussions is that we have to give six months' time for the director elected to ICANN. It appears to be the 18th of April, but as somebody mentioned, the due diligence part also has to be before that. I just wanted to understand and a clarification. Maybe [I can get a sense] from somebody else on this timeframe.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: The thing is, the moment we inform ICANN with "Here's the candidate," then it's up to ICANN. If their due diligence takes one month, two months, or three months, we are not responsible for that. They have their own internal process. We cannot change that. We perform our duty and hand over the candidate's name, and then it's up to them. If we try to cater to the due diligence period, what I can recall is that it's from a few weeks to a few months. So it's really impossible to follow the deadline if we take the due diligence within the deadline. So that's my understanding. I would like to understand if we are wrong or right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you very much, Aftab. Yes, the selection phase is over. Who is selected is to be passed to ICANN's general counsel. The general counsel kicked off the due diligence check. That's basically vetting of, for example, criminal records and what's demonstrated in the bio and some statement to be quite truthful or something like that. In my case, I remember that it took three weeks or something. But that is needed in the ICANN organization's side, to execute that due diligence check.

These days, the ICANN organization is very keen to assure the board members' qualification. These days, one of the recent happenings is that some directors from the ccNSO actually had not been vetted. That was pointed out from the community. Then they actually ran thoroughly throughout the due process, the due diligence check afterwards. Right now, every board member is vetted to clarify the sincerity and the truthful demonstration of their statements or something. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Another important point to mention is that ICANN likes to have the new board members participating on the retreat before the next ICANN meeting in October. So they push the diligency to be ready so they can invite the new members to be part of the retreat. So that is not a problem that they don't fulfill the

timeline. They do it in two, three, or four weeks. All the time I've been part of the process, they've done it very fast.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

RICARDO PATARA: Aftab, before Kevin, there is a comment from Jason in the Adobe Connect, stating that all the candidates had signed a document allowing ICANN to do the due diligence beforehand if they have any questions. It's a comment from Jason. Then Kevin.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: A clarification. These dates were signed off by the ASO AC last year based on input from the Secretariat and the ASO AC confirming the dates. My understanding is that one of the other important dates that's not mentioned here is that our next meeting is on April the 8th, I believe – Herman, is that correct? – so that, if the ASO AC does not make its selection by April the 8th, as an example, which is during the selection phase, it would then need to have an emergency session to stay on date, on track.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] discussion [inaudible]

KEVIN BLUMBERG: Well, discussion. Exactly. But we need to be able to go through this. Also, my understanding – please clarify if anything is wrong – is that we are on track right now with all of the dates that are before us.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Yes. Thank you for that, Kevin. Yes, we are on track. We do have a closed session only for ASO AC members to deliberate on the point which Kevin highlighted. We'll get one chance to have a discussion before we go for the election. So we have to have all the details beforehand. We will review these details in the closed session because it's a sensitive matter. So we will review it, but just to give you an answer, yes, we are on track. But we have to be very strict with the guidelines and the deadlines so that we don't go off track. As Rajesh mentioned, we have to provide the name right on the deadline, which is the 18th of April. So we have to be very strict with that. Thank you, everyone, for highlighting this point.

Now, if we don't have any questions on that board election, we can move forward.

Okay. The update from – just to give you the highlight, the appointed Jorge Villa and Fiona Asonga on the CCWG

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

Accountability Work Stream 2. I would like to hear from Fiona on what the status is of that.

FIONA ASONGA: Thank you very much, Aftab. Now, in regards to the CCWG Work Stream 2, we are coming close to the end of this very long assignment. By the end of last year, we had finalized our reports of three of the groups. That was the SO and AC Accountability, Human Rights, Transparency, and Guidelines of Good Faith Conduct for Removing Board Members. We have been able to, during this ICANN meeting, finalize on the final reading of the remaining groups, which are on Staff Accountability, Diversity, the Ombudsman's Office, and Jurisdiction.

So where we are right now is analyzing all those recommendations from the different subgroups of the CCWG to see the areas of conflicts and interdependencies and to be able to have consolidated recommendations from the CCWG that are now going to go out for public comments sometime after this meeting.

We first we'll produce a draft report of those recommendations and then discuss it internally within the CCWG. Once we are comfortable with the revised recommendations, we shall circulate.

It's very important that the ASO, as one of the chartering organizations, now looks into those final recommendations because, out of those final recommendations, from where I'm sitting, we are observing that there's going to be additional responsibilities put on the chartering organizations in how they engage at ICANN, which means that we are going to have to relook again at our internal operating procedures and again make another review of those. We're going to look at our overall duties as the ASO and see how we fit as the Empowered Community and chartering organization within the ICANN structure. So we are going to have to relook at that one.

All the recommendations have been tidied up and are finally ready. It's basically important that we bear that in the back of our minds and look out for that. We will definitely be expected to give our input as a chartering organization to the consolidated recommendations.

Thank you. Unless there are any specific questions, then maybe I can answer. Michael Abejuela, who's with me as the ASO representative on the CCWG Work Stream 2, is also here. We can answer your questions.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Just one clarification. To help this process, I have asked Ricardo to manage the queue so I don't miss anyone. I'll ask Ricardo who have raised anything in the queue, please.

RICARDO PATARA: Brajesh and then Kevin.

BRAJESH JAIN: Thanks, Ricardo. Fiona, do we have any timeline or time limits for this? Thank you.

FIONA ASONGA: Yes, we do have a timeframe, a time limit, for all this. We expect that, after ICANN61, we shall have our final draft report ready by the 29th of March. Then we shall put it out for public comments on the 12th of April. We expect to conclude on the public comments on the 24th of May. So between the 12th of April and the 24th of May is when we need to put in our input as a chartering organization to the consolidated recommendations. We'll get the final CCWG report ready by the 24th of June this year. That should be the end of this assignment.

BRAJESH JAIN: Thank you.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: Fiona, that was most of the question I was going to ask, so thank you. That was wonderful. Is it possible to add this, then, as an action item; to track it for later in the year so that we can hopefully close this off and have a big thank you for the time spent?

FIONA ASONGA: Yes. I think we should with Aftab's permission, the Chair's permission. We should be able to track it. Around the time of our April meeting, we should be able to circulate the final document or the link to the final document that will be ready for input.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Yeah. Thank you. Then I could even just add for the next meeting that we have an update from the CCWG Work Stream 2. So we can then follow up.

Just one question from my side: do they expect the ASO to provide the feedback? Or any individual as well? As you said, as a chartering organization, we have to provide the feedback. So they are expecting the ASO to, or any individual?

FIONA ASONGA: Individual feedback would be welcomed, but the feedback that carries the most weight is that that comes from the chartering

organizations that set up the CCWG in the first place. So it's very important that the ASO, as one of the chartering organizations, gives feedback. [inaudible] will be half a paragraph or something like that. It's very important. It's better than keeping quiet because, when there's no response, it's not known where the particular chartering organization stands on a particular issue.

Thank you.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay. On that note, Paul, I would like to have your comment on that; that they are expecting the ASO to provide comment. Is it something we'd like to consider moving forward within the EC?

PAUL WILSON: I can only rise it with the EC.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Yeah. I would like to ask Herman to just add this for the EC so that we have clarity on this one.

Yeah. Thank you. Thank you, Fiona. You and Jorge have done a wonderful job on that. Both of you have made sure that we are getting the updates on a time-to-time basis.

Since we are quite close to the result, just keep a good eye on that. Keep following up. Hopefully by next month we have some

clarification on the update as well [on] who's going to provide the feedback. We will share it with you as well.

So thank you so much for that. Any other questions on this, the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2? If not, then we can move forward.

All good? Yeah. Okay. The next is that we appointed Brajesh Jain to the NomCom from the ASO AC. Would you like to provide the update?

BRAJESH JAIN: Thanks, Aftab. I have a short presentation. Susanna, if you can help Herman.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BRAJESH JAIN: This is the outreach phase for the NomCom. This session being open definitely helps in that because outreach goes to more people. Everybody knows about the Nominating Committee, but just for the record, the Nominating Committee is an independent committee tasked with selecting eight members [of] the Board of Directors, the key positions within ALAC, the

ccNSO Council, the GNSO Council, and two Board members of the PTI. That's not mentioned here.

The NomCom is designed to function independently from the board. The supporting organizations and advisory committees – for example, while I [inaudible] the SO/AC to nominate me, my functioning within NomCom has to be independent of ASO AC functioning.

On behalf of the interest of the global Internet community and within the scope of ICANN's mission and the responsibility we assign to it [by] the ICANN bylaws – next please. This is the structure of the Nominating Committee. As you can see on the left, there is an ASO member. That's me. There is country code names. There are 70 presenters from GNSO from various constituencies; one from IAB, ALAC members. There is no member as yet from the Government Advisory Committee so far. They are deciding not to appoint anybody for whatever reason best known to them. RSSAC and SSAC members are the non-voting members to the NomCom.

There is the Chair, Chair-Elect, and the Associate Chair. The functioning says that last year's NomCom Chair becomes Associate Chair, which becomes an advisory capacity. Then there is the Chair-Elect, which is expected to become next year's

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

Chair. These three Chairs provide a three-year continuity, but they don't have any voting in the structure.

Next, please. If any of us has any question which I can answer, please interrupt me. The Nominating Committee selects eight of 15 voting members. We just [tie their thumbs]. This year, there are three positions. At-Large members – the NomCom selects five of ALAC, three of 21 GNSO, three out of 17 and two out of five PTI Board members. As it happens, this year there is no PTI Board selection to be done.

Next, please. This summarizes the positions which are open. Three [serve] three-year terms. There is no reasonable limit this time. As we all know that, in ICANN, there is a requirement that at least one board member has [inaudible] reason. Then there is an upper cap of five per region of ICANN.

The GNSO Council, one seat. ALAC this year is open to only Europe and North America. ccNSO Council – there are two seats, two-year and three-year. Normally, it is one seat, but last year's NomCom seat, which was given to the ccNSO? For some reason the ccNSO rejected that nomination in [inaudible] discussions. The person was appointed then opted out of the discussion. Hence, the seat became vacant. So that is why you that that seat is a two-year term. This year it's a three-year term.

Next, please. If we are curious, that was [inaudible] NomCom line, we are right now into the outreach phase, which means that, up to the 19th of March, 2018, we can give an expression of interest. On the basis of [UIE], then the NomCom provides the application to be filled in for which the last date is the 26th of March, 2018. Of course, the 23:59 UTC remains.

Then it goes to Phase 3, which is the assessment phase, which is expected to conclude into the [Panama City] NomCom selection meeting. Selectees will be announced somewhere in July.

As you'll recollect, while other SO's have been given six months' time, with a view that, with the NomCom selection appointments, reasonable diversity of ICANN requirement is taken care of.

For example, when other SO's fill their seats and they find that there is nobody from any region, it's NomCom's job to make sure that at least one of the three comes from the region. In case there are already five from any region, the NomCom will make that a sixth person doesn't come to that seat.

Next, please. Thank you very much.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Thank you, Brajesh. Just a quick question. They also have the six-month notification period?

BRAJESH JAIN: The NomCom does not have this. The NomCom is expected to comply with the bylaws and fill in the gaps if there are any. As I explained, Suppose after all SO's elect nomination selections, if it is found that, from any region, there is no Board of Directors, the NomCom has to make sure that one will come from that board. Similarly, if the NomCom also appoints any SO/AC [inaudible] and there becomes six from a region, then that becomes an issue. So the NomCom has been given a special dispensation that, [for] all of the SO's, they appoint the nominees.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay. So it's just because the NomCom has to find the missing pieces from other regions. That's why they don't have this limitation. It's just for all the other SOs who have to appoint Board members.

BRAJESH JAIN: I suppose so.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: This has now come up twice. Can we ask ICANN to just show us the snippets that are required for us related to this timeline? I'd

love to, at some point, just see it. I know it's a very big document, but it has been brought up. I'd like to actually see it at some point. Is that an item that we can ask to have done for the next meeting or before the next meeting?

BRAJESH JAIN: I did not get it.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: This wasn't for you, Brajesh – more, I guess, for Carlos. If we could just have a snippet in regards to the six-month time commitment that we just brought up. I realize you've brought it up. I assume that the NomCom themselves are responsible for taking care of that. So I don't need to worry about that from my side. But I would like to see that from our side.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just a question of clarification. So we're getting the timeline. I'm sure, you, the NomCom, is a responsible observer; for instance, diversity constraints or other constraints regarding the composition of the global Board of ICANN. So you have a perfect look at what the ASO and other organizations have selected in terms of members. Are there any issues of the timeline regarding that? Are you sure to have all the information to select directors regarding all the constraints?

BRAJESH JAIN: As I explained, by the time we make a selection, after Panama, at which time all the SOs should have appointed their nominees. So at that point in time, only the NomCom appointees [inaudible] they are there left in balance.

[inaudible] maybe can pour more light on this.

HERMAN: Aftab, we have Jason online. I don't know if he's able to talk.

JASON SCHILLER: Let me see if you can hear me. Kevin, if I can try to reinstate what you asked, I think what you're saying is: can someone, perhaps Carlos or Herman, put up our ASO AC timeline for director appointment and pull out any significant dates or deadlines from the ICANN process and marry those two up and see where there's any dependencies, conflicts, or concerns where our timeline might slip and not meet an ICANN timeline? Is that essentially what you were asking, Kevin?

KEVIN BLUMBERG: Yeah. That's actually much better. Thank you.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI:	Thank you, Jason. Thank for the clarification. It's over to you, Carlos. Can you get that? At least if you can get this information before our board election procedure later in the closed session so that we can deliberate where we are exactly on the timeline. As per our timelines, we are on track. We just want to make sure that we are not going ahead or staying behind.
	Thank you so much, Brajesh, for that. Just to keep a good eye on our process so that were on track as well, we keep on doing the good things. Thank you so much.
BRAJESH JAIN:	Just let me take another minute. I would like to, once again, make an outreach appeal to all of us present here and also our audience in the hall. Please go to the people and make applications so that whatever expectations on the regional diversity [inaudible] are required – because our criteria is very clear that it has to be married, married, and married. But if there are applications from regions which are less represented by gender, that will definitely help. Thank you.
AFTAB SIDDIQUI:	So ASO AC's criteria is also married, married, and only married? At least we are on the same page. I thought you were asking all the ASO AC members to apply for this post.

BRAJESH JAIN: Including [you].

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Thank you for the clarification. Okay. So, yeah, it's a good thing if we can reach out to our communities and let them know this is happening. If we know someone who is well-deserving, we should probably forward their name as well. Thank you for your message, Brajesh .Well noted.

Okay. Moving forward now, we have – sorry. [inaudible]? Yeah. Okay. So we have a thing called the Ethos Award. Kevin will explain what that is and why it is here.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: I was asked very recently to be one of the panelists, I guess, for deciding the Ethos Award. Each year – I believe this since 2014 in London – one or two people from within the community are chosen for the multi-stakeholder award, with is the Ethos Award. Basically, everybody, they have to work between the communities, so it's obviously important that somebody from the Numbers community is able to provide input to this panel. The decision will be made and, for the people that win the award, there'll be a ceremony at ICANN62 in Panama.

As of yet, the nominations are still open until the 19th, so until next week. Then we've got a bit of work to do to get everything done from the nomination period to when it's actually awarded. That's basically it.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: All right. Thank you. Nurani?

NURANI NIMPURO: It'd be interesting to know what nominations have come in and if there are any from our community.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: I've been given no information at this time on any of the nominations. I don't know if they wait until the end. I literally found out about this a week ago. We're just waiting now to get more information on it. It was a little bit last-minute to get [decided on].

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Who else was in the last one? Filiz, you were there, and John? If you can share the timelines, what happens, after the nominations is closed. Then they notify us?

FILIZ YILMAZ: Last year it was a little different. I wasn't asked personally. I was informed of that. It was the NRO EC and the ASO AC Chairs who are appointed to this automatically. As the ASO AC Chair of last year, I performed the duty.

It's pretty confidential. Neither the process nor the details will be shared that quickly. Don't expect too much. It is pretty last-minute. It is still being put on. Every year's panel has the right to define their process that they're going to follow that year. You will probably ask for us to define that process once you're meeting starts.

Last year, in fact – I don't know if this is purely confidential – I think it was public that our own Paul Wilson was one of the candidates. It will be good to see other people nominated for the award. There might be conflicts-of-interest situations, which you will have to deal with, Kevin.

Basically, you deliberate on individuals that come in and on why you could pro or against particular individuals to continue in the race. Last year's panel had opted for an iterative process, where they first went for a short list and then continued shortening it down until the winner was announced.

Part of it is that, in some cases, you will not even know the individual, and all you are left with is what you hear from the others, as well as the information that is presented. I have sat in

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

some interviews with the individuals. Again, depending on the process of the panel that adopts, you may conduct interviews with individuals if there is anything you don't understand. You can ask them.

Time difference is an issue. So, yeah, that is what I can share.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: Filiz, thank you. That's actually far more information than I was given. It's very useful. Just trying to parse what you've said, expect a reasonable amount of time or an unreasonable amount of time. It is completely unknown. It all depends on the makeup, the group, the number of people. It could be anything. It could be a lot in a very short amount of time. That's essentially what I should be allowing myself.

FILIZ YILMAZ: If you're asking if there's a lot of work or not, yes, it is a lot of work. There were weekly meetings I attended last year over the course of two months, probably. I read about 100 pages of CVs, bios, and deliberations. I also went through a good amount of e-mail conversation. So, yeah, be prepared. There will be a time commitment required. Yes.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI:	Well, before I allow anyone to ask any questions, I would like say, Filiz, thank you so much. We were not aware that you were doing such a wonderful job. As an ASO AC member, I will say thank you so much for that.
BRAJESH JAIN:	Kevin, [inaudible] shows five years active in community. How is it defined that the person is active in the community or not? Whether he has to be a member, whether he has attended some meetings or should have been part of a mailing list or something?
KEVIN BLUMBERG:	Again, I've got no information to date. I really don't want to comment on something I'm not aware of. I can go back to it, but I don't know in the deliberations or anything else, until I know more. Then I probably won't be able to see once I know more. You're talking about five years. It's for the applicants.
BRAJESH JAIN:	For the applicants. The last date in the 19th of March. Over the next few days, is it possible to get some definition from whoever is there that we could circulate into the ASO AC so that we can tell our community that they should consider the same?

ICANN COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

KEVIN BLUMBERG: I think the issue is going to be, if it's not a fixed definition – X, Y, or Z – it will be up to the committee. The applicant will fill it in good faith. Then that will be part of the selection phase. That's my assumption at this point, Brajesh.

BRAJESH JAIN: Thank you.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Thank you, Brajesh. Thank you, Kevin. The quick thing is, if you think there's somebody from the community who has been involved, regardless of number of years, put the nominations. Then let the panel decide what the criteria is and how they fulfill it or not. The deadline is quite close. If you think somebody has been involved and deserves recognition, put in the nomination.

BRAJESH JAIN: Okay. Thanks, Aftab.

NURANI NIMPURO: Not speaking as an expert, but there is a wiki page on the multi-stakeholder Ethos Award. That describes a little bit what it is and the background behind it.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Yeah, exactly. The link shared on the web here was the wiki page. It explains everything: why and who should be there. You can take an example from the past nominees and past awardees. It will give you a good idea of what they are looking for. If you think somebody is there, [sure]. Nurani?

NURANI NIMPURO: Because was what the criteria were, and especially if we're asking people to nominate people, I think it's useful to know what the criteria are. Do you mind if I share them from what the website says?

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Definitely.

NURANI NIMPURO: Great. It says, "Demonstrated ability to work across community lines with both familiar and unfamiliar ICANN stakeholders with the aim of consensus building and collaboration that substantiate ICANN's multi-stakeholder model .Facilitator of dialogue and open discussion in a fair and collegial manner through the spirit of collaboration as showing through empathy and demonstrating a sincere desire to engage with people from

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

other backgrounds, culture, and interests. And demonstrated additional devotional factors exhibited by time spent supporting ICANN's multi-stakeholder model and its overall effectiveness through volunteer service via working groups at all committees."

So I think it's good to have that in mind when nominating people. Thank you.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: This criteria kicks in if you have been doing this for five years. That's the eligibility. So eligibility plus criteria should give you enough information to make up your mind that the person you are thinking about or if you are circulating the information that they are the right people.

BRAJESH JAIN: I definitely will not vote personally, but for circulation, thank you.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: I believe self-nomination is okay.

If there are no questions on the Ethos Award, we can move forward.

All right. Just a quick thing. This is the next point in the agenda. Within the ICANN activities is the review of past appointments. As you can see, we have, at the moment, four people: two to CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 – that is Jorge and Fiona – NomCom is Brajesh, and Ethos is Kevin. We have been doing this every year. What happens is that we lose track of this thing, of who we have nominated and where.

When we were looking into the details of who we have nominated in the past, we found out that some of the groups, of course, have completed their work. If our name is out there, that doesn't make any difference. They had a limited scope. They performed their duty. That is done. If an ASO AC appointee is there, that's fine.

But some of the groups are still working on something. We appointed a few people, but they are not part of the ASO AC anymore. We have to review that. There is nothing wrong with that person being part of that group. He's still part of the community. We're not saying that at all. Probably he/she/it is doing a much better job as well. But the thing is, the association with the ASO AC is in name only. If the person is not part of the ASO AC anymore, probably we should be able to assign somebody else.

I would like to suggest that we add this thing as part of our work plan. It is not there yet. Every year, we review who we have appointed and ask them, if they are still part of the ASO AC, what the timelines are, how much time they are investing, and what the timeline is of that committee or the working group so that we are aware of the engagement and we aware of the progress.

If anyone has any objection to that, please just let me know. Otherwise, I would like to request that put this in our work plan. The reason I'm saying that is because the work plan has already been approved and has already been published. If you want to add something, we need a consensus, and, of course, a motion.

Before I ask for a motion, I would like to ask for any questions or comments on if it makes sense or not.

BRAJESH JAIN: I think this definitely would be a good thing to have [recorded]. But will it be draft first to be passed? I know we're passing the motion that it should be put into the work plan.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: My point of view is, if we agree that we put it in the work plan, then we can draft a text and put it there. It's not a legal thing. We will review all of our past appointments at the end of the year. That's it. Let's say it should be part of our Work Plan 2019:

review all the 2018 appointments. If we add it today, in the 2018 plan, we will review all the 2017 appointments. That's my understanding.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Nurani and then Kevin.

NURANI NIMPURO: Thank you. Two comments. One is that I think it's very good to keep track of these. I think we've lost track of some of them. But a question of clarification. I think some of these appointments are made by the ASO, correct? So that's not necessarily the task of the ASO AC. I think that, before adding it to our work plan, we need to be clear about where the responsibility lies. I think, in many cases, there's a consultation or something, but at the end of the day, it's actually the responsibility of the Chair of the ASO – i.e., the NRO EC – to perform the task. Thank you.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Thank you for pointing that out. We conceded that one as well. The thing is, it's not just the ASO AC who appoints people. It's the NRO EC on behalf of the ASO. So what I'm thinking is we do our due diligence and inform the NRO EC that we appointed these people and that we think that they are not part of the ASO AC. We would like them to be replaced – I wouldn't call them

removed – with these members. So it's up to you now. Sometimes they ask us to appoint somebody and they ratify it. Again, we will follow the same process as the way we are following it today. But, yes, rightly pointed out: we have to highlight this to the NRO EC as well. If we just put it in our work plan, it's not going to be complete.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: I see this as a multi-faceted "We should absolutely be reviewing every year just to keep track". I also believe that we should be asking the member that has been assigned at the beginning of each year if they can continue on. I think it's a reasonable thing to ask in some cases. Things change year to year, and if it's a multi-year commitment that they've done, I don't want them sitting there not doing the work because they're uncomfortable but at the same time not feeling like they have the ability to request a chance. Obviously, when you start, you should try to finish. By reviewing it once a year consistently, for those things that do stretch over multiple years, it gives people a graceful way to request a change.

If members of our body are being selected by another body or – I don't want to say a higher-up, but if the NRO EC is selecting people from our group and those people are no longer in our group, I think, at a minimum, we should be notifying them. They

probably do know, but if we're doing this review, to pass that to them is probably a very good idea.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: All right. This closes this discussion. I need suggestions. Should we draft our work plan and share with the NRO EC, or do we go ahead and put it on the work plan and then, whatever the outcome is, we inform the NRO EC? Two options.

Any suggestions for that?

HERMAN: Aftab, we have Jason online.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Jason, go ahead.

JASON SCHILLER: On a previous point, I just wanted to say that, when we appoint people to a position we typically keep in contact with them and expect updates on what's developing. So it'd be reasonable in those updates to also check in with them and make sure that they're still comfortable continuing in that role.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Yeah. Thank you, Jason. An absolutely valid point. Sometimes it's too much [all] work and it's not a good idea to overstress them. So, yes, I totally agree with you. Again, just review it every year and make it part of our work plan. Any objection to that?

KEVIN BLUMBERG: I'll second that.

JASON SCHILLER: Just to be clear, the review is to ensure… I'm sorry, I'm hearing an echo now. The review is to ensure that we're getting regular updates from people that we've appointed and we haven't lost touch with them, and also to make sure that they're still comfortable [inaudible], correct?

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Yes. Let me put that way. Review all past appointment and ask for the update and ask them if they would like to continue or not. Is that okay?

JASON SCHILLER: Perfect, thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just for clarification. All current appointments, isn't that right? We're not talking about the past but the ones who currently serving, they're the ones –

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: If we added in our Work Plan 2018, we will be reviewing 2017 appointments only, not before that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The ones who are currently appointed, right? Okay. Good, good, good.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Yes. Sorry, yes. So, whatever the text I said, if people agree on that and I am accepting a motion that.

Brajesh was in the queue. Did you want to say something?

BRAJESH JAIN: I think I'm out of queue. Thank you.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: So, to move it forward, I will second that.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: All right. Any objection? Anyone would like to abstain? No? Thank you so much, Kevin. We have a motion. So, even though Brajesh is out of the queue, let's make sure that you're not out of the coffee, so we have a coffee break, so we can take a quick coffee break. It is 10:30 to be exact on the clock and we can reconvene in 20 minutes. 15. Yes. 15 so that you're back in 20. Thank you.

[BREAK]

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: All right. Please be seated, everyone. Okay, so let's start the second session after the break. Yes, it's 20 minutes plus 10. Yes. Okay, okay. I had decaf. Coffee was not available, so that's fine, basically.

All right, so let's start with the remaining agenda items. The next on the agenda item is the RIR report. So, we only had APNIC 45 in the last month, so we have update from APNIC 45. Brajesh then will provide the update.

BRAJESH JAIN: Thank, Aftab. APNIC 45 took place at Kathmandu, February 24 to 28 along with APRICOT, which was early February 24. APRICOT,

as we know, is Asia-Pacific Regional Internet Communication Operational Technology, which is just conducted out of two APNICs. One APNIC is done along with APRICOT and one is done APNIC as standalone. Next, please.

Proposal [116]. Prohibit to transfer IPv4 addresses in the [final block]. As we know, that APNIC like the [inaudible] finally block and then this was to prohibit transfer of IPv4 addresses from final eight until there have been a delegated or remain the delegation for at least five years applies to what market [inaudible] transfers. It was implemented on 20th November, 2017.

Similarly, the [record], the final pool will be placed in 1038 pool and recovered non-1038 space will be placed in the IPv4 record pool, which means that two pools will be separately maintained.

On the Prop 120 final eight pool insertion plan, a proposal was that once a request cannot be fulfilled from the final pool, we suggest to create a waiting list that will be many same as recovered full waiting list, APNIC to manage two waiting list pools, the record pool and 1038 pool. It did not reach consensus and it was turned to mailing list. A prop 123 proposal allowed the transfer of 1038 without the five-year restriction for delegations made before 14 September when this new

restriction had come up. It did not reach consensus written back to the mailing list.

Prop 118. No need policy [inaudible] reason. Here we had a unique situation. The author who had proposed this policy that removed the requirement to demonstrate need when transferring IPv4 addresses into [inaudible] reason. Exception the resources are from a higher region requiring [inaudible] based policies, where [inaudible] must provide a plan use of at least 50% resources would not apply to AS number.

So, the author did not submit revised proposal and basically uncontactable, though consensus there is to change to new authors took the same proposal and he will submit the revised proposal, and then that [comment] period.

Similarly, there was a Prop 119. [inaudible] transfers create a possibility for [inaudible] transfers that will allow organizations to have resources directly register under them while they are the custodians of these resources on the Internet. Once again here, author did not submit revised proposal and was not contactable. Here also consensus there is to change author to submit revised proposal.

Next, please. And thank you very much. Any questions? You're welcome.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay, [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, [inaudible] for the record. Just to understand the situation [here in] APNIC, what [inaudible] of consumption of the last /8 currently. What are the level of remaining IPv4 addresses?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's about 50% of the last /8 and the current rate it's got to last about three more years.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay, thank you.

LOUIS LEE: Hi. The two proposals that had authors that were unreachable, were they the same author or do we know that or are we starting to see a trend where authors are just throwing it in there and then disappearing?

BRAJESH JAIN: While [inaudible] I think it is same author [inaudible].

AFTAB SIDDIQUI:	[inaudible] same author. He presented it in the last two meetings but didn't reach any consensus, so… and then there was zero activity after the last meeting in Taichung, and then the policy [inaudible] chairs asked the author and then there was no response and they tried all possible scenarios to contact the author.
	I mean, the author just vanished. So, he was not responding on phone, e-mails, nothing. Actually, he switched jobs and then closed everything associated with the previous job, so that was very strange and for very first time happened in the APNIC region, so we didn't know what to do with it. So, the consensus was, "Okay, fine. Somebody else wanted to pick it up," and then a community agreed, "Okay, fine. We can change the author." The policy is not you cannot just change the author unless the author give it away to somebody else.
	But the community said, "Okay, fine. We don't care if somebody else is going through with the same policy." So that we contain the historical information because the historical information attached to the number remains as it is and then we move forward, rather than copy pasting the same content and coming back with the new policy proposal number only and the same text without any historical information, it doesn't make any sense. So that's why it will move forward with a new author.

Any other questions from anyone else? If no, then thank you, Brajesh, for the update.

Now the next item on the agenda is global policy development process overview and just to give you a highlight on that, why it is there. It's been a long time since we have a global policy and most of the ASO AC members were not part of that process when it happened, so that's why I requested Louis to use his historical information and provide some… well, I should have asked Harmut. I didn't know that. But anyway, it's okay, I already asked Louis. The thing is we need to know how actually the process works in reality, how it happened, so that we can go through it and be on the same page.

LOUIS LEE: All right. This is Louis in Louis's hat. So, in order to get into the reality of it, it's useful to get a little background on what global policy is. It stems from the MoU, the ASO MoU, and Section 5 is the definition of it. The important parts are that it has the agreement of all RIRs and it's a policy that requires specific actions or outcomes on the part of IANA or any other external ICANN-related body for it to be implemented.

This is in contrast to what we termed a globally coordinated policy, where it may be a policy agreed upon by all five RIRs.

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM
61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

However, it is a policy where it doesn't require an external body to in order to act and implement.

Okay. If we may go to the attachment A that this section refers to, this is the part of the MoU that gives a little more inform about the process. And beyond this, though, we'll also get into our own ASO procedures that talks about the actual mechanics.

All right. There are three ways that the global policy proposal can get into the process. The one way is that the submitter, the author directly submits it into one of the RIR policy development process directly. Another way is for that author to give it to the ASO Address Council to assist. And the third way is for the ICANN Board to make the request for us to develop this policy in conjunction with them.

And I think I just went over one, two, and three. So, in the case where the author submits directly, we get a notification from our team that people that are in that region and we will put the discussion in our own meeting so that we can decide amongst ourselves and agree whether this policy has the potential to become a global policy, so we decide whether it requires all five RIRs and requires an external body to implement.

Now, once it's in all five regions, each of the regions will have their own policy development process, they share a lot of the characteristics such as it being open, meaning that the

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

discussion is available to all to participate in. It's transparent in that all the discussion is available to everybody, and it is bottom-up developed, meaning all of the stakeholders have a voice, and for us, our stakeholders, don't have a residential geographic boundary.

If you are somebody who's interested in number policy and how it might affect a different region, go ahead and provide your discussion points and participate. It is not limited to operators, not limited to [IXs], those that are members for a term that may vary between regions. A member may be a person that resides in that region or somebody who pays registration fees. So, there's none of those restrictions involved in the policy development.

But the different RIR PDPs, policy development process, do vary a little bit in, say, the calendar, the amount of days it needs to be on a mailing list, what kind of last call is required, how do you gauge consensus, whether you have a chair or co-chair or committee deciding that consensus, that's where they vary a little bit. Okay.

Now, we understand that due to various reasons, the texts may vary slightly between the RIRs as the policy goes through. For instance, you may have a term for the LIR, just throwing it out there, that is not defined in another region. Now, the meaning of the proposal is what's really important. Now, if the same

meaning is passed at each RIR through the policy development process and it's accepted, then the text is forwarded to the ASO AC.

You see that in number four, then, that's where the Comtex then will need to be ratified by each RIR and then in number – that was four. And then number five is where it's forwarded to the ASO Address Council. After that, the Address Council will need to review the process followed by the RIRs and make sure that to our satisfaction, that the PDP was adhered to and that all the significant viewpoints have been considered.

If we are satisfied with that, then we pass the proposal to the ICANN Board for consideration and ratification. There is not that much consideration involved because we have made an agreement that if it satisfies the ASO AC, they should just look to see if affects ICANN in their duties as Board members, just to make sure that they check on their own. Now, the wording is up there exactly, so if there's a difference between what I'm saying and the text, the text does take over.

If we may scroll back up a bit near the top of this section, in number two, I want to highlight the point, the first sentence, "The proposer has a duty to assist relevant communities within each regional policy forum to make them aware of the deliberations of their peers in other regional policy forums."

So, as Address Council members, until it reaches us, we are to observe the process, observe how this policy continues through. If you'd like to speak, give your viewpoint on it, please do. You're all community members but understand that as the ASO AC, we don't have an active part in this until we receive it after ratification.

Is there a question on this? Okay. And if we may go to the actual procedures, please. This was attachment A, right? So, the ASO procedures gives quite a bit more detail about our activities. There we go. Perfect. And then you're going to share this over Adobe. Okay. We still need MoU here. Right? No. Okay. This is the issued as attachment first draft. It's interesting. I'm definitely at a different document. Section 6 would then the published procedures. Oh, okay. They should be identical. Yeah. It's just slightly different format.

All right. This is a more detailed version with our mechanics of how we're doing this. We have already Policy Proposal… PPFT. What's the F? Facilitators Team. Sorry. This team is made up of one member from each region and is tasked to keep an eye on the policy proposals within each region to make sure that they can highlight any potential global policies.

So, when they see something that could be a potential policy, let the chair now, and I believe it says in… Okay. I'm trying to make

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

sure that this is the same text as in our policy. Actually, go to the other one. Under documents. Operational documents. Operating procedures. Number 6, there we go.

All right. Thank you. So, the authority and overview just talks about the MoU and attachment A, and then 6.3 is the Global Policy Proposal Facilitators Team. And then going down a little bit in 6.4, it talks about how there are three ways to submit it, which we've already talked about. Submitted to an RIR forum, to the Address Council, or through the ICANN Board.

So, this is where you can see that the PPFT will within 10 days of completion determination requested respective RIR that the policy proposal be placed in the policy forum for their region for processing. Now, this is a matter of just alerting the RIRs that we have a policy that does have that potential, once the AC agrees.

Okay. And that part is the same if it's submitted to the Address Council. Keep moving down, please.

The ICANN Board piece, if the ICANN Board asks us to develop policy in this respect, we will work with ICANN staff to draft a policy and then go back to the ICANN Board to make sure that the draft reflects what they need. This is where full concurrence before we proceed forward. That's the word. Then at that point, we will pass it on to the RIRs.

Kevin. Back up one, please. Thank you. 26.2.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: Just a question. It says at this meeting, which I would take as an example, this meeting or the next meeting, the Address Council will examine the proposal to determine if it meets the definition of a global policy. So, as part of that phase, the Address Council needs to discuss the content of that global policy that's been submitted. Is that correct? To verify that it would be considered a global policy in their view. Is that how I'm reading that sentence? I'm just reading at this meeting, the Address Council will examine the proposal to determine if it meets the definition of a global policy.

LOUIS LEE: So, the discussion would not cover whether it's a good policy or not, but it's only on the text to see if it has the features required for global policy. Great. Lets' move down. Okay. Once the policy's been introduced, it goes through the PDP within each RIR. Oh, also, the Chair of the Address Council will need to notify the chairs of the other SOs and ACs that this policy has the potential to be a global policy.

It is to encourage participation. Now, it refers to an annex that has yet to be put together, so I've just been using the previous

one as the template each time. So, I'd be happy to share what I've sent previously unless Herman already has that.

Okay. So, Ratification Phase. This is where this policy proposal has already passed through all the five RIRs and it has been ratified, adopted to the extent that it's been accepted. Of course, it cannot be implemented because being a global policy, it does require an outside party.

The Address Council will receive this notification that it's been ratified by the RIRs and we will need then to establish a timeline in the calendar to conduct our final review. So, the PPFT would produce the report that tells us that whether each RIR's PDP have been followed and whether all significant viewpoints have been addressed.

Then the AC would review that report and make sure we take all steps to satisfy ourselves that this indeed is the case, and accept the report, and then we can forward the policy proposal up to ICANN Board for ratification.

Now, the ICANN Board does have a couple of options, three options. They can just – well, before I get right into that though, once they receive the policy, they do have the, in their procedures, to ask the AC what we think of the policy proposal. It's not quite in here because this will be reactionary for us. However, it might be nice to set that expectation that we will get

this request from the ICANN Board so that we can be prepared to write a response.

Okay. The details are up there. The important part is that ICANN Board – oh, sorry. I think I jumped the gun a little bit. If the AC does not find that both all the significant viewpoints have been considered and that the PDP has been followed, we would send the global policy proposal back down to the NRO EC with these concerns and let the RIRs figure that out, how they want to deal with that. Okay. Next page.

Thank you. We may also need to ask for an extension of time, if that's something we need. All right. Going back to where we give the proposal to ICANN. So, if you scroll up a little bit, you will see the different board actions available to them. They can either just accept the policy with a simple majority, reject it with a supermajority, or by a simple majority, requesting changes, or they may just take no action.

However, if you scroll up a little bit, we can see what happens with take no action. The ASO MoU does provide for that if they take no action, it will be accepted by default after a certain amount of time. And I believe that time is 60 days. I did not review that directly. Let me look at that real quick here. Yes, it is 60 days. Okay.

So, that wraps it up. Any questions? Sorry to have jumped around a little bit, but I think being this complicated, if anybody has any questions, I will be happy to try to clarify.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]. When were the last global policy past? And [inaudible] if we can have some data over the minimum period dictates to pass global policy. Thank you. Historically, maybe Harmut or [inaudible] can help.

LOUIS LEE: Do we have a slide next after this that talks about the previous global policies? I thought there was an agenda line for that. Okay. It is documented online, though, what all the previous global policies are. Generally, from just past experience, if it takes a cycle or two for a policy within each RIR to get consensus because of tweaks, because of getting feedback from the other regions as for the concerns to try to address the concerns, it could take a good year and a half to two for a – here we are. It could take a good year and a half to two for very minor changes. For major changes, the extreme is that it could get abandoned.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: Post-transition, there have been no global policies and I'm curious have we investigated because fortunately, I came on

right at that just after that time, prior to transition, did we look at if the transition would have any impact to global policy timelines or requirements or anything like that for us.

LOUIS LEE: I don't believe we looked at that directly as such but we've always had that in the back of our minds. That name IANA did not change, all these references the IANA function, so whether it's PTI or some other group doing the IANA function, the MoU could still apply directly. I'm not speaking as a lawyer. Any lawyers in the room want to address that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Nurani then Brajesh.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Nurani not pretending to be a lawyer. I guess depends on what your question. I mean, in the IANA transition didn't necessarily if – so for example, the proposal that the Numbers community put forward, the [Chris] proposal as part of the global proposal on the transition, that didn't actually touch the MoU at all and we did actually have early discussions, but whether or not this would affect the MoU and it was quite clear early on that the proposal for how to manage transition or actually handle post-transition, the MoU was out of scope for that.

And in essence, nothing has changed between the RIRs and anything that affects the global policy. What's changed is the contractual relationship with the between the RIRs and the IANA and now PTI.

So, I guess it depends also what you mean with the global policies because the global policies that we see here, we're all about how resources would be allocated from IANA PTI to the RIRs. From what I understand, this proposal is rather different in that it actually doesn't talk about the relationship between IANA, PTI, and the RIRs, but it talks about the different mechanism, so to speak.

LOUIS LEE: I guess where I was coming from was we had a discussion earlier about the six months and getting verification and it's more of the question of is there just any timelines or constraints on ICANN at this side when it comes to the things that they're responsible for, post-transition, that would be different that might impact the timeline, so that we're saying, "Oh, if everything went really well, it might take two or three cycles, RIRs, 18 to 24 months," but now the ratification phases and things like that because of post-transition might what we were used to taking might be considerably longer or the expectation, there might be expectational changes, etc. different forces at

play just in terms of timings and things like that post-transition because I'm not aware of what goes on in that from the ICANN side.

NURANI NIMPUNO: From my perspective, I would say none of that has changed. I mean, what has changed is the contractual relationship for the allocation of IP addresses, but that process and the role of the ratification by the board, etc., none of that has actually changed. Like all of those have remained the same. The IANA transition hasn't changed that and I don't know if there are any other changes in board procedures or anything like that but not as far as I'm aware. But I'd be happy to from the board member.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Yeah, so just want to add one thing that if it is a concern, then we do have two recommendations from ASO review, which requested us to review our GPDP, Global Policy Development Process. There are some cosmetic changes required.

So, while we will be updating those procedures, we can send a request to ICANN Board asking, "Well, this is what we are doing. Can you just let us know if there is any change at your end?" Or we just move on. Just a clarification question. What do you think?

NURANI NIMPUNO: Maybe I'll refer to Ron. I'm not aware of any changes and there's no changes in this regard when it comes to pre- or post- the IANA transition, so I'm a little bit unclear as to what the question is, but maybe Ron can.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: The only question was I understand is we have timelines, like 60 days you have to do this, 30 days you have to do this. ICANN Board will take that many time to ratify it. After the transition, is there an impact on the timelines? Yes or no. That's it. If no, we are still under the assumption that nothing has changed. Right? But we will be making few changes in our operating procedures, so my suggestion was is it a good idea to just send a note? We are just asking if there is any change after the [transition], let us know. If not, all good.

LOUIS LEE: So Nurani, I'm not talking about changes on our side. I'm talking about just internal procedures, policies, we now need this to be double and triple checked on the other side. In the past, it's taken 10 days for us to get this back to you. It might be 15 days. Things like that. Just internal working, not relation relationship type things. I understand that hasn't changed, but more along

the lines of every year, everybody's policies and procedures internally change and does that have any impact. I just thought that I don't want to use the IANA transition as the specific. It's been a number of years. It was a big change, which was IANA transition, and every year you go more, so everybody's procedures changes, so has there been a change? Just more curiosity than anything.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Yeah, sure. You want to add something then I'll [put] it to Ron.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Yes. I think I don't have a problem with asking clarifying questions, but I think there's a difference between if we make a formal request to the board and I think I'd rather we have Ron here, we can ask him. I think that may be his answer, actually, resolvers.

LOUIS LEE: Okay. Let me make sure I understand the question. Is the question if a global policy proposal is presented to the board, has the process the board uses to assess that changed pre and post? Yes, I'm seeing nods, so the answer is no. There's no change on our end if something comes before us from the ASO. Have we modified our processes as a result of the transition?

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: All good? Perfect. Who's on the queue?

HERMAN: Yeah, John Curran – his hand [is up] but he's not able to speak because he's just an observer. He had not connected to the Adobe as Carlos explained to him. I don't know if he wants to write the question.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: John joined as an observer, so observers are not allowed to speak. I'm sorry, John. Herman would love to read it, if you can just write it down, please. I'm really sorry for that. And I saw Craig raising the hand. It was in something. Craig, would you like to answer that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Before that, very quickly, John said that he will send an e-mail directly to the SO/AC regarding the [inaudible].

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Thank you so much, John.

CRAIG NG: My contribution is actually just to clarify something for my knowledge. I think the question was whether the global policy development procedures have changed as a result of the IANA transition. The answer is that the policy development processes were determined by – sorry, the ASO ICANN MoU and Nexus, the policy development process, and that process is the process unless it's varied. So, I'm not aware of any variation since the IANA stewardship transition of that document, but that document that is currently next to the ASO MoU is the one that's applicable.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Thank you, Craig, and just quickly looking into the Attachment A, it does clarify the number of days in the MoU, so I think we're pretty sure that if the MoU and its attachments are intact, then there's no change, so there's no need to ask any question. Is that okay with you? On the mic.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: Sorry, I apologize. It was while we were reviewing the way policies were doing, it was more informational trying to understand it was not me asserting or in any way expecting that there were radical changes to the structure between the MoUs and things like that. It was more things take time, has things changed? That's all.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay, thank you. So, yeah. All good. Any question on that? Any further clarification required? No. That's good.

So, the reason for this explanation and the overview was that somebody in LACNIC region proposed a policy marked as the global policy, and we wanted to be sure that everybody's on the same page about the process, what is the process, how it works, what is our role.

So, thanks to our PPFT team member, Jorge, who picked it up from there and informed the ASO AC, so he informed the chair and then I passed it on to the ASO AC members for them to review, and as Louis explained, we have to just review the – we don't discuss the text of the policy. We just review of global nature or not. That's it. So, Herman, can you put the policy link?

So, just a summary, it's we are not going into the detail of not going into the detail of the text that what is he trying to resolve, if it is a good policy or bad policy. It's just a matter of consider it as a global policy or not for other RIRs.

So, as per the policy procedure, you think it has the global nature. Let me just read out: "Proposes the creation of a virtual RIR that would be responsible for assigning IP address

[inaudible] system numbers to organization without a well-defined single [renalization]." That's it. This is the summary.

So, if we don't have any concern on this one, we can just say fine, this satisfies the requirement of global policy. We are not rejecting it. I'm reiterating that person review the policy procedure, which Louis explained, so I'm just reading the policy procedure again.

The Chair of the Address Council will notify the council of the proposal and will place the policy proposal on the agenda of the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Address Council. So, this is our monthly meeting and it's part of the agenda. At this meeting, the Address Council will examine the proposal to determine if it meets the definition of a global policy. If it does not, we won't do anything, and PPFT member will inform. If it does not then the PPFT member of the particular region will notify the appropriate RIR that the policy proposal does not meet the criteria of the policy proposal. Am I right?

The Address Council will take – yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Ricardo is handling that.

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Yes. We have Brajesh, Jason, and Fiona. Okay. The Address Council will take no further action if that is the case. If, on the other hand, the proposal meets the criteria –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Ricardo is taking the queue.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Observers can only speak if they are asked to speak. Let me clarify.

The Address Council will take no further action. If on the other hand, the proposal meets a criteria of a global policy proposal, then the PPFT will within 10 days of the completion of the termination request to the respective RIR that the policy proposal replaced in the policy forum for their region for processing. That is the RIR. We have nothing to do with it further.

So, we are clear on the procedure. That was the whole idea to explain the procedure. Louis explained it from top to bottom. Questions. Brajesh, Jason, and Fiona.

BRAJESH JAIN: Thanks, Ricardo. For me to assess whether this is a global policy or not, there's a need to understand what is this virtual RIR because this did not exist before. So, unless we understand that

this becomes difficult to be able to say whether it is of global nature or not. Thank you.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Who's next in the queue?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Jason.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Jason, please. Go ahead.

JASON SCHILLER: I, too, am concerned with this term virtual RIR and I'm not sure that the policies implementable as written. However, in terms of deciding whether or not it is a global policy or not, we simply have to look at [inaudible] IANA to do something new and it certainly does do that, and on that basis, I believe that it does qualify as a global policy.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Sorry, Jason. It does or it does not?

JASON SCHILLER: It does instruct the IANA to do something, therefore, it is a global policy. Now whether or not that policy is actually implementable, it's a different question.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay, so I'm just rephrasing it because every time you said does or doesn't, you missed it. So, implementable or not is not a question. If it is global or not, yes it is, right?

JASON SCHILLER: Correct.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay, thank you. Who's next in the queue?

FIONA ASONGA: Thank you. I think when we look at the MoU that we have with ICANN, there's something about the development of RRIs. Now, without reading this policy just from the title alone, I'm a bit concerned because we have not looked at that but I think there is a very clear agreement on how a new RRI is to be formed.

Now, I don't know whether – I haven't read through it because I needed us to start the process, so now as we begin, the first question is can we look at that and see what that says? Then for me, that will help me know which set of our policies and

procedures are we going to use, because I think we needed to have taken a bit of a step back to that, and then, also, in the same procedures, did we talk about virtual RRIs, what does it say? If we can get clarity on that, then it helps us chart the way forward. Thank you.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: All right. Who else is in the queue?

HERMAN: We have, Nurani then Jason and Cathy.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Technology. I think we need to be clear about the procedure that Louis so eloquently covered at the start of the session. First of all, it is not our role to sit and discuss the content of this policy. We're not here to debate what we like or not like or what we support or don't support. We do that in our regional forums. So, if you have an opinion on the actual content of the policy, please go to your regional RIR meeting and express that opinion as a community member, but it's not our role as the ASO AC to do that. Firstly.

Secondly, I think this has not been put to us as the ASO AC yet, so this discussion is actually too premature. I think the process policy says that – sorry – the procedure says that it needs to be brought up in the next ASO AC meeting as an informational agenda item. Simply to make everyone in the ASO AC aware that there has been a global policy proposal. So, I guess as a little reminder to everyone to read up on this and to follow the discussion, it makes sense for all of us, regardless of what we think of the proposal, to follow the discussion.

But apart from that, I would suggest that we don't take any other action at this point. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Nurani, for reiterating what I said at this meeting. I'm just reading it again from the procedure. At this meeting, the Address Council will examine the proposal to mine if it meets the definition of global policy.

I'm reading from the Document 641. Submitted to an RIR. Submitted to an RIR forum. 641. Line #4. Yes, I think so.

[AXEL PAVLICH]:   Thank you. [Axel] speaking. I'm deeply confused and I appreciate your attempt to bring the global, the nascent policy global policy to our attention. I believe there is no global policy

proposal at this point. There is a policy proposal in one of the RIRs region that is marked as potential global policy proposal. I wouldn't expect that either that proposal is brought directly to the ASO AC and then you would bring it into the RIR's region or that it would, as all the others have done so far, go through all the regional processes and then possibly consensus among the regions and identical policy text would emerge. That then would be given to the ASO AC, according to my understanding, to check whether or [inaudible] or the regions and then mark it as then mark it as a successful global policy proposal, but we are by far not there yet. Thank you for letting me speak.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: No. [Axel], thank you so much. I didn't want to say that being a chair, so let me say it now. It is not a global policy. It doesn't satisfy the requirement. It is just proposed in one RIR and we can just inform through the PPFT that please present it to other RIRs to comply with the global policy rules. Is that correct? [inaudible]

KEVIN BLUMBERG: So, I don't know if that's the case because it's an app particular region, not in the regions, and I'm reading it from 641 and this is the clarity I guess I'm looking for is within 10 days of the introduction of a global policy proposal in a particular region,

the PPFT member will notify the chair. That was done. The Chair of the Address Council notified the council of the proposal. That was done, and will place the policy proposal on the agenda. Again, done.

Of the next meeting as an information item. Okay. At this the meeting, so the meeting where we are now, the Address Council will examine the proposal, which we are doing, to determine if it meets the definition of a global policy. So, I guess what we should be doing is going to the definition of a global policy and asking the question if policy has not been submitted in all the regions or whatever, if it doesn't meet certain criteria, should we be looking at a specific definition of a global policy and then asking does this meet that strict definition at this time?

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay. So I shared my opinion. Any other opinion?

HERMAN: We have Jason on the queue. Jason?

JASON SCHILLER: So, looking at 641, it is my belief that what this is attempting to do is that in the event that a global policy is submitted to only one region, it should be brought up before the ASO AC in their

next meeting, and if it is clear that it is a global policy per definition, that we ensure that it gets placed on all five RIRs' dockets for discussion. And I believe that what we are attempting to do right now.

I don't believe the definition of a global policy requires it to be submitted to all five regions first.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay, so Jason, if we ask the PPFT member that is Jorge to inform that to the proposal that fine… I'm not sure what we we're going to tell the proposal. Okay, fine, this satisfied the global policy requirement and now you can submit it to all RIRs.

JASON SCHILLER: I think the important point here is that all five RIRs have it for discussion, whether the author does that or if the [author is] willing to do that, we need to do it on their behalf.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay. So, just to close this topic, let me ask everyone. One option is what Jason said, we go back to the proposal through the PPFT member that we reviewed it. It falls under the global policy criteria. We didn't consider the content, we didn't consider the text, it addresses a global position. I don't know

how to put it in the manner. But that's it, our job done, and then the proposal will talk to the respective RIRs, number one. Number one option.

Number two option, we go back to the proposal through the PPFT member saying that, "No, it does not satisfy the global policy requirement and you have to submit it to all RIRs." That's it. There are two options.

RICARDO PATARA: Before we hand you Brajesh then [inaudible] in the queue, I just want you to highlight one thing. I'm from LACNIC and I talked to Jorge. Jorge is the PPFT and he has reached out explaining the situation, and the proposal is very immature in [inaudible] sense and we'll have LACNIC meeting in one month, more or less, it's May 1st, and the idea for the proposal was to at this point receive more comments from the community before [inaudible].

So, he's expecting to have the comments during the open policy forum in LACNIC meeting in Panama May the 1st, so I ask people that they can join the mailing list and also follow the policy forum.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Thank you, Ricardo. Just before we ask, give any time to anybody else, I would propose to park it until May meeting, and

then discuss it again. We don't even have our proper feedback from the LACNIC at all. Yeah, I'm just proposing right now we park it for May meeting and then we'll discuss it forward. Is that okay?

KEVIN BLUMBERG: So, this is an unusual situation because it hasn't been submitted in all the regions and one thing I was looking at, which might actually sort of, Aftab, lean more towards what you said with number two, which was going back to the author, is in the discussion phase, it says once the global policy has been introduced, the proposal author is expected to participate in each regional forum.

That to me seems that to be a global policy, it needs to have been introduced in all of the regions and allow for discussion in those regions. As it hasn't been in all of those regions, which is what we were saying with number two, again, it wasn't. I don't know if this was envisioned that it would not be done in all the regions. So, I would be supportive of what you're suggesting with number two, but I think we need to inform the author one way or the other at least be able to provide feedback to the author about what our expectations are.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: We can provide the feedback that we are parking it until you have some confirmation from LACNIC. Right? Anybody else on the   queue?

HERMAN: Yes. We have Brajesh waiting for a long time and Jason.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Sorry.

BRAJESH JAIN: Thanks. In case it has been parked [inaudible] Christian but it was option number two, I was the PPFT for APNIC, so that I was curious that do I take it forward or not. If it has been parked for May meeting, I have no more question. Thank you.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: And so parking is a suggestion if everybody agrees. Okay. I would say any objection if we park it.

HERMAN: We still have Jason. I don't know if he wants to say something.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Jason, please go ahead.

JASON SCHILLER: I'm not going to object but 6.4 introductory phrase states a global policy may be introduced in one of three ways. First way. Submitted to an RIR policy forum. The proposal is introduced into an RIR policy forum in accordance with its policy development process. So, my read of this is if it claims to be a global policy, if it tells IANA to do something, and it was properly submitted to at least one RIR policy development process, then it meets the definition of a global policy.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Thank you, Jason.

JASON SCHILLER: Granted, if we want to park it, that's fine.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay. Once again, three options. One, it is a global policy, we go back to the proposal to ask them that "Fine, it is a global policy," and you submit, go ahead and submit it in all RIRs. Option one. Number two, we go back to the proposal, saying, "No, it is not a global policy," you still go ahead and submit to other RIRs and we will review it as a global policy. Number three, we park it until May.

ICANN 61 COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

Please. If my first, my suggestion was we pick three, park it until May. If we agree, okay fine. If somebody wants to go with one or two, I'm absolutely fine with that, as well, but let's close the discussion as early as possible.

RICARDO PATARA: I'm inclined with the option three. It's aligned with what [inaudible] has to wait until the policy forum to receive comments and feedbacks from the community in life.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay. Any other fine with three? Louis.

LOUIS LEE: I just want to say that Jason's read of our policy is in line with the MoU Attachment A, where it says a proposed global policy can be submitted to either one of the policy forum or to the Address Council directly. So, Jason's read is correct and is in line, is not in conflict with anything else. With that in mind, I'm okay with three because there is a big potential for change, tweaking, and it would be too early for the current text to be forwarded to all the others to be considered.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay, but I read it again, Jason's understanding is right, and I agree with that. But we are parking it until May. At least we have some confirmation from LACNIC. Good?

KEVIN BLUMBERG: So, yeah. I'm very concerned about number three but we're parking it without – I realize the reason you're giving is that we're waiting for more information on LACNIC, but that wouldn't be the reason we can park it. So, I would suggest that we discuss this, have a little bit of time to think about it and check the staff on a couple of things, and maybe bring this back up in the afternoon, keep it open, etc., we can keep discussing it, but I'm not comfortable with number three.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: The only reason I said we park it is because by that time – if we inform the proposal right now, nothing is going to happen. It will still go through the LACNIC and then will be proposed in other regions. That's what my understanding is. So, if we move forward today and say "Fine, it falls under the global policy, go ahead and do it in other RIRs," it will be [same]. But anyway.

FILIZ YILMAS: I'll just start with saying the MoU text in our operational documents text is not ideal. We knew that. It came through the

ASO review. And this is something that this council still needs to resolve in the sense. However, that reading of the 6.4 introductory phase, my reading on top of that, on Jason's – and I agree with them, it's very clear that there are options – one of the options is to pass it the ASO AC but that needs to come from the proposer.

We have not checked and we do not have any information from the proposer how they want to proceed. So, I believe Ricardo's suggestion to go back in LACNIC and check up with the proposer, "Would you like to pass it on to ASO AC?" and then we have to deal with it. Or "Would you like to go around all the RIR regions and propose your own policy proposal in each region? Which one you would like to go with?"

I think we should not make the decision for the proposer on this ourselves and in that sense, I think we can already go ahead and ask Ricardo or anyone from the LACNIC region to go back and check with the proposer how they would like to proceed. Thank you.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: So, to answer that one, Jorge already explained it to him and then he proposed it in the RIR. He still explained it to him, this is the procedure and that's how it is. So the proposer knows the process.

Anyway, we have a problem right now because there is another session in this room in exactly 10 minutes. We can continue the discussion later on in the second session and I am happy to keep that session open, as well, for observers, because it's a continuation of the discussion. But we have to close this meeting but before we close this meeting, we have NomCom leadership in the room. They requested to have a meeting with the ASO AC and we put it in the agenda initially but there was no – the agenda published on the website has that session but we didn't get any confirmation, so it's not here, and then we got the confirmation last night.

But they are here, I asked them to be here. I would like to welcome them. But my request to the NomCom leadership is that we have very, very little time because other people are waiting. Please.

ZAHID JAMIL: Aftab, thank you. When we say very little, how much time are we talking about?

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: 12:15 is the next session and somebody else has to occupy that.

ZAHID JAMIL: Okay. That's really, really fast. So, let me not go through the slides. It's not important. Let me just speak. We are here, you are probably – is this the first time you had NomCom come to you and speak to you or is this something that has happened a lot before?

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: In five years' time, I know this is the first time.

ZAHID JAMIL: All right, that's good.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Fiona did give us a bit – no, I'm sorry. Brajesh gave us a bit of what you're expecting.

ZAHID JAMIL: So, let me first start by saying that Brajesh, you're a delegate to the NomCom. It has played an exceptionally pivotal role and very constructive role, and we're not just saying that going to every ASO AC, just saying that we are represented. It's actually true. It's been very pivotal in many of the important very strategic discussions we've had. So, thank you, Brajesh, in front of everybody. Number one.

Number two, we have a deadline of the 19th of this month, which is in about seven days or so. That is the deadline to apply for those slots up there that you will see. Just one back, please. We have three seats that need to be [inaudible] ICANN Board. We have one for GNSO, two for ALAC, which are geographically limited to Europe and North America, and then two for ccNSO. It's really important that if you apply for the ccNSO Council, you are not affiliated in any way to a ccTLD. We learned that from the hard situation from last year. I'm sure you know what that was.

So, that's basically the slots and if you go one further down, the next slide, let's keep going further because we did get a lot more women, but let's go further down, and one more, one more, two more, keep going, and yeah, there we go.

So, we have a now standard website, noncom.icann.org. It used to be icann.org/nomcom 17, 18, 19, it keeps changing every year. Anyway, so on the 19th of March, you need to apply to get your expressions of interest. You'll get access to your application form and by the 26th of March, you have to complete that application form. It is extremely critical people understand that the process of the NomCom is very important because it allows people from outside and also inside the community to be able to be selected and participate in what we call leadership positions, so we would encourage if there are people you know from the outside the ICANN community or within that you think could

qualify for one of these places or these slots, please do let them apply.

I want to then move quickly on. Are any questions about that? Then we want to talk about the NomCom improvements. Any questions? No. Okay. All right.

So, forget the slides. I'll just say the following things. The NomCom basically [gets birth] at the AGM every year, and our budget and what we can do is decided 11 months in advance before we are given birth to, which means that the NomCom basically has no control over its destiny. That has changed this year. We have forced through certain decisions after our birth, changing the destiny books of the NomCom, and we have in the past basically whenever the selections of candidates used to take place, used to do it online.

So, I'll give you an example. Brajesh or myself are sitting at home, we're looking at a list of applications, and we're rating them one to five and saying this person is a four, this person is a three, and then basically based on that the results that we get, there was a cutoff, saying well, people who are above 3.5 will be going to the next round and everybody below, unless someone pulls you out from below, basically is rejected. We think that's a bad way or not the best way to select board candidates.

So, this year, what we're doing is we're meeting face-to-face with all applications and I want to tell everybody this. All applications will be deliberatively in a group discussed face-to-face and considered, so that's a big change this year.

Then many other things we've changed. People have complained about the black box, you apply to the NomCom and you don't know what's going to happen to your application because at the end of the day, you get told when everybody else is already appointed. That's going to change because as we go through the stages, you will be as a candidate as good customer service, will be told where you are if you made it or not.

One of the things we want to also emphasize is we're abiding by the bylaws. There's a lot of conversation in the community about what the NomCom is doing about maybe changing its rules regarding nonvoting liaisons being able to not vote. Well, that's kind of obvious because they're nonvoting, you don't get to, but just to be clear, they are participating in everything, including the straw polls. The only thing they don't participate in is basically the final votes of a selection or a deselection or rejection of a candidate.

And I'll stop there because there may be questions that people have. I'd like to sort of bring them to the floor and answer them, if that's possible. And after, by the way, it's great to be in the

presence of someone who started Cybernet. You're my ISP to date.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Thank you so much. Just a quick question. So, when you said meeting – just want to clarify. Meeting all the applicants or meeting the NomCom committee members will be meeting face-to-face to review all the applicants.

ZAHID JAMIL: The latter, yes.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay. That's fine. Any other questions? All good. Thank you so much. Yes.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Yes. Hans Petter Holen, for those who have been here a while, you know me. I'm Associate Chair and I just want to encourage you in your board selection process that you actually adhere to the deadlines in the bylaws. So, according to the bylaws, you have to notify six months ahead of the AGM. That's April 20, and that's going to be published publicly promptly, the bylaw says. I see on your website that you have planned to do that one month later and I would really encourage you to make sure you deliver

on the deadline on the 20th because, otherwise, we will have a problem in making sure that –

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Just to clarify, we had the discussion the morning. Our deadline is April 19th.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: So, we will get that notification a few days after that.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Okay. That's to clarify again, our deadline is to notify ICANN. So, then they have a due diligence process, as well.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: No, no, no, no. That's your process and you need to be clear on that because if you read the bylaws, it says that you are supposed to give the notice to the EC administration and they are to post this promptly on their website. So when you do that notice, this is not notifying ICANN staff to due diligence. This is notifying that you have completed your process. That goes public.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Let us review that and get back to you.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Please do, because if you don't, if you look at the composition of the board, we have a requirement to not appoint more than five candidates from any region. So, if you appoint somebody from a certain region, we cannot appoint anybody from that region, so this will actually affect our work.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Absolutely noted. We will review it in the second session and I will get back to you on that.

ZAHID JAMIL: Thank you for your time and hope we can make this happen every year. Thank you so much.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Let's break this session and be back at 1:30.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We're going to be starting the NRI session promptly at 12:15.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]