Number Resource Organization (NRO)
Response to the ASO Review Report of the ICANN Address Supporting Organization (ASO)

Date: 30 April 2012

Introduction
The terms in which periodic reviews of the ASO are undertaken are established in Section 8 of the ASO MoU in accordance with Article IV, Section 4 of the ICANN Bylaws.

On December 2010, the NRO published a Request for Proposals and Terms of Reference to conduct the first independent review of the ASO.

Early in 2011, the Number Resource Organization, with confirmation from the ICANN Board’s Structural Improvement Committee, commissioned an independent review of the ASO to ITEMS International, a consultancy firm with extensive experience, including the organizational review, in 2010, of the ICANN Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO).

ITEMS International delivered its final report early in 2012. This report has been posted at the ICANN website for public comments.

The NRO welcomes the report of ITEMS International, commends the quality of its analysis and appreciates its constructive recommendations.

NRO’s considerations on the 26 recommendations of the report and the one recommendation during the ICANN public comment follow.
### I) Recommendations regarding clarifications and updates to the ASO MoU

| Recommendation 1: Clarify the purpose, mandate and objectives of the ASO and distinguish between the ASO functions to be undertaken by the Address Council and those to be undertaken by the NRO Executive Council | Per the “ICANN Address Supporting Organization (ASO) MoU”, the NRO fulfills the role, responsibilities and functions of the ASO.  

The NRO recognizes that there exists confusion within the ICANN community regarding structure of the NRO and its role of serving as the ASO. Additionally, the mandate of Address Council within the ASO is also sometimes not clear to the ICANN community, although it is clearly specified in the ICANN ASO MoU as follows:  

- Leading the Internet number resource global policy development process  
- Providing recommendations to the Board of ICANN concerning the recognition of new RIRs, according to agreed requirements and policies.  
- Defining procedures for selection of individuals to serve on other ICANN bodies, in particular on the ICANN Board, and implementing any roles assigned to the Address Council in such procedures.  
- Providing advice to the Board of ICANN on number resource allocation policy, in conjunction with the RIRs.  
- Developing procedures for conducting business in support of their responsibilities, in particular for the appointment of an Address Council Chair and definition of the Chair’s responsibilities. |

The NRO commits to increasing educational efforts within the ICANN community regarding the specific roles in the ASO that are served by the ASO Address Council, and to transparently and internally handoff communications and requests between NRO and ASO AC as necessary. As a result of this review, we will also review our use of terminology related to the NRO and ASO, including both the usage and definition of terms, and adopting more meaningful terminology as appropriate.

**Recommendation 2:** Update Attachment A of the ASO MoU to ensure that it is consistent with the description of the Global Policy Development Process (GPDP) in the Address Council Operating Procedures (ASO AC OP) document.

The ASO AC OP (ASO Procedures) is an internal document, under ongoing development, where details about the global policy development process can be expanded and tasks between EC and NC (AC) assigned. We believe the ASO AC OP should be consistent with the ASO MoU and not vice versa, but as a result of this review the NRO will continue to review the OP to ensure that this is the case.

### II) Global Policy Development Process (GPDP)

**Recommendation 3:** The signatories of the ASO MoU should mutually agree on a procedure on how the Address Council should deal with a global policy proposal that has been objected or rejected by the ICANN Board.

The ICANN Board and the NRO shall enter into conversations to agree on a procedure to deal with global Internet number resource policies rejected or objected by the ICANN Board.

**Recommendation 4:** The signatories of the ASO MoU should mutually agree on a mediation procedure should the ICANN Board reject a resubmitted global policy proposal for the second time.

Agreed.
**Recommendation 5:** The signatories of the ASO MoU should agree on a procedure through which the recognition of the ability of the ICANN Board to request the Address Council to initiate a policy development process through the RIRs would be provisioned.

As already established in Attachment A, Consideration 16, the ICANN Board may send communication to the ASO to consider the need for number resource policy development in addressing a specific problem or area. The ASO AC agrees to develop procedures for this eventuality.

| **Recommendation 6:** Update Section 6.1.1 of the ASO AC OP concerning the Address Council Review Segment to reflect the fact that the ICANN Board is now mandated to request advice from the Address Council on the merits of a forwarded global policy. | Agreed. |
| **Recommendation 7:** Section 6 of the ASO AC OP should contain a complete description of the GPDP, including Attachment A of the ASO MoU and all the associated procedures requested by the ASO MoU. | Agreed. |

### III) Recommendations regarding the presence of the ASO during ICANN meetings

**Recommendation 8:** The in-person meetings of the Address Council held during ICANN meetings should be open to all registered participants, at least for most of the agenda.

Agreed.

**Recommendation 9:** During ICANN meetings, the ASO should continue to organize, on an experimental basis, short joint sessions with interested SOs, ACs and GNSO Constituencies.

Agreed, to the extent that there are relevant matters between the parties to discuss.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recommendation 10:</strong>  The agenda for NRO/ASO workshops at ICANN meetings should be enriched, avoiding presentations that are already available in the NRO, ASO and RIR websites.</th>
<th>The agenda of workshops can be enriched to become more attractive to the ICANN audience and should be announced in advance. Presentations should focus on current and prospective ASO activities. Presentations could be made publicly available in the NRO, ASO and RIR websites.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 11:</strong>  The presentation of the ASO Report during ICANN meetings should always be delivered by the Chair of the Address Council.</td>
<td>When possible and where the report consists predominantly of subject matter in the scope of the ASO Address Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IV) Recommendations regarding enhancements to the ASO website**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recommendation 12:</strong>  The ASO website as a whole, and especially the homepage, should clearly reflect the fact that the ASO is an ICANN SO whose functions are fulfilled by the NRO.</th>
<th>Agreed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 13:</strong>  A detailed FAQ of the ASO should be added to the ASO website.</td>
<td>Agreed. This shall be completed before the end of 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 14:</strong>  A fully researched, documented and referenced history of the ASO should replace the existing history page of the ASO website.</td>
<td>Agreed. We note that the report from ITEMS International, particularly section 1, provides good value in terms of research to improve the history page of the ASO webpage. This shall be completed before the end of 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 15:</strong>  The ASO should translate the ASO’s constituent documents into the main languages in use within ICANN and the addressing communities.</td>
<td>Agreed. The ASO will endeavor to provide translated versions of the MoU and global policies in the main ICANN languages before the end of 2012.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendation 16:** The ASO website should be regularly checked for technical errors, broken links, etc. For this Reviewers recommend using the three W3C website validators.

Agreed.

**V) Recommendations regarding the enhancement of the ASO Procedures**

**Recommendation 17:** The procedures of the ASO should be labeled ‘ASO Procedures’, not ASO AC Procedures.

Agreed. The NRO EC and the NRO NC (i.e., the ASO AC) shall continue to work together in the development and completion of the “ASO Procedures”.

**Recommendation 18:** A procedure for the appointment of NomCom members should be added to the ASO Procedures.

Agreed.

**Recommendation 19:** A procedure for the appointment of members of the Affirmation of Commitments (AoC) Review Teams and any other ICANN bodies should be added to the ASO Procedures.

Agreed.

**Recommendation 20:** A procedure for advising the ICANN Board on the recognition of new RIRs should be added to the ASO Procedures.

Agreed.

**VI) Recommendations to the ICANN Board**

**Recommendation 21:** The ICANN Board should be urged to request advice from the ASO on policy issues regarding IP number resources other than global addressing policies.

No comment.
**Recommendation 22:** The ICANN Board should check if its Procedures for the Ratification of Global Addressing Policies are in conformity with the ATRT Report’s recommendations in this regard.

No comment.

**VII) Recommendations to the NRO Executive Council**

**Recommendation 23:** The NRO Executive Council should help to empower the Policy Proposal Facilitating Teams (PPFT) in their facilitation role.

The NRO EC and the NRO NC (effectively, the ASO AC) shall continue to work together in the development and completion of the “ASO Procedures”. The role of PPFT shall be further clarified.

**Recommendation 24:** The NRO Executive Council should respond to the ICANN Board’s request to react to the ATRT Report as soon as possible.

Agreed.

**Recommendation 25:** The ICANN Board and the NRO Executive Council should agree on the content of a FAQ of the ASO to be posted on the ASO website.

Agreed.

**Recommendation 26:** The ICANN Board and the NRO Executive Council are encouraged to agree on the content of a documented History of the ASO to be posted in the ASO website.

Agreed. The Secretariat of the NRO should develop a proposal to be broadly consulted, with the EC and NC, and also with the ICANN Board.

**Recommendations received in Public Comment Period**

**Recommendation #1:** We recommend that as part of the review of the ASO MoU, an independent entity is appointed by ICANN’s Board of Directors to undertake a review of the conflict-of-interest built into the ASO MoU which is unique to this Supporting Organization.

The NRO will mutually agree with ICANN on revised ASO Review procedure that provides a joint selection of an independent entity to perform the future ASO Reviews.