OZAN SAHIN

Hello and welcome to the Address Supporting Organization Address Council public session number two. 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 Comprehensive Anti-Harassment 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 or otherwise as directed. When speaking, please 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

Thank you, Ozan. I am Hervé Clément, the Chair of the ASO Address Council. This is the last session and it's an open one for the group to work and to present as well. This week was the opportunity for the group, for the SOAC to work and to continue our work on updating a document which is called the ICP-2 and this presentation will replace the work of the document I will say in the history and say you some words about the work we have performed so far.

This presentation will be co-presented by me first and then by Amy Potter and Esteban Lescano as the vice chair, knowing that all the group, nearly all the group ASO AC is here, so thank you for that. All this week, we have been supported by the legal of the region, by the CCG. So, it's a communication team of the different regions as well.

We have the support of the ICANN, the staff of the regional international registries we have ASO and it's something I will recall about and a part of the ASO is the NRO EC which is comprised of the CEOs, the directors of the different regions and we are here, Jia Rong, the CEO of the APNIC as well.

And after saying that, we can go through the slides. So, Ozan, if you can go to the next one. As I said, we are the ASO address council. We are here to advise on internet number. So, we are to advise the community and the Board on that. We are comprised of 15 members, three from the different regions. So, you have, for instance, the RIPE NCC for Europe, the AFRINIC for Africa, etcetera.

What do we do normally? As we said, it's a role of advisements. We advise the ICANN Board. When there is a global policy, you have policy managing the IP resources within the different regions, but sometimes there could be a global policy which is a policy common to each of the regions and we deal with the distribution of resources between the ICANN and more specifically the IANA with the dedicated function within the ICANN to the regions. We appoint two members to the ICANN Board, seats 9 and 10, and somebody also to the ICANN nominating committee.

In terms of transparency and in terms of work we have to do, we meet every month virtually via Zoom session. If you go to the ICANN ASO website, you can find very easily, you have the information about the meeting you can attend. So, don't hesitate to do this meeting at public and everybody can attend as an observer. And usually, we meet in person during the first ICANN meeting of the year, which is the case currently.

All the group except one have met personally on site in Mumbai. And this year we will start at the end of the year the process for the election of the Seat 9 for the ICANN Board. The ongoing work we have to do is to see what are the policy discussion within each of the region and to see if there is potentially a global policy.

And a big work we have to do and we continue to do is about the ICP-2 update. You can go to the next slide. Here we are, except Ricardo was not able to be there, but he attended from South America in 2 a.m., 3 a.m. in the morning, all our sessions. So, we are very dedicated to our work, as you can see.

You can go to the next one. ICP-2. ICP-2 was adopted in 2001 by the ICANN. It's the list of the different criteria to create a regional internet registry. And as it was adopted in 2001, and in 2001, there were three regions that have been created. Before, it was the RIPE NCC, the APNIC, and the ARIN. And after that, there was the ICANN in 1998. And the other document, this document, the Internet Condition Policy 2, the LACNIC and the AFRINIC have been established.

By definition, this document is a quarter of a century old. As you can all know, the changes change a lot, a little, I don't know. So, it was necessary to update this document. And it was not very clear about how these criteria could be used. For sure, it was used for the creation of a regional internet registry, but not for the ongoing life of one, and in extreme cases, de-recognition. And for that, you can go to the next slide.

The NRO EC, I talked about just before, asked us, the ASO Address Council, to review first the document they have drafted. And the purpose of the document was to validate and address ongoing regional internet registry compliance with this document, with ICP-2. It's a task we have performed at the very beginning, and then to strengthen or to update this famous document.

And it's something we started in 2024. Now, you can go to the next one. And so, you can see it was two years ago. It's normal that you see the timeline you see on the screen. You can see grey squares on that. If it's grey, it's the signification that it's completed. And I will go through roughly the different steps of our work before that. And we are currently on our final review of the document before the approval and adoption, which is something we continue to discuss.

And we are in Q1, Q2, and we are still working on the different version, the last version of the draft document we are talking about, and I will talk about also.

Next one, next slide. We started our work in October 2024 with different consultation, but I will go through the three different consultation we had in the next slide. And so, I won't describe the different document, but it was a good idea to go to the next slide.

So, thank you for that, Ozan. We started our work with a draft of the core principle that will after was used to create the first version of the update of the ICP-2. We drafted one. You have a QR code to reach this core principle document. This core principle document went into regional consultation. There was a consultation within the LACNIC region, within the ARIN region. And it was a consultation within the ICANN as well.

It was between October and December 2024, this consultation. We received a lot of answers. You were able to analyze each of the answers, knowing that there could be answer out of scope of the document, and we explained why it was out of scope. And for the other comments, not out of scope, we explained how we use it to create the new version of the document. And if you go to the next slide.

With that, we were able to draft a Version 1 of which is called the Regional International History Governance document. It's the ICP-2 update. And this document, for instance, because it was not clear if the criteria could be used for the ongoing life of the day recognition. So, we clarified the scope of the document on life cycle of original international history management.

There were in the document governance structure we talked about. So, we formalized it clearly. Original international history performed operational functions. So, this document, the Version 1 strike fund is operation one. And there were additional clarification. And this QR code here help you to reach the Version 1 of the Regional International History Governance document. This document went to consultation as well.

And with that, you can go to the next slide, please. And after the other consultation, and within the region, and within the ICANN, we were able to draft a Version 2 of this document with the modification of the title. For example, it's something I stressed during each presentation. There is a preamble. Why a preamble is for this precisely describes the scope of the document, because as I said, among all the comments we received on for the region and from the ICANN, there could be some out-of-scope remark and it helps us this preamble to explain why it is out of scope.

And then I will let you read the challenge regarding this document knowing that via this QR code, sorry, sorry for that, you can access to the document and there are two other supporting documents, the red line, who explains the challenge between the Version 2 and the Version 1. And there is, I would say, a rational document to explain why we made some change between the two documents.

Next one. And you have all the information about the two documents and related to the two consultations, the two last. So, there was one, I said, for the quad principal, there was a second consultation between April and May 2025 and another one between August and November 2025. And you can access to the different comments we received via the different consultation. You can go to the next one. Where we are now.

Next one. We met after the third consultation, we met in Montevideo, which is the headquarter of the LACNIC to review the different feedbacks. We add a lot, we create subgroups within the council to work topic by topic and to, one more time, it's the same process. It is very, very important for us to read all the comments, to be sure to capture everything from the communities, regional one and ICANN one.

We were involved in Montevideo to solve some aspects, but after that, it was remaining open issues and drafting issues. And it's something we continue to do this week and we will continue also by, I would say, at least June 2026.

And with that, I think I can give the floor to Amy for the issue I was talking about. Thank you.

AMY POTTER

So, we've had a lot of really great and really productive conversations this week, working through our open issues. And so, I'll give you an update on where we are on those now.

Next slide. So, there's the issue of recognition review and the role of an independent third party there. Under the current version of the document, if the existing RIRs do not unanimously recommend recognition of a new candidate RIR, the candidate RIR can request ICANN to perform a recognition review.

And the issue that was open there is whether or not ICANN would be performing it itself or an independent third party would come in. We've had some great discussions this week and the sort of status of that right now is we're just waiting to get clarification in writing from ICANN on the role that they would like to take within this process.

All right. So, still on the Recognition Process, under the current version of the document, it allows for recognition of a candidate RIR with one dissenting RIR under certain conditions. We had really in-depth conversation about this process throughout the week. And we're really trying to consider the issue of conflict of interest that might exist among the existing RIRs when a new candidate RIR wants to join in the system.

We came to the agreement that we think unanimity is too strong of a requirement here and also that the process of recognition really needs to take under consideration the possibility of conflict there. So, we've got quite in-depth in our discussions on how to modify the process to ensure that the conflict is considered well within that process. And so, we're now in the process of drafting through some new more in-depth procedures that take conflict into consideration.

We also talked quite a bit about the Audit Process. So, within the document version 2, there are two different audit processes. There's a regular audit that in the second version occurs every three years. And then there's an Ad Hoc audit process that can be initiated by an RIR, a group of RIRs, ICANN, or a group of members of the impacted RIR.

So, we spent a lot of time thinking about how does the regular audit process and the Ad Hoc audit process work in relationship to one another. One concern that we were really trying to give a lot of thought to was we didn't want the RIRs to end up in this situation where the Ad Hoc audit process could be abused and the RIR would constantly be under this process of going through these cumbersome audit reviews.

So, we took a few different approaches to deal with this issue. We agreed that regular audits and Ad Hoc audits would have different scopes and we would allow for a process that would have the Ad Hoc audit process be much more narrow in scope than the regular audit process. We also agreed that the regular audits would occur at least every five years instead of every three years to prevent the RIRs from really being burdened in this constant audit process.

We also agreed to change the name of the Ad Hoc audit process to reflect how it was going to be a more targeted compliance review because we understand that in different regions the term audit has a totally different meaning and we felt like a more targeted compliance review better reflected the fact that this in-between process is really targeting something much more specific that the RIR is being reviewed to see whether it's complying with.

So, right now we're in the process of fleshing out exactly how those details are going to play within the text, but we really made a lot of great progress there this week.

We also talked a lot about the Emergency Continuity Process, both the initiation of emergency continuity and how it's renewed. So, under the current version of the document, the process for initiating emergency continuity requires the unanimous agreement of all of the other RIRs and ICANN. And we talked about whether or not that, you know, if a real emergency situation arises, whether that process really can rise the equation quickly enough to ensure that the affected communities are able to continue to receive services.

And we also wanted to balance that with a concern that, you know, we don't want the process to be abused. So, we reached agreement that we want a more simplified initiation mechanism and we wanted to allow the impacted RIR to initiate emergency continuity for themselves because it's entirely possible a scenario could come up where the RIR itself recognized that it needed some help due to the emergent situation.

So, we wanted to give them the ability to kick off that process themselves. We also agreed that we didn't want to limit the number of renewals that could occur under the emergency continuity process because we don't know what the sort of source of the issue giving rise to the emergency continuity process is. And we wanted to allow for flexibility. We agreed the text will allow the emergency operator to take a staged approach in providing the affected RIR services.

So, if the emergency continuity process goes on for a longer period of time, this will allow the emergency operator to, you know, piecemeal take on the RIR services based on doing, you know, a triage of the situation. Let's get the core functions out there first and then in a staged approach take on additional services. So, at that point, I will hand it over to my colleague, Esteban.

ESTEBAN LESCANO: Excellent. Thank you very much, Amy. Well, we also have these items under drafting that we also made some progress this week. Next, please. We are not going one by one, but there you have, there was a transition and continuity, audit obligation, the recognition, in this case, the rehabilitation as part of the recognition.

And finally, the document structure that we agree that we need to improve the readiness of the document and the flow. Next, please. Well, this week was a very, very busy week. I think that we have to be very proud of the work we did this particular week and the discussions we already have. And the work done includes some sessions with other constituencies inside the ICANN ecosystem.

And I congratulate the CCG for the summary of the interactions with the different constituencies, but we met with the GAC, we met with the LAG, we met with the RSSAC, with the ICANN Board, with the ISPCP, and we had two public meetings, one at the beginning of the week, in order to provide information about the work we planned to do at that time. And now, this final session with all the information about the work done.

I think that it's not needed to go point by point, but it's a good summary of all the, well, you can see the key concerns raised for each of the constituencies and the response that we already did to fulfill the different expectation and the comments arise from the different communities.

Next, please. Looking ahead, the future. Well, the first thing to consider is that we are planning to, or the compromise we have with that process is to finish it before the end of the year. Regarding the specific document, we are working and we will continue working to have it finished in a final version for the Seville meeting.

We will meet again face-to-face in a similar way, and I think that with a similar dynamic that we had this particular week, in order to finish the drafting of the document. And then, we had to present it to the NRO EC for approval, and once it be approved by the NRO EC, it has to be presented to ICANN for final approval. We hope to complete this proposed timeline. Next, please.

Well, finally, just to remark the congratulations to all the ASO EC members, the support staff from the RIRs, the CCG, the legals, Germán as our secretary of the NRO, and the observers. It was a very productive week, and well, thank you for that, and congratulations to all.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

And the floor, thank you so much. The floor is open to questions, if any.

DEBRA SWATILAL

Thank you, and thanks for giving me the floor. My name is Debra Swatilal, for the record. I'm an end user of the internet, and I'm speaking here in my personal capacity. I just wanted to start by saying this is a genuinely difficult task that all of you are doing, building consensus across such a wide range of voices and perspectives is not easy. So, thank you so much for that. I have two questions that I hope the group could help me understand.

The first one is on recognition. It is much appreciated that ASO EC acknowledges that the question remains as to whether the current mechanisms adequately balance these concerns around conflict of interest. I want to understand how the AC is thinking this will be resolved. I mean, ICANN's foundational principle is a multi-stakeholder, bottom-up, community-driven approach.

So, my question is, if existing RIRs are the ones making the determinative call on whether a new RIR gets recognized, and that goes to the ICANN Board after that, how do we ensure that the Board's role in this process is one of genuine deliberation and not just ratification of what has already been decided by the RIRs? I think that question matters because it goes to the heart of what makes this organization's decision-making legitimate.

The AC has also mentioned in various presentations made during the course of the past few days that the unanimity minus one mechanism is still under discussion and that a supermajority model is being considered. But I want to flag that if two RIRs or more than that are conflicted and excluded, and three or fewer voters remain, and a supermajority threshold is then applied to three voters, effectively it will still require unanimity and still might give de facto veto to at least one RIR.

So, my question is, will the supermajority model actually solve the unanimity problem, or will it in reality be recreated and maybe under different conditions? And there is a further dimension that I think deserves attention, and I want to clarify that I raise this not as an accusation, but as a genuine governance question. RIRs that work closely together over years quite naturally, without any malicious intent, develop reciprocal understandings.

So, one RIR will support another RIR's position today, and that might be reciprocated later on. So, this kind of quid pro quo dynamic does not require bad faith to exist at all. It can emerge organically from long-standing working relationships. But it is also impossible to detect this sort of a situation. It is impossible to prove in, impossible to prevent under any peer-voting model, regardless of threshold.

That, in my opinion, is a structural governance gap that threshold, a threshold model alone may not be able to close. The ASO MOU signed by all the parties also says the RIR's role is to provide recommendations to the ICANN Board. My question is, is a peer-voting model where entities with a direct financial or territorial interest in the outcome hold determinative power really is consistent with that language?

The MOU says that the role is only to advise the ICANN Board. So, how can we ensure that the governance document really reflects that? So, that was on recognition. Just two more things on accountability.

KEVIN BLUMBERG Yes. So, I appreciate the veracity of the questions. We're not in a public policy open scenario right now. We're taking the work that's been given to us in three prior open consultations. We're digesting all of that, and we are finalizing the draft that is going to go to the NRO EC. There are some great questions there that have been asked during open consultations. There are some great questions there that we are currently looking at.

So, I appreciate what you're asking us. Unfortunately, this isn't the right venue for many of those questions. I will say that there is an absolute complexity, no question, and our goal is the stability of the RIR ecosystem. That is, I think, one of our top preeminent goals.

In some cases, unfortunately, you can't have perfection and have stability. And what I mean by that is, when we look at conflict of interest as an example, and I'm just going to use this as an example as one of the ASO AC members, when you look at conflict of interest, in an ideal world, there would be no conflict. But unfortunately, to be able to support an ecosystem that is continuing to run, there has to be some conflict.

The key is the declaration of that conflict, the understanding of the conflict. But it doesn't remove that conflict. If we did, it would be done in a vacuum where it would be immaterial that we had working our RIR ecosystem today. So, that is the complexity of the things that we are currently deliberating and finalizing with the text. But unfortunately, the questions, many of the questions you're asking were more a part of the open consultations rather than something we can address today, unfortunately.

DEBRA SWATILAL

So, the status report that has been published and that is being discussed and this public forum that is there, it is to not address the questions that have already been asked, just to clarify.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

No, no, the idea is to receive some feedback about the process and the discussion we already have. I think that maybe some of your concerns are also shared by the group because in some way it's difficult or as Kevin mentioned, it's a very complex system and that is, in one hand, it's a global process. But also, we have to understand that each of the communities has its specifics and needs to, from a global common ground, respect the difference in the RIR communities.

That is why when we begin to draft this document, well, we understand that there are a lot of challenges in terms of how to balance a system that is global but also has to, in some way, to represent or to protect the rational community's interest.

DEBRA SWATILAL

Yeah, I mean, that point is very well taken, that it's a really difficult task to bring consensus.

JIA RONG LOW

Thank you. Deborah, right?

DEBRA SWATILAL

Debra.

JIA RONG LOW

Yeah, thank you. Thanks, Debra. I really appreciate your questions because if we can have more people interested in our system like you, we would have a much more robust engagement largely and really appreciate that.

I would respond to a couple of points. The first is similar to what Kevin is saying because there is a task given to the ASOAC and the task is specific within a certain scope and the questions you ask are more at a macro level in some ways. So, the task at hand is not meant to address some of the issues that you have raised.

Some of the issues that you have raised is more at the macro level. Fundamentally, there is a need, though, to bridge a gap in understanding how the systems work in the first place. So, for example, when you talked about recognition and the thresholds and then how do we ensure that the ICANN Board is not just ratifying but there is a Multi-Stakeholder Model that supports decision making in the first place.

I have to explain all the way, take a few steps back, to explain that the ICANN Board cannot ratify anything unless a Multi-Stakeholder Model process has been completed in the first place. So, I have to explain how that process works in ICANN too. So, for example, this whole process is happening right now at the ICANN community and then we have various sessions with the constituencies.

At the end of a draft, ICANN has to put it up for public comment. Then the Board will have to consider all of these points. And on top of that, during the public comment, it will go back to the SO and the ACs. The advisory committees must advise ICANN Board whether they agree or not. So, those are parts of the entire multi-stakeholder process that's building. That's why this whole process takes two to three years to get to even where we are today.

So, that's why I meant by we have to explain how the processes work for each of the organizations. Then it would partly answer your question.

Now, for those that are not part of this community, it's quite hard to understand that because you would see the process at discrete points in time. And this is why we take point pains in our sessions to explain when the process started, how long it was, who did we speak to, how many rounds, and so on. It's to explain to you how we got to where we are today.

So, that Multi-Stakeholder Model is working because we're taking it from bottom up. So, it's not the other way around like when we talk about top down would be the ICANN Board would decide directly. But in this case, it's not. So, it's really built from bottom up. So, why I take a bit longer time to talk about this is because in the case of the RIRs and our governance model vis-a-vis ICANN, we are running two processes that's going on.

In fact, it's actually six because we have five RIRs. All five RIRs have different, slightly different ways of approving something in their process. And we have to run consultations in all five RIRs to do that and come to a point where each RIR community agrees with all the work that's happened. Then we consolidate that as one group.

ICANN is to do likewise the same, but running ICANN's own process. And at the end of the day, then we combine both of them to have a final document that is ready for adoption. So, we're running several concurrent processes all at the same time. But all of those processes are multi-stakeholder. So, I'll come back to just one quick point, last one.

So, for example, in the APNIC community, when we're doing consultation, so we have representatives which are Akinori, Nicole, Davis is there as well. So, they are kind of in front of a firing squad. And they invite inputs. Okay, tell us what you think. And then they will convey those inputs back to this group. So, there is that multi-stakeholder process that's happening at the same time. So, seeing how all of that unfolds is quite challenging, especially from someone if you're not part of this process at the time.

So, that's why I said I appreciate your comments so much. Because we need more people like you interested in our space, interested in the process. And we hope that you can participate. And hoping really that you can be involved in our work too. And with your lens of looking at where the potential gaps are, your inputs will be really helpful. Thank you.

DEBRA SWATILAL: Thank you. Just to ask, so I really appreciate that you mentioned the multi-stakeholder approach. So, with the SOs and ACs, can we expect that they will be involved even when a new RIR is being recognized? Will it be a multi-stakeholder approach?

JIA RONG LOW

So, this is why the language in the documents is super important. And incidentally, I have it right in front of me. This is a draft language, but Article 3, Recognition. So, assuming all the thresholds and all that are made, the 3.1c, Community Support.

The numbering community in the candidate RIR's proposed service region must be committed to supporting the candidate RIR, including by actively participating in its policy development process. Now, just a simple extract of this language means if you do not have support from your community, multi-stakeholders from your community, there will be no standing up of a new RIR in the first place.

So, Multi-Stakeholder Model also means the governments as well. Whether it's the members or community or the governments, they have to be supporting the recognition of a new RIR and put forward the position that they are supporting this. So, again, there is a process that allows for that. So, the language must allow for this to happen.

DEBRA SWATILAL

Sure. Thank you.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

I don't know, Amy, you want it? No, it's okay. Thank you so much and we really appreciate your dedication. Thank you. Are there other questions? I don't see neither on the chat. And if no, with that, I propose to adjourn this meeting. Thank you, everyone. Oh, sorry, excuse me. Closing remark. I might apologize.

JIA RONG LOW

Thank you. So, I'm going to echo Esteban earlier to thank everybody. There's a lot of work and just answering the questions just now from Debra, it's like the journey is pretty long. Already two years in, we have another year to go. But appreciate, again, everyone's tenacity and endurance. And I just have a small reflection I thought to share.

And I was sharing with Hervé and the vice chairs earlier this morning. I really enjoyed spending time with all of you working together over the week. And it reminded me why I'm here in the first place. And I think it's the same reason why all of you are here as well. There’re two things. So, first of all, yes, we do have a problem statement, but it's because we care so much about this system.

And we understand the gravity by which this system has impact on the internet. I think everybody can agree to that. And that's why we are here. That's why we're here as volunteers, more importantly. So, that's a huge piece that I really appreciate.

And the second part is the part about doing a piece of work doesn't mean you cannot have fun doing it. And I was saying why I enjoyed working with everyone this week so much. And that's the other piece, is this community. You know, we spend time working with people from different cultures, different backgrounds, different regions, especially for us as a whole.

I came in feeling, out of the rest of the week, physically exhausted, but spiritually feeling a lot fuller than I was before, because it's spending this time working with us, everybody together. And I hope these two pieces; they resonate very strongly with me. And that's why I stayed in this community for so long. But I think likewise, I think that resonates for you as well. And I just wanted to use this opportunity to thank you. Thank you all for really your dedication, the work that we put together as a group, the outcome of which will in many ways make history.

And I really appreciate all this effort. You know, it's the time, the effort, the willingness to work with each other, the different time zones put together, the many times we have to sit down and communicate the same thing, all of that combined. And I really appreciate the whole week that we spent together.

And I look forward to when we have even more interactions as we go towards going to Seville, but all the sessions in between, and then seeing the outcome at the very end. I'm really optimistic about it. And I'll take this opportunity again to thank Hervé for leadership with Esteban and Amy, then our staff present, Herman for Secretariat, CCG, Bedrika, Uka, and our lawyers, Jeremy, Athena.

If I miss anyone, please, I do apologize. But not forgetting, ICANN support staff as well. Then also support, appreciate our Board members for supporting us throughout as well. And then thank you ASO AC or NRO NC. Really appreciate the whole time. So, thank you very much.

ESTEBAN LESCANO | No, no, we have to call the motion to adjourn.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT | I think that for this time, I call the motion to adjourn.

ESTEBAN LESCANO | I second it.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT | Thank you so much. Motion adjourned.

OZAN SAHIN | Please stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]