
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – Joint Session: ALAC and ASO AC
Sunday, March 8, 2026 – 15:00 to 16:00 IST

YESIM SAGLAM

Hello and welcome to the joint session, ALAC and ASO AC. My name is Yesim Salam, and I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod. Interpretation for this session will include English, French, and Spanish. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom.

When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record, the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English, and speak at a reasonable pace. I will now hand the floor over to Jonathan Zuck, ALAC Chair, and Hervé Clément, ASO Address Council Chair. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

There are two chairs you brought, right? Right. Thanks a lot and thanks everyone for being here. Thanks to the ASO for joining us.

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.

It is not a group that we have spent a lot of time with in the past, but increasingly with the whole RIR issues, it has felt like something that we should make ourselves more informed about. We are very excited to have you here. Without further ado, I am happy to hand the microphone to you to get us started.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Jonathan, thank you very much and hello to the ALAC. It is an At-Large community. That is right. We had this discussion with Sebastien. I know that and we are all part of the At-Large community. Exactly.

It is a joint meeting with the ASO AC, but we have a gift to offer to you because we are not only the ASO AC here today. We are the ASO as a whole with the presence of Jiarong Low, who is the chair of the NRO EC. I prefer to give you all the acronyms before and explain that afterwards.

Just to present ourselves, I am Hervé Clément, the chair of the ASO Address Council. We are here with Amy Potter and Esteban Lescano, who are the vice chairs of the ASO AC. Jiarong Low is the chair of the NRO EC.

All the groups, the NRO EC and the ASO AC, form the supporting organization, which is the ASO AC. We are here to present the status of our work about the update of the Internet Coordination Policy 2, the ICP2, which is the list of criteria adopted in 2001 to recognize regional internet registries. I think we have slides to share.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Michelle, is that a safe assumption?

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Excellent. You can go to the next one, of course. Thank you. First, one part of the ASO is the ASO Address Council, comprised of 15 people, three coming from each region, managing IP resources.

From the regions, you have two elected by the community and one appointed by the executive board of the regional internet registries. At the ASO AC, we advise the ICANN board on the questions they have about these sorts of topics.

We are unique within ICANN because the policies managing the IP resources are defined within each region, so they can be different from region to region. Sometime it could appear something which is called a global policy.

It is a policy common to all the regions and dealing with the distribution of resources from ICANN and more specifically the IANA, which is the function of the IANA dealing with that to the different regions. We oversee if the process to adopt a global policy is done in a good way.

We appoint two members to the ICANN board, Seat 9 and Seat 10, and also a member to the ICANN NomCom. We meet once a month virtually. The different meetings are open to everyone and you can go to the ASO website to have the details of the meetings.

This year there is important work. It has been the same since three or four years now: the update of the ICP2 document. We will at the end of the year restart an election for one seat of the ICANN board which will be Seat 9.

Of course, we still have ongoing surveys on the development of the different policies within each region to see if potentially there could be a global policy. Go to the next slide. It is just to see where we are.

We are here today, nearly all except Ricardo, who was not able to come. Normally, the first ICANN of the year is the ICANN where the ASO AC meets in person. Because it is very useful to see ourselves and to work together better, you can go to the next slide. As I can remember, with that, I can give the floor to Jiarong Low. Thank you.

JIARONG LOW

Thank you. Hi everyone. My name is Jiarong Low. I am the APNIC CEO and this year I am the chair of the NRO Executive Council. Some of you know me very well, especially from the APRALO community, because I used to work for ICANN. It is very good to be back and I am very happy to see everyone.

I will talk a bit about Regional Internet Registries. Essentially, RIRs are the organizations that allocate IP addresses. We have a close relationship with ICANN because IANA is the one that manages the entire pool of all IP addresses globally.

Based on the global policy, which is made by the ASO AC, it will allocate into five blocks for five different regions. That is the

relationship between ICANN and the RIRs operationally. It is important for us to talk about IP address allocation because it is one of the three unique identifiers.

It is very important for us in the At-Large community to not only understand this because you are our greatest advocates when we talk about the internet. Internet is not Wi-Fi, 3G, or 4G. It is also not Google, Facebook, or AI. In our space, internet just means the technology for your device to connect to mine.

To do that, we need three things that are all unique identifiers. We need to code our computers to speak the same language, so we use the same protocols. Globally, the organization that manages global protocol standards is the IETF, the Internet Engineering Task Force.

Then the Regional Internet Registries play a role, the RIRs, because we allocate IP addresses. Every device needs to have an IP address, then it connects to the internet. The Regional Internet Registries therefore play that role.

The third one is why we are here at ICANN, because people cannot remember the IP address numbers, therefore we use names. That is why we have the DNS. At ICANN, ICANN is the platform that coordinates domain name policy.

All three organizations, IETF, the RIRs, and ICANN, make up the sum that is the internet. If any one of our organizations were to get into trouble, be at risk, or have a weakness, we become, in some ways, the single point of failure that is the internet.

Everything else that builds on the internet, all the buzzwords talking today about AI, if we don't do our jobs well, all those internet-enabled technologies will cease to be able to innovate further.

That is why it is so important that we have this time together with the At-Large community because, like I mentioned, it is not just for you to understand it, but for you to advocate for it. Super important. I thought this is a good time that we can share this as background.

I mentioned how RIRs allocate IP addresses. We don't allocate IP addresses to individuals. We allocate them to ISPs, telcos, and network operators. Your ISP will then use the IP address block and allocate individual IP addresses to your device.

That is how you connect to the internet. Let us move to the next slide, which broadly and quickly covers the RIR functions. As for how much IP address space we can allocate, like ICANN where the community makes policy, likewise for RIRs, we are member-based organizations.

Our community also makes those policies. It is important for the community to be engaged. Based on the multi-stakeholder model, that is how we continue to evolve our policies as we go.

I will go to the next slide. Now I will cover the NRO. NRO basically is a cooperative body. We are not a legally incorporated entity, but we are a cooperative body comprising the five RIRs. As a group, we

are the NRO, and it comprises the NRO Number Council, which are the elected and appointed representatives like Hervé Clément, Esteban Lescano, and Amy Potter from each of the RIR regions.

Part of the NRO includes the NRO Executive Council, which comprises the five RIR CEOs. Together we are one body. At ICANN, we act as the ASO, the Address Supporting Organization. We are part of the SO AC structure.

Earlier, Hervé Clément's slide mentioned the responsibilities that we have, which includes being part of the NomCom and nominating two seats on the board. We are part of the governance of ICANN. Likewise, when it comes to ICP2, we are bound together in some ways in terms of coordination.

We have the relationship with IANA, but likewise, in terms of ICP2, ICP2 is where ICANN recognizes new RIRs. But that is a twenty-five or twenty-six-year-old document already. Every document like that is worth review to look at the weaknesses and how we can improve and strengthen the weaknesses that we have.

This is where we are right now in terms of the work. I will then pass the mic back to Hervé Clément to share with us where we are and where we will go from here. Thank you.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you very much, Jiarong Low. I won't spend too much time to explain the different processes through which we went to reach the

current situation of today. It is important to recall that because there were three consultations from that.

The legitimacy of the document we are updating and the document we will draft is the communities: the ICANN community and the regional communities. As a council at the ASO AC, we are not there properly to decide things from scratch on the document, but we are here to collect the feedback on the different communities and to try to synthesize them to make something which corresponds to the wish of the communities.

You can go to the next slide. Next one. Thank you. Just a piece of history around that. ICANN was established in 1998. There will be a QCM just after to show you follow that. Before ICANN, there was a history because first it was RIPE NCC to be formed, after that APNIC, and after that ARIN for North America.

This famous document we are talking about, the Internet Coordination Policy 2, was adopted in 2001. Via this document, LACNIC for Middle and South America and AFRINIC for Africa were created in 2002 and 2005.

As you say, Jiarong Low, twenty-six years is a while, specifically within the internet. Of course, it was obvious that this document has to be updated for two reasons. It has to be updated per se, but it was only used for the formation and the creation of regional internet registries, but not for seeing if the ongoing responsibilities are really fulfilled from each region.

It could be used also, in extreme cases, for the derecognition of a regional internet registry. That is the reason why, and it is on the next slide, the NRO EC, of which Jiarong Low is the chair, asked us for two tasks in October 2023.

The first task, which we did at the very beginning of the process, is to review and advise the NRO EC because we draft procedures for validating and addressing ongoing regional internet registry compliance. Those different criteria have to be used to see if a regional internet registry went in a good way.

We reviewed this draft at the beginning of the process. Then we went to a tough task, which is to update and to strengthen the ICP2. It is something we started to do at the beginning of 2024. Next slide.

There will be a lot of slides. I won't go very deeply, but just to see all the process and the timelines we went through. We are at the blue rectangle, which is the final review of all the work we did. We tried to summarize it in a version two of the document. I will explain what it is. We hope to go to the approval and the adoption of the document before the end of 2026.

Go to the next slide. It is the different steps we went through. I won't detail this slide neither, because it will be very important to have discussion after the presentation. We can go to the next one. That was perfect. That was the first document and the first work we performed.

It was to list principles for the drafting of the document we will reach. We drafted this document with a list of principles. You can go to this document via this QR code. There was a first consultation because we asked the different communities what they think about this document.

From ICANN, we had fourteen responses. As I can imagine, you were part of the responders. From the different regions, we have less than three hundred responses, but because the responses are more individual than in ICANN, which is global.

We analyzed the different answers and with that, we created a report about that which is also accessible. You can go to the next slide. To summarize the different outputs we had from the first consultation, it was a need to clarify the role of the different communities in the process of recognition and ongoing derecognition.

There was concern about this specific process of recognition and derecognition. There were some specific questions you can review when reading the dedicated document. Next slide. With that, with the first core principles and the different outputs, we were able to draft version one of the first document: the governance document for the recognition, operation, and derecognition of regional internet registries.

We have a new QR code to access this document. This draft is an update to the ICP2 we talked about at the very beginning. This

document, for instance, clarified the scope on the life cycle management of the regional internet registries.

It formalized the governance structures to be sure who is responsible for what and strengthened operational requirements. Next slide. You can see we have a first one to read the different answers we had from the regional communities, the answers from the ICANN one, and the document where we analyze the different outputs we had.

Next slide. The QR code I talked about was about the second consultations because each time we draft the document, we go to the communities on consultation to be sure to capture everything on the different questions we had.

Via the second consultation and the different outputs, we were able to draft a second version of the document. With that, we changed the title a little and added a preamble. It is very important because there were some remarks we read, but they were out of the scope of the document.

For us, it was very important to explain the scope of the draft of the document we had because even if every question was very important, some were out of scope and it is important to explain why. There were some questions about the implementation procedures, because if we recommend something, it is very important to see how you can use it in day-to-day life.

There were questions about recognition, derecognition, and audits, which we will talk about in a few minutes. Next slide. Another QR code to go to the version two of this document. Next one.

Because we want the community to have an easy way to read version two of the document, we created a redline of change to explain to the community the difference between version one and version two. That's the first document. The second one is the rationale behind each modification we made between version two and version one.

Next one. You will find another QR code to access the answer regarding the last consultation, the answer from ICANN, and the analysis of the different answers regarding version two of the document. Next one. Where we are now, and it will be my pleasure to give the floor to Amy Potter.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Can I ask a quick question? There was a lot of information that in many ways is reassuring that the process was rigorous and went through many steps.

If you were in an elevator at the bottom of a building and there were ten floors to go up, and by the top of the tenth floor when everybody got out, you had to summarize what really needed to be changed about the document to modernize it to incorporate what

has recently taken place, what would that sound like? What is the elevator pitch associated with the changes to the document?

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

I can elaborate a first answer and after I will let my colleagues complete. Many things are that there is no more the notion of outside recognition. You have ongoing life and the possibility to see what happens for a regional central history in its life.

There is a notion of derecognition and the specific role of each organization regarding this governance. There is a document which sticks to the real and current life of the internet. That is my first answer. I don't know who wants to complete. Jiarong Low?

AMY POTTER

What I would say is that the original ICP2 document that was written in 2001, many years ago, was written at a point in time when we were considering adding new RIRs to the entire system and it set forth the criteria for becoming a new RIR.

Implicit within that is the understanding that you need to continue to fulfill those obligations once you are an RIR over time. All of this time has passed since then. The world has changed in a number of different ways and we have learned a lot from seeing RIRs operate.

So revising the document came up. We wanted to make it explicit, not just implicit, that not only do you have to meet a certain set of

criteria to become a new RIR, you have to continue to meet those criteria over time.

If you don't, there are consequences because we need to make sure that the communities are able to still receive those services and to receive them in a functional, efficient way.

It is really just elaborating on those requirements and making sure that they are actually enforceable so that the communities At-Large can continue to receive internet services and IP address services.

JIARONG LOW

Jonathan, you asked such a great question. Now we are doing a barstool pitch competition, essentially. But the elevator pitch for the document is just summarizing what Hervé Clément and Amy Potter said.

The ICP2 document only focuses on recognizing a new RIR, but we have never thought about what if an RIR were to not function that well? How do we derecognize one? Largely, that is the main thing.

Then in between are the details, which are what Amy Potter largely said. How do you derecognize means if you fail to do your work well or if you were not financially sustainable. But who would play that role to determine that?

The document provides the guidelines, but we need an impartial body and another organization that comes in to do that. We at the RIR community feel, like I mentioned, that which binds us together

with ICANN. ICANN would be the most logical choice for us to do that together.

That is why this process comes in, which not just ties ICANN's role as a coordinating body together with us in looking at this whole process, but also the ICANN community. As we work on developing this document, it is important that we are all part of this conversation. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

I heard two things in there, really. I am wondering: did the criteria themselves also change because we know more about the management of RIRs as well? There was some shenanigans with people buying things from out of the country.

Did any of that stuff make its way into the criteria to be an RIR as well? Did the specifics change also? Just yes or no. I do not mean you have to go through them all.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Let me say it that way. The document explicates some conditions or obligations that maybe were implicit in the current ICP2 document.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Okay, Hadia, go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

Thank you. This is Hadia for the record. This is a quick one. You mentioned having ICANN as the body that would review the RIRs and determine if they are compliant or not. When you say ICANN here, are you talking ICANN Org?

JIARONG LOW

Short answer is yes, because you have to have an organization that implements the policy, the governance document we are talking about.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

Thank you. No, the ICP revisions... we have been following it, and they have been pretty robust and needed. We had a few questions on the implementation procedures, which mentioned that ICANN would be creating them later. That was giving a bit of a lack of clarity.

Some comments had come up that it would be nice if the final report also takes those into consideration. It is a tricky question I want to ask: given the geopolitics we are in today, RIRs are in different regions, and ICANN is in a particular country.

It was not thought of, but are you all also thinking in some lines regarding the jurisdiction challenges which may come? It is too soon, but looking at the polarized world we are in.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

There are general requirements or commitments that the RIRs have to comply with in order to be recognized as an RIR. One of these is, for example, to be incorporated in a jurisdiction that is a decision of the community.

It has to be incorporated, has to have good governance rules. There are a lot of requirements and obligations that the RIRs have to comply with. It is not connected with a particular legal system or a particular country.

This document is a global document and tries to establish general principles that then have to be implemented.

This document is not about implementation. The implementation will come forward with the details for the specific issues.

JIARONG LOW

Just to help to add some clarity as well. Like what Esteban Lescano is saying, the document is meant to be high level. It is similar to any ICANN policy. You want to keep some of the specificities out and leave that for implementation.

The reason is because if we start to talk about the specific implementation criteria, then we could have a four hundred page document and we will still be doing this after five years. The world is changing very quickly.

Increasingly we have to establish a structure to strengthen ourselves first, quickly. So there is the impetus behind the two. I

think the second question that Amrita asked about the geopolitics is a tricky question.

Given how things are, you do not know which part of the world is safe and which part isn't anymore. What is important is that we put in the resources, first of all, to strengthen the whole system with the RIR governance document globally.

Each RIR has to strengthen our resources to work within the jurisdictions that we are in and work with our host governments to make sure that we have not only engaged members, but engaged governments that likewise share the same mission of a single internet. Not all governments think the same, and that is one of our greatest challenges today. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Two more, and then we will let them...

ALFREDO CALDERON

Yeah, sure. I do have a question. I am Alfredo. Right now I am mentor for the NextGen, but I am here as part of the community.

My question is: basically what you're saying is that you are proactive within the document in terms of fortifying what we have right now, and that is basically it. You do not think that you are going to develop the document for the criteria to be proactive, thinking towards the future?

ESTEBAN LESCANO

No. The document makes explicit some content that was explicit and also adds a new mechanism of accountability and a new mechanism to empower the community to request audits on RIRs.

It is a complete revision. It is a complex document, but avoiding the implementation details. Implementation details will come further.

JONATHAN ZUCK

We have Claire Craig next in the queue. Claire, you have a question, and then I will come back to you.

CLAIRE CRAIG

I do. This is Claire Craig for the record. Following up on the question that Amrita just asked, since we understand that this document is not an operational document, but it is a more or less strategic setting out of the principles for how this is going to operate. Well, not operate, setting out principles.

Do you have a mechanism for ensuring that when you start to look at the operational issues, it could be done in a way that there is uniformity across the regions? What you find is that things happen differently in different jurisdictions, and sometimes the way it operates depends on the members of the RIR.

Something that may happen in one RIR may not necessarily happen in another one because this is what the members of that particular RIR want.

How do you ensure that there is some kind of continuity or level playing field across the RIRs? Or is that not something that you are concerned about? Thank you.

JIARONG LOW

Thank you for the question. Basically, the question is saying that the different RIRs all work differently operationally. So how can we be more uniform in implementation?

The short answer is that is why we need a third-party organization, and in this case, it is ICANN. So that when we look at auditing the RIRs, it's done in a standardized way across all the five RIRs.

Whether ICANN were to choose to do it themselves or ICANN were to appoint another vendor to do that, that's part of implementation. Having ICANN come in and play that role allows for that uniformity. That is the first point.

The second point is the document does provide... later Amy Potter will go into some detail, which is useful because it does provide, for example, a threshold for determining recognition or derecognition.

That will be decided by RIRs or the members of an RIR or ICANN. Again, it allows for that different permutation that it can take.

But at the end of the day, it has to be uniform across all the RIRs again. The document provides for some of that together. Taken as a whole, that's how we are going to look at it globally. Thank you.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you, Jiarong Low. Another focus from that is that this work of updating this document has been asked to the ASO AC, and the ASO AC by definition is a council comprised of people from the different regions.

When we analyze the different answers and the idea of implementing something, we have finally, because of the composition of the ASO AC, the advice and the experience of all the regions finally.

We had a cross-session at the beginning of this afternoon on a very specific point. It was not funny, but interesting because everyone, regarding its different regions, had slightly different answers to a question and via that, we could form something that could be, in my opinion, useful.

JIARONG LOW

Thank you. Will you speak in Spanish?

EUNICE PEREZ

Thank you. This is Eunice for the record. Thank you for sharing all these documents. They are all very interesting. I have one question. This is in connection with the operation, and this is what we see also in the document that you shared, because this includes the part of the operation of the RIRs.

This is in connection with the assigned blocks. When those blocks were assigned and they are proprietary of an organization, what does that mean? Does it mean they're no longer part of the RIRs?

In these documents, are you considering to regularize this? And also, do you have any statistics of how many organizations have their own proprietary blocks in Latin America?

Another question: one of the institutions that I belong to has one problem. That problem is they obtain their address block from IPv4, and when they want to make a request to their ASN, they are told they cannot assign them, even knowing that an ASN is good for you to ensure traffic when you are going to send addresses in your different websites.

What we were told at the time is that we needed to return the address block so that the new addresses in IPv6 now can be given because the other ones will no longer be required. I understand that this is something that allows you to have certainty in your institution.

JIARONG LOW

Thank you. I will take the first question. The second question, sorry, I do not fully understand it, so Esteban Lescano can probably do it better because I think there is a translation issue.

The first question is when IANA allocates to the RIRs, whether it is proprietary. Long story short, it is not. No RIR actually owns the IP addresses we allocate, and it is very important to emphasize this.

RIRs do not own or have any ownership over the RIR blocks that are allocated to us. We just function as a technical coordinator. In fact, I think this is such a great question, I want to say it again because some governments also think that the RIRs own the IP address and therefore they also want to own the IP address blocks for their countries.

That is not how it works. None of us actually own it, so it is good. We do not have a proprietary hold over the IP address we allocate, and our entire job is technical coordination.

We are given this whole block and we are given the function of allocating to any network operator or ISP who wants to run a network. Based on the policy that our community has defined in APNIC, for example, they have to show us a network plan.

In the network plan, they have to say how large the network size is and how they are going to use the IP addresses. We check that, and if it checks the policy, we will allocate those IP addresses accordingly.

There is no proprietary behind this at all. Once they are allocated to that ISP, they use those accordingly.

If they were found to not use the IP addresses in the way that they are supposed to, for example for APNIC policy, within the first five years, if they are actually not running a network with the IP address but lease it somewhere else, then they violate the policy.

APNIC's job then is to reclaim those resources and we put it in a reserve pool for twelve months so that it kind of refreshes itself. Then after that, we can allocate it again. But there is no proprietary behind this at all. That really helps to clarify for everyone to understand the role of RIR.

EUNICE PEREZ

Thank you. I am not referring to that. I am referring to my university having the contract for the block of IP before. My university is the proprietor in this block. My question is about the document that you share: talking about the regularization of these assignments where the universities or other organizations have these blocks as a proprietor.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

No, but I think that maybe we have to split the issue because there is some misunderstanding about this issue. You have two types of resources. First of all, nobody has property on the resources. The resources are authorized for use to a service provider or to an end user.

It is not my opinion; it is just that each RIR has its own policies that are developed on a PDP, a policy development process, conducted by the community. Those procedures or those rules established that there is no property on the numeric resources.

I think that you are referring to the legacy resources. Legacy resources are the numeric resources that were allocated before the creation of the different regional registers.

In that case, each region has a different solution, but they are resources that are not specifically regulated by the current policies. That is why I think that you come from Mexico, and Mexico is one of the examples where there is a lot of organizations that have legacy resources.

But those resources, in some way, have different rules than the generics or general resources that we are talking about. This document has no connection or nothing to say about the legacy resources.

JONATHAN ZUCK

So we've got...

ESTEBAN LESCANO

And let me say that because I think that it's important. In my case, I am also on the LACNIC board. If you have any questions, we can take them later on.

AMY POTTER

I will give one concrete example of one specific sub-provision of this document that I think might help clarify both that question and also the question asked earlier about the balance between the global nature of what we're doing here versus regional concerns.

Within this document, we are setting out the ongoing obligations of RIRs. That is sort of setting, "Hey, here are the minimum requirements that all of you have to meet." There are several; there are over twenty of them.

One of them is that every RIR has to have a policy development process that is open and transparent, that communities can participate in, and that are published.

Within each individual RIR, they develop their own PDPs that align with those requirements, but their individual communities make their own policies through that policy development process.

A lot of the policies that go through each individual RIR's PDP set out the requirements for receiving space from that RIR or for transferring space from one RIR to another. Decisions like that are made on a local basis within each RIR.

This document is more global than that. We do not get into the granularity of what one individual region is going to decide for itself or its own community about what works for its policies.

It is just setting out the requirement that you have to have this transparent, open process for developing policies so that the members of that community have rights to sort of self-govern in that sense, if that helps.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Okay. We have Cristobal next in the queue. You are still muted if you are...

CHRISTABEL MEBAGHANDU

Pardon me. Good day, everyone. Sorry, I did not realize I was still muted. Thank you for this document that you have shared. I want to appreciate you two for clarifying that it is more or less a strategy document.

My question is regarding derecognition. Am I still audible?

JONATHAN ZUCK

Yes, we can hear you.

CHRISTABEL MEBAGHANDU

Thank you. My question is about the recognition of an RIR. In the event that derecognition happens, I wanted to know what provisions does this document have for technical continuity so that the region that a particular registry is serving continues to have access and end users continue to have access? That is my question in a nutshell.

JARONG LOW

Thank you. This is Jiarong Low. I can answer that. Basically, the RIRs themselves have to have a backup system so that if an RIR were to be derecognized, it would go through that backup system

to ensure that everything can continue to function within that region.

Until the time when a new RIR were to replace it, then that RIR again would take over the functions. We have to establish a backup system. The backup system can take two forms. One is an emergency, if something happens very quickly.

In the ICANN setting for domain names, there is an EBO, emergency backend operator. We have to look into something like that as well, just in case.

At the same time, amongst RIRs, we have to have a backup system that allows for if something were to run a longer term, we are able to have a backup as well. We have to do both of these elements.

In some ways, at the high-level document, it does talk about these things. The implementation detail of how we are going to do that will have to be worked out again. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

All right, and finally, end of the queue, Aftab.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI

Hello, everyone. I hope you can hear me loud and clear. If I am out of the queue, just let me know.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Yes, go ahead, Aftab.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI

Thank you. Good to see some known faces. Thank you, NRO EC, for doing an amazing job. It is not an easy one, so again, I really appreciate that.

One request I have is it would have been nice to share that presentation a bit in advance so that we could have circulated it with the community to get more questions. In the absence of that, you will get questions from ourselves only.

The first question I have has two parts, so I hope someone can take a note. Because the RIR governance document now is moving towards finalization, could you please clarify how the final text will ensure the accountability mechanisms?

Whether they are clear, practical, and accessible to the communities they will be intended for? How will these mechanisms maintain confidence in the RIR ecosystem?

The second part of the question is: when will the community have the opportunity to review the revised version in the light of the concerns previously raised, as the written response was submitted by ALAC and different RLOs as well? That is all from my end.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Thank you, Aftab. Let me try to answer your two questions. The first, just to give you some examples, the document provides that the RIRs will conduct audits: two types of audits.

Periodical audits that may be in a time of three years or five years, but periodical audits that check that the RIR is in compliance with all the obligations and requirements of the governance document.

There will be also ad hoc audits that are audits that, for example, community members or ICANN or other RIRs can request in case that there is some non-compliance or some disruption in the provision of the services or in complying with the different obligations.

That is a way in which transparency is achieved. We think that, for example, this issue of the audit is a good improvement to the system.

Regarding the other question, we made three full consultation processes and it is not foreseen to have a new one. In some way, we are using this type of meeting, these joint sessions, to receive feedback from the different communities inside ICANN.

We are taking notes about the different interventions, the comments, and questions. I hope to answer your two questions.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Yeah, and I confirm that the idea regarding this current meeting is to take into account all the questions we have, including yours, Aftab, and to answer them each by each.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

And to say something about the step forwards, we need to finalize this process before the end of this year. Now we are discussing some open issues. The idea is to write a final version that will be presented or finalized in the next ICANN meeting in Seville.

Just to give you an idea of our timeline for the future.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you. Regarding the open issues you are talking about, we had more slides just after we wanted to comment, but I recommend you to read the slides to see what are the open issues and the drafting issues.

We have also with the different answers, so there will be an open session at the end of the meetings to wrap up all the work we would have done here during the week. Thank you so much.

JONATHAN ZUCK

All right. I want to thank the ASO and NRO, the closest Venn diagram to a circle, I think, that could exist. Thanks for joining us. As you can see, there is a lot of interest from our community, which is very diverse.

We appreciate you being here. Join me in thanking them for joining us. Now there is a short break.

Thanks to the interpreters, the staff, the tech folks, and everybody reading all the questions in the 75 places the questions can be deposited.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]