

---

ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – ASO Address Council Public Session (1 of 2)  
Sunday, March 8, 2026 – 10:30 to 12:00 IST

OZAN SAHIN

Hello, my name is Ozan and I will be monitoring this -- excuse me. Welcome to the Address Supporting Organization public session. My name is Ozan and I'm a Participation Manager for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and ICANN Community Anti-Arrestment Policy. Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I will also post them in the chat for your reference.

Only questions posted in the Q&A pod will be read aloud during the session, as time permits, and when directed by the chair of the session. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in Zoom and state your name for the record and speak clearly at a moderate pace. I will now hand the floor over to Hervé Clément

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

And good morning, everyone. I am Hervé Clément. I am the chair of the ASO AC and this meeting is a co-chair with Jia Rong. Jia Rong, I let you introduce you as well.

---

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

---

JIA RONG LOW

Hi everyone, I'm Jia Rong. I'm the APNIC CEO and I'm the chair of the NRO Executive Council this year.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Yeah, for the people who are outside of our group on the ASO, the ASO is a supporting organization of the ICANN related to numbering and address resources management. Roughly speaking, ASO is comprised of two parts, two legs. The NRO EC, first the current directors of the regions, and Jia Rong is this year the chair of the NRO EC and I am this year the chair of the ASO AC. and we will explain what is the ASO AC a little later in this document.

We have during this week in ICANN where the ASO AC is present face to face as we usually do, we are present to work in a document which is called the ICP-2 and we will go to the ICP-2 explanation as well. For transparency, we have organized two open sessions because the idea is to make and present our work publicly.

In the other session, we have closed session because we need to work closely and we will explain on who we work, on which we work. Lately also, but it's very important, one more time to have public session and there will be a last one. It will be on Wednesday, Thursday to wrap up all the work we will do for that. And with that, I propose to start.

We have a set of presentation. I will introduce the slide then Jia Rong, as part of the NRO EC, will present some information, a sort

---

of tutorial, on what is the registry internet system and what Regional Internet Registry does.

Personally, I will present then the work we have performed so far about ICP-2 and I will then give the floor to Amy and Esteban, the vice-chairs of the ASO AC then, to present what are the current issues we have to work on also. And, of course, the rest of the ASO AC will be free to complete our work.

Then the slide, I think that everybody is able to see the slide, we have displayed in Zoom and in the room as well, it's about the ASO AC. And it's about the document we are working on, which is the Regional Integrity Reference document Version 2. As you can imagine, there was a Version 1 also. It's about ICP-2 review process. You can go to the next slide. Thank you.

The ASO AC, which is a part of the ASO AC, is for Address Council. The ASO is a supporting organization of the ICANN, as I said, and the objective of the ASO is to advise on internet number resource policy. When we say about internet number, we said about IP addresses and number of autonomous system also.

We are normally 15 members, three from each of the five regions. We will have the map later to show you the region and in each of the regions, two of the members of the ASO AC are elected by the community, and one is appointed by the executive board of the dedicated regions.

---

What we do as the ASO AC, we advise the ICANN board on different questions the board could have on these questions. Within the different regions, it's up to the community to deal with the policy managing the IP resources and to accept it or not, depending on consensus.

So, policy varies from region, but there could be some time a policy which is common to each region on dealing with the distribution of resources, I will say, from the ICANN to the region, but the function of the ICANN dealing with that is called the IANA.

We appoint also two members to the ICANN board, seat 9 and 10, and we appoint somebody to the ICANN nominating committee. We meet remotely every month at the beginning. These meetings are open to everyone, so you can go, there is a link perhaps somewhere, to the website, to the ASO website.

If you type via Google, ICANN ASO, you can reach this website, and you can as an observer attend these meetings. And normally, we meet in person during the first ICANN meeting of the year.

And this year, so we will start at the end of the year the process for the election of seat 9, we survey the policy development process in each of the regions and to see if potentially there could be a global policy appearing and that will be the main part of this presentation. We conduct the ICP-2 review process. You can go then to the next slide.

---

And as it's always good to have pictures of people because it's more lively, so you have all the people there. Only Ricardo was unable to attend this meeting personally and for people in the room, so you can see all the people around this table there. Next slide, please. And I give the floor to Jia Rong for the next one.

JIA RONG LOW

Thank you. So, because we're talking to a broader audience, so I will cover a little bit about the unique identifier system before coming into the role of Regional Internet Registries. So, bear with me, my ASO AC colleagues, for hearing the same thing over and over again.

So, when we talk about internet in our space, it is not Wi-Fi or 3G or 4G fiber optics cables. It is also not AI or Google for that matter. It is the technology that connects your device to my device and to do that, we need three things.

We need to code our computers to speak the same language, in other words, we use the same protocols. And the organization that manages protocols globally is the IETF, the Internet Engineering Task Force.

Every device needs to have an address and those are IP addresses. So, the role of the Regional Internet Registries is to allocate IP addresses, but we don't allocate them to users. We allocate them to ISPs, telcos, network operators to run the network. And then

---

ISPs, in turn, when they provide the internet service to the user, they assign that IP address to your device.

I'll go quickly to the third part, which is, because people cannot remember IP addresses, so we use names. That's why here at ICANN, ICANN is the platform that coordinates domain names and decides on domain name policy. So, all three together form one unique identifier system, that is what makes the internet.

This system is in some ways for the public, something that nobody knows. Many people don't know that we exist because we manage an infrastructure that cannot be seen. Whereas if you see Wi-Fi or public fiber optics cables, satellite, you can see these things, but the things that we are managing here, you cannot see them so that makes it much harder.

But coming back to then again, the role of the Regional Internet Registries is, we have this relationship with ICANN's IANA function. The IANA function holds the entire pool of IP addresses, whether they are IP version 4 or IP version 6, and through the Google policy that Hervé mentioned, that policy decides how IANA then allocates IP addresses into five blocks to five different regions.

So, on this slide you can see we have five different Regional Internet Registries, each serving a different region. This ensures that we do not have overlap, we do not allocate the same IP block to two different people, which then will result in the system not working.

---

So that's the important role of coordination. So, that covers the Regional Internet Registries.

Then I'll come quickly to the NRO. As Hervé mentioned, the NRO comprises of the NRO NC, which is the NRO, Number Council. And this same group in the ICANN setting then functions as the ASO AC, the Address Supporting Organization, Address Council.

Now, the NRO consists of two parts, the NRO NC and also the NRO EC, the Executive Council, of which the RIR CEOs are a part of. So combined, then we are the NRO and combined we are the ASO that is part of the ICANN's SO and AC structure. So that's why we are here.

The NRO again is a coordinating body, so we make sure that we coordinate across the regional internet registries. And in doing so, we make sure that we are aligned in the key focus areas that we're working on. We make sure that we are aligned when it comes to global policy, coordinate accordingly.

And now when it comes to the work that is ICP-2, the RIR governance document, this is extremely crucial because we've identified ICP-2 is a 26-year-old document. And as with everything that we do in life, it deserves a review and we should look at how we should improve and strengthen our system. So, this is the background behind this work.

And with our governance model, which is multistakeholder, we have all our reps from the different regions and they take the

---

feedback from our Regional Internet Registry communities. And that's how we've gathered today, consolidated all that work together into one draft Regional Internet Registry governance document, the RIR governance document.

So, we have a very ambitious timeline to try to finish this document by the end of the year. And we do need a lot of support from our community, especially from the ICANN community as well, because we are strengthening our coordination together with ICANN.

And I think that's extremely important for both the numbering community and the names and ICANN community, to further strengthen our ties and our partnership. Only then can we deliver a document that would really make our entire system more robust.

Because it is on the one hand an RIR problem, an RIR system, but on the other hand, we are part of the entire unique identifier system that I mentioned earlier. And by improving and strengthening our coordination as an entire community, then we would ensure that we further future-proof our internet that we so love. So, I'll close with that and hand over back to Hervé, please. Thank you.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you, Jia Rong. So, you can go to the next slide. Very good explanation so you made. Perhaps, I don't know if you want to go to this slide regarding the function of Regional Internet Registry or something? So, you want to skip? Okay, go to the next slide. So,



---

the Number Resource Organizations, so you explained about that. Next one, please.

The ICP-2 review. What is ICP-2? Internet Coordination Policy. There are three documents called Internet Coordination Policy and only the two is dealing with the Regional Internet Registries and related management. And IP resources as you explained Jia Rong, it's an ICANN document and it was accepted in 2001 as you said 25, 26 years ago. So, as you can imagine, it must be updated. You can go to the next slide.

And what I didn't mention also is that the ICP-2 defines the criteria for the creation of a new Regional Internet Registry. Historically, as we are in an ICANN meeting, so to have a focus, the ICANN was established in 1998, but there was a life before.

So, the RIPE NCC first was established in 1992, then the APNIC, the region we are currently, in 1993. Then the ARIN for mainly the US and the Canada in 1997. I spoke about the ICANN. This famous and is now famous ICP-2 was adopted in 2001 and via the ICP-2 because the ICP-2 was used as a document on the list of criteria. The LACNIC for Middle East and South America was established in 2002 and the AfriNIC finally in 2005.

I will repeat also that it's a quarter century document. The world has evolved since then. It has to be updated and this document which is currently a list of criteria, need to be more explicit. Because it has to be a help, I would say, to survey, to look after the Regional Internet Registry ongoing responsibilities and to see in

---

extreme case if it could be used for the derecognition of a Regional Internet Registry. You can go to the next slide.

This ICP-2 review project, which is not a secret project for security or something, even if security is something, so we can take it into account also, this project. So, in October 2023, the NRO EC asked us, the ASO AC, to work on two subjects.

The first one is a document which is called ICP-2 Implementation Procedures, which was drafted by the NRO EC, and the NRO EC asked us if we are okay, I will say, about that. So, it's the aim to implement this criteria for the ongoing Regional Internet Registry compliance, and it's something we did.

And the second task, which is the main one, and it's something we have worked since the end of 2023, I would say 2024, is to strengthen to update this document, which is the ICP-2. You can go to the next one. Which is a summary of the work we have done.

I won't detail all the different square or rectangle we have here, but just to show, we are at the blue square now which is what we called finally the final review. And I will recall that we have performed different consultations till now and we hope to have approval and adoption before the end of these days. As you recall, Jia Rong, the idea is to complete the document and the work before the end of 2026. You can go to the next one.

Then the timeline, I won't go to the timeline because I will explain then the different steps afterwards. Next one. So, it's a part which

---

is completed, we started with a list of principles which we will drive to the draft of the document. Next slide.

Here in this slide, you see a QR code and as everybody knows you will see afterwards another QR code because it's a very easy and digital way to go to the document.

The first document the group drafted was a list of principles that as it is written, that will form the basis of the update of the ICP-2. This list of principles has been shared with different regions and the ICANN also in parallel for feedback and the consultation which was held between 8th of October and 6th of December 2024, we received 40 responses from the ICANN and nearly 300 responses from the different regions.

We analyzed the different outputs we had and we made a summary of report regarding these different principles. You can go to next one. That was the idea of the outputs we received from the different communities. It's about clarifying the role of the different communities. For instance, a Regional Internet Registry decision implies a corresponding process, that is necessary according to the governance model as a whole.

There was concern about the process of recognition, the recognition and different other question about the principle. Then you can go to the next one. Thank you. So that was about the list of principle. Then with that, we could go to the start of drafting of

---

the Regional Internet Registry governance document Version 1, which is completed now. Next one.

The Version 1, you have another QR code, you can reach the document if you want. With document we introduced detailed governance structures, operational requirements, and procedures for the full lifetime of the Regional Internet Registry recognition, the online life, and one more time in extreme cases, derecognition.

The scope was clarified about the document, the governance structures was formalized, et cetera, that was aligned with the output received from the first consultation about the principle. You can go to the next one.

Wow, over QR codes. You have a QR code about the archive discussions and the outputs from the community of the regions. You have a QR code reaching to the different outputs from the ICANN also. And you have a QR code to the documents summarizing the report we made regarding these different consultations as well. Next slide.

There was after that a Version 2 we were able to draft. Next one. So same, I won't go extensively to the list of the modifications we made compared to Version 1, but very important, we made a small change regarding the title.

And there is a preamble also because we noticed that some questions we had, 100% were not related to the document and the work we were doing. And the idea of the preamble is really to

---

explain, what is the scope of the document which help us to explain. If you made a certain comment and if we said we don't take into account it, it's because it's not of the scope of the document and the preamble helps it to do that. Okay, next slide.

Yeah, surprise, another one. And this QR code is to reach the Version 2 of the document, which is something. So, you really can read now because it's the basis of our work this week. Next slide. And to help to read this document, the Version 2, we have elaborate red line of changes. So, we clearly show you what is the difference between the Version 2 compared to the Version 1 as well. Next one.

And we explain also, the first document is to show what are the differences and this document explains that are the rational behind the different changes we made regarding Version 2 compared to Version 1 as well. And next slide.

Okay. So, you can have a very excellent collection of QR codes after that. Because it's the same as the Version 1, you have access to the different comments and from the region and from the ICANN and the report we made regarding the different answers we received about that. And we want to again thank you.

If you were part of the communities or part of the members who made answers regarding the different consultations, thank you very much for that because it's very helpful. Next slide. Where we are now and it will be my pleasure to give the floor to the vice chair.

---

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Yes, it's time for Amy, but let me jump in. I think that all the process that you well described shows that it's a process that is not beginning now. It's a process that took two years since the beginning that we made three public consultation rounds. First on the documents about principles, and the second on Version 1, and the third on Version 2.

Now, I mention that because, for example, yesterday there was a comment in the GAC session about if there will be a new round of consultation. And as I mentioned yesterday, I think that, well, we discuss it a lot and we understand that with three public consultation is enough and is not required to make a new one. Where are we now? Well, I think that we have another slide, Amy, if you want or --

AMY POTTER

Sure. So next slide. So, following the consultation on the second draft, we met as a group in Montevideo to review all of the very helpful feedback that we received.

As a result of that work, we put together a status report that was published to provide transparency to the community and highlight issues that are still under discussion that we are working on now, as well as the issues that we have already agreed an approach to and are moving forward to drafting.

---

Next slide. So, within the timeline, we're all the way here towards the end, we've published that status report and we're now just finalizing the document and finalizing a few issues.

Next slide. If you would like to see the status report, once again, we have a QR code for you here to read in more depth about some of the issues that Esteban and I will be presenting right now. Next slide. So next slide.

All right. So, of the issues that we are still discussing and working on here this week, one of them has to do with recognition review. So, during the process of applying to become a new RIR, if all of the existing RIRs do not unanimously recommend for that candidate RIR to be recognized within the system, the candidate RIR can request that ICANN review the recommendations of those RIRs.

There is a possibility still open that ICANN could either conduct that review itself or they could appoint an independent third party to do that for them. At this point, this issue is still in progress because we require some input from ICANN on which route they would prefer to go there. Next slide.

Also, during the recognition process, so if ICANN or the independent third party that reviews the recommendations of the RIRs determines that any of those RIRs that recommended against bringing in the new candidate RIR did so, based on a material error of fact or provided inadequate justification for that, the current

---

draft allows for the recognition of that candidate RIR if all of the other RIRs except for one recommend moving forward.

We've received some feedback that there might be instances that come up where there's a conflict of interest among the RIRs that are making those recommendations. So, we're still in the process of deciding what approach to go with there to deal with those situations. Next slide.

During the derecognition and ad hoc audit processes, both derecognition and ad hoc audits can be initiated by three different parties. They can be initiated by an RIR or group of RIRs, by ICANN, or by a group of members of the impacted RIR.

The issue with both derecognition and ad hoc audit that we are discussing still currently is what the threshold should be for the number of members that can initiate both of these processes.

Currently in the Version 2 of the draft, both of these can be initiated by 25% of the RIRs total membership or 2,000 members, whichever is lower. We've gone back and forth about what the appropriate threshold here is because each of the RIRs has a very different number of members and different criteria for becoming a member.

So, we'll be continuing to work on figuring out what the appropriate threshold there is for both derecognition and ad hoc audits. And whether or not they should be the same threshold or if there should be a lower threshold for audits than derecognition since derecognition is a much more serious matter. Next slide.



---

There's also a concept of an emergency continuity process within Version 2 of the document. This is intended to be a less severe outcome and derecognition. It would come into play if an RIR that currently exists is unable to continue to provide the services that it needs to their own community.

This process currently under Version 2 requires unanimous agreement of all of the other RIRs and ICANN in order to move forward with the emergency continuity process, which would allow an interim body to take over that role to ensure that the members of that community are able to continue to receive the necessary services.

We are still in discussion about what the appropriate threshold should be for initiating the emergency continuity process and whether it should be lower than a unanimous agreement among the RIRs and ICANN. Next slide. And I will turn this over to Esteban.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Yes, last but not least, we have some items that are under drafting. Those are items that were discussed inside the ASO AC. We received a lot of feedback from our last consultation and in some way, we have an agreement on how to deal with those items and that's why we select, we classify as under drafting. Please, next one.

And one of those items is, for example, the document structure. Well, we have in some way to improve the readiness and simplify

---

the document. Well, we are rewarding or reorganizing the document to improve flow and clarity. Next one.

Other item under drafting is the transition and continuity. This item refers to the smooth transfer of service and operations of the recognized RIR to an interim or successor entity as directed by ICANN. And the feedback we receive is that we have to ensure that communities remain engaged during the transition and to protect the rights of the affected resource holders. Well, we will add some text to the document to provide this continuity of services and protection of resources holder rights.

Next please. Regarding the audit obligations, the feedback we received that once an audit is done and if the audited RIR receives some recommendations, well, we have to clarify that the RIR will follow the recommendations did during the audit. Or as a conclusion of the audit process, we will add this text to the document.

And finally, we have also an item under drafting that is regarding, if the audit process has been part or not of the recognition process, in that case, we receive feedback requesting the audit to be a mandatory part of the process. We discuss this a lot on the video, and we decide that if the recognition is a last resource and is a process that has not to be delayed, in that case, it is not needed to include an audit or a specific audit as part of the process.

We also took into account that under Article 6.2 already creates an obligation to help and rehabilitate a RIR before any recognition

---

process. Then, with this specific item, we understand that it is not needed to change anything. Next one.

Yes, and here, it's regarding once the recognition process is initiated, well, the feedback we receive that is needed to put the rehabilitation as part of the recognition, as a specific step in which the other RIRs will help the RIR and the [inaudible - 00:35:51] to solve and to fix the non-compliance with the document. Then we will add an obligation to attempt to rehabilitate RIR before further the recognition step are taken. Next, please.

Well, and now that was the general overview of the process, the different steps, the consultations, the feedback received, the work that we are doing or we did, and now the work we have to do during this particular week at ICANN85. Next please.

The ASO AC will be here in face-to-face meeting. We have 10 working sessions, 10 closed working sessions. Also, we have four joint sessions with other ICANN constituencies as, for example, ALAC, GAC, ISPCP and the RSSAC, no?

JIA RONG LOW

We have RSSAC in the middle here.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Ah, yes, there. And also, this public session and another public session on Thursday as wrap-up of the work done during this particular week. Next one.

---

Well, looking ahead, I think that this is just to recall the timeline that we have, that, well, Hervé and Jia Rong expressed that the objective of this group is to finish the updating of the ICP-2 this year. Then we have this particular week in which we meet here in Bombay. We have to make a lot of progress with the objective of having B3 to be finished in Seville in the next ICANN meeting.

And after Seville, we will present the final version of the document that will be delivered to the NRO EC and also to the ICANN board for approval. As you can see, we have a tough timeline ahead and therefore we have to work hard during this week. Next please. Well, it's time for questions, comments.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Don't hesitate. Thank you very much for your presentation as well. I hope that, so for people who don't know our group, the way we work, the different acronyms, the details, it was clear enough.

So, to come back to what Jia Rong said, really the idea of his work and the update of this document is really to strengthen the system as a whole, as it is. And so, it was explained by you, Jia Rong, as well, that the resources we deal with at the end of the day is related to everybody because now nearly everybody uses internet as computers, mobiles and so.

And even if you're not aware of, you all use IP addresses in a certain sense. So, the floor is to questions or remarks, if you have. So, we

---

are really happy to answer what you want. Brajesh, so Brajesh was part of the NRO EC in the past.

BRAJESH JAIN

Thank you very much. This is for the record Brajesh Jain as one of the community member. The question which is being raised by security agencies in our part of community is how many IPv4 addresses are not in the registry system or reserved?

IANA tells that certain addresses are reserved like 192 and certain addresses are given to RIRs. And certain legacy IP addresses, I think IANA made efforts to put them into the registry system, but do we have a record of how many IPv4 systems are not in the RIR systems, either allocated or unallocated? Thank you. They may be in the system, but not allocated. Thank you.

JIA RONG LOW

I can take that, yeah. So, Jia Rong speaking for the record as well. I don't have the numbers offhand, but we definitely would have it because IANA has to keep track of its own record in terms of its allocation. And each of the RIRs would have a record based on what's allocated to us and what's been further allocated downstream. So, there will be a record of how the addresses are blocked in different ways, but the best way that we can follow up is, I have to get the data, Brajesh, unfortunately, then we can circulate that around.

And I've discussed with Hervé yesterday, also for our colleagues in the ASO AC, throughout the ICANN week we can be getting questions from various community members. And I think it's useful for us to always be able to close the loop, so we will make an effort to, if we are unable to respond on the spot during the sessions themselves, we will respond in writing through the secretariat. So, we will respond again in writing so that people would have a clearer sense of, for example, Brajesh's question. So, we will be able to respond.

And then it's also public, so everyone can see where the questions are and what the responses are. I think that's very helpful from a communication perspective as well. So that's something we'll work on during the week. So, Brajesh, bear with us first, please. Thank you.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you, Jia Rong. Other question, compliments? So, I am connected via the Zoom as well and if you confirm me, I don't see any specific question on that.

OZAN SAHIN

No online questions yet.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Okay, I let perhaps one minute. Okay, perfect. Go on.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER

I am [inaudible - 00:43:02] speaking for myself. The question which Brajesh asked has a second part also and that second part is as to what are the actions being taken by the RIR community worldwide to get these IP addresses back into the system and get them, you know, allocated and get them into the system? Thanks.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Kevin.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

So, sorry, Kevin Blumberg. I guess my first question that I'm trying to understand is, how is this part of the remit of the ASO AC? I appreciate the question.

There are some great organizations that look into these things. Team Kamru, as an example, has the Bogon list that looks at this type of thing. And I think it is definitely a question for the RIR communities in terms of, is there space that is not allocated out of the total pool, historical legacy space, et cetera? But is this a question for the ASO AC or is it a question for the local RIR communities, is my question.

And I'm asking it because it is very easy for the ASO AC to take on work. It is very hard for the ASO AC to recognize that the work that we're taking on is not actually for us, it should be for. Another example is the global, we get asked about global policies all the time, where a global policy is a very specific terminology between the RIRs and IANA.

---

When most people are asking about global policies, they're talking about it in the role of between the RIRs, which is not what a global policy is. So, for my colleagues, sort of my question here is, is this question an RIR question that Jia Rong, as an example, can take on? Or is this a question of the ASO AC? And I think it's more it's for Jia Rong from an NRO EC perspective.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Thank you, Kevin. I also want to add that there are different solutions in different regions because sometimes these type of questions are answered by specific policies that develop it inside the regions. That is why maybe there is no only one answer, you need to reach at the specific policy in the specific region, or other initiatives, sometimes are not policies, are directives from the RIR that established how to manage this particular situation. Go on.

JIA RONG LOW

Ladies and gentlemen, so don't mind, let me respond first. Thank you. So let me help to respond as well. So, referring to what Kevin is saying, yes, I totally agree. So, the question is more relevant for the RIRs directly themselves and similar to Brajesh's question. So, it's more for me to get the information and I will share that back as a follow-up. So, it's not extra work for my colleagues who are here. I just made that very clear.



---

The short answer to the last question is that there's two parts to it. The first is each RIR have different ways of managing it. So, each RIR is managing it differently.

So, for example, for APNIC, we did reach out to operators and some of them are individuals who got blocks of addresses from Jon Postel directly before. And we ask them, do you want to still hold on to them if you're not using them? Or would you like to return them to the pool? We ask them this question. It's a consultative way of doing it. And some of them returned the IP addresses because they stopped using it, but it's different from region to region.

Now, that said, at a broader level, for the NRO EC, we had a strategy discussion just recently and the question again is, is reclaiming more IPv4 address a relevant thing for us anymore going forward?

Because we've been talking about, let's move to IPv6. IPv6 is the way to go going forward. And on the other hand, we're still holding on to v4 and also then posturing for ourselves that we say IPv6 is important, but at the back, we are still holding on to v4, which is not helpful.

So, as a strategy across the NRO EC we will be publishing this, we will be focusing on the importance of IPv6 and also planning for, there will be a day when we will be in the world without IP version 4. That's the direction we want to go towards.

---

Because only then can we scale the network much more, but when we are holding on to some of the legacy methods of running the networks, we are actually limiting how the internet could further scale. So that's where we are thinking currently. So that's the not too short response, but I think it's important to address both elements.

Then, like I mentioned, it's my responsibility to follow up on the earlier questions related to RIRs. So, my colleagues at ASO AC, don't worry. Yeah? Thank you.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

And thank you, Jia Rong, that's very helpful on this compliment. And thank you, Kevin, it was very helpful as well. And that's the reason why we added the preamble, as I said, to the Version 2. Also, sorry.

SHIVA UPADHYAY

Hello. For the record, my name is Shiva Upadhyay. So, I have a few observations on the feedback status report on the ICP-2. So, one of the few questions, short questions I would like to ask, like we have some kind of arrangement of RIRs like SLA with the IANA.

So, in the current document, do you have any thoughts on how the accountability of the RIRs for the community, do you think there should be need to have some kind of a service level agreement with the ICANN or community where we can say derecognition can be initiated if the particular RIR is not going to deliver the required

services or maybe they are unfair to the community in distributing the IP resources? So, can we make some kind of obligations on the existing RIRs?

And the second observation is on the conflict of interest. Second observation is like we already having a part RIRs and RIRs admit like we need to cooperate among themselves. So, one of the example is transferring the resources. When someone from one area is transferring resources to the other area, they need to have some kind of cooperation between them that we understand.

But at the same page, like you can't be judging your own case what we say. So, what are your thoughts on how you are going to address these concerns? Thank you very much.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Yeah, there is some aspect in your question. To be sure, so when you were talking, Esteban, about the open points and the ongoing points we are dealing with, I think there are some aspects that are connected to your questions in detail. And we have no specific answer yet, but we are aware of -- I don't know if you want to add something.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Yes, just to add that regarding the provision of services, we established in the document some principles that have to be complied by the Regional Internet Registry during their life cycle. And those principles include the provision of registry services and

---

other services in a regular manner, in good shape. I think that in some way it is connected with your question, one of your questions.

And the other regarding the conflict of interest, we are working in some of the provisions to avoid that and to establish specific remedies or specific procedures for the case of the recognition of new RIR or derecognition, but it's included in the discussion that we are having.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Definitely and to complete, I see Amy and Andrei wanted to add option. Amy?

AMY POTTER

Sure. So, one of the many QR codes on here is Version 2 of the document. If you wanted to look in more detail, section four, Version 2 of the document lays out many of the ongoing obligations of each of the RIRs to ensure that they're continuing to provide services to their community and to their members.

And there are a variety of processes throughout the document including derecognition, that holds them accountable to those for failing to comply with those obligations. But there are quite a few of those that I think address your concerns in there.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you, Amy. Andrei?

ANDREI ROBACHEVSKY

Andrei Robachevsky. Yeah, I'd like to stress that in the document, there are also provisions for audits. And there are regular audits and there are also ad hoc audits that can be triggered by the membership of the area themselves, by other RIRs, or by ICANN. So that sort of, I think, safeguards continuous accountability and safeguards that all the services and all the commitments are held.

I also would like to mention that RIR accountability is not just appearing now in this document, it was on the RIR radar for many, many years. The periodic surveys, if you go to the NRO website, you will see area accountability there and some stakeholder surveys that are regularly conduct. So, this is not something that appears in the new version of the document, it was already in the system. Thank you.

JIA RONG LOW

Thank you. This is Jia Rong for the record. Just to add from what Andrei was saying as well, we're not suddenly then creating accountability mechanisms. The RIRs have accountability mechanisms built into our day-to-day. So, for example, we have two conferences a year, during which we have the annual general meeting and annual members meeting.

So, during these conferences, we published our reports and the community and the members can grill our board members any question they like. And in there, we also then published the reports

---

of the satisfaction levels from the members vis-a-vis our services. So basically, that's part of the governance and accountability and transparency mechanisms in an RIR already.

Now, tied to the RIR governance document, that's why there is one particular area which talks about the threshold. When you have members, 25%, that can trigger that threshold, it's when a particular RIR in its own governance mechanisms seems to be, for like a better way of saying failing, where a large number of members have become dissatisfied and therefore, they can trigger that as well.

So, it provides for one other mechanism to do the trigger, but again, each RIR has its own accountability processes and mechanisms in place already, but this further enhances and provides a more robust means for the membership in the community to work with RIR. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER

So, I was going through the Version 2, so one word, the good faith was there. And second is like, I do agree we have a very good system, but what triggered the ICP-2, so we should not forget that, like it triggered by, one of the RIR was not performing as per the expectations. So, we have a good faith on the RIRs.

But what triggered the ICP-2, like amendments and what communities started discussing because I don't want to take the name, but we all know, aware what it triggered. So, we have to

think, like today we are working, fine, no problem. Like from last 10, 20 years, we are working fine, no problem, it's good. We are full faith, but we should be able to address what happened like one or two years back. That should be captured in the document clearly, audits.

And if there is an agreement and they will be contractually binded somewhere, like not today, maybe in future, we can have a set of parameters that is mentioned in the governance document of Version 2. I agree like there will be a regular audit. They have to provide reports. And also, within the RIRs also they review their own work. They select people from the community who reviews. It's open, multistakeholder model, I appreciate, but after all that, that happened. That is the reality and we should work on that. That's it. No problem.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Kevin?

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Thank you. Kevin Blumberg. I'm going to speak, I'm going to be very direct here and say this is my opinion, this is not the council's opinion.

Right now, ICANN is going through something called a Review of Reviews. What is the Review of Reviews? It's to review the fact that the reviews are too much work, that we put too much into the bylaws related to the review process. And now, less than 10 years

---

later, we're already having to completely review the review process. I'll say review a couple more times.

One of the hardest parts of the past two years has been the term we. Who is we? Okay? It is very easy to get completely bogged down where it is impossible for the RIRs to actually function because there are so many parties that aren't part of it, but not part of it, but get to have a say in it.

And I think when we looked at the percentages, that's an ongoing thing right now. Is it 25%? Is it this? Is it that? It's to come up with that balance between having an effective set of organizations and an effective set of multistakeholder requirements without bogging down global organizations, organizations throughout the world, in things that may work in one region, but not another region.

This is meant as a high-level document. There's an implementation, and I think this is the most important one. There's an implementation document that is going to have to come out of this, that's going to have to be worked on between the RIRs and ICANN.

That is coming down the road, but for now, this needs to be a high-level document. It needs to have aspirations in it and good governance in it and all of those things. But the more specificity us as technical people put into it, the more complexity we create and the more problems we create.



---

So, it needs to be something that is high level, that allows us to have all of that, but at the same time, then flow through with more information. Otherwise, we're going to have a 400-page document that specifies everything and then five years from now we're going to be going, wow, we really didn't mean to create this complexity.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

And thank you, Kevin and I like that. So, one more time, there's a current document we were presenting and we are working on really is, it's a basis, it's a frame, it's a general framework for that and we have a lot of question of -- there is this question addressed to us.

Is this question be included in the global document or in a future implementation document, which will give us the details perhaps you are requesting currently? And for some question, it's something and it's something so we will study this week also at a certain point, but thank you for that.

Same, I don't see anything on the chat. Is everybody in the room happy with the presentation and the explanation we gave afterwards? So, if no any additional questions, I can propose to adjourn this public meeting. Thank you, everybody, for attending.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

I want to second it.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

It's our process.

OZAN SAHIN

Thank you. Please stop the recording.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**