
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – Joint Session: ASO AC and ISPCP
Thursday, March 12, 2026 – 13:15 to 14:30 IST

OZAN SAHIN

Hello and welcome to the Joint Meeting between the Address Supporting Organization and the GNSO Internal Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency. 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 Committee Participant Code of Conduct, ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and ICANN Committee 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 this 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 Philippe Fouquart.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Ozan. This is Philippe Fouquart speaking. I work for Orange and I'm the ISPCP Chair and we're glad to welcome our ASO AC colleagues for this continuing story of the ICP-2 review, and we

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.

understand that we're closer to the end than to the beginning which is good news. So, joking apart, we've been supportive of this review, and we're looking forward to this discussion.

It appears that given that it's somewhat late in the meeting, some of our members have left already, but I think the core members are still here. So, I'm sure we can have a robust discussion. So, I'll hand over to Hervé.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you very much, Philippe. I am Hervé Clément from Orange, as I can remember, and the Chair of the ASO SC. For this presentation, it's now two years and a half work about that. We will co-present this slide with Amy and Esteban, the co-chairs, and all the group, I think many of the group is there also. So, thank you for, yeah, on the other side also.

Thank you for that. Thank you particularly to the ISPCP for your support regarding our work and regarding the document. During each of the consultations we heard you answered with a very comprehensive document, with a very detailed remark, a very good one as well, who helped us to continue to complete our work. The work is not totally complete, but it's something we can say a few words about that.

The idea, because at the beginning of this ICANN meeting, I was used to present the work we have transformed on the different consultations in a more extensive way. We will go quicker through

that and to have more space for Amy and for Esteban to present the issues, the open issues we have worked on this week. Of course, because it's important to let us time to ask a question if you have still, if any. ICP-2, everybody knows what it is.

The document we are working on is currently, it's not particularly the definite name, but it's the Regional Internet Registry Governance Document, and it's version 2. You were able to read, and that was under consultation as well. Ozan, if you go to the next slide please. I won't repeat who we are. You know, so you can go to the next one, which is a very cool slide as well.

But the cool thing is that we are here, so you know yourself, except Ricardo who was not able to come with us but I can confirm that Ricardo was attending different meetings, even at 2 a.m. local time for him in the morning, 3, 4. So, I have to thank him and the ISPCP as well. Next one.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Hervé, for speaking. I know this is not the topic, but we realize that you're now fully staffed as a council, which is, as a side note, good news, I think, that you've got a new member. So, just to note that in passing.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

And that's a very important note. You're totally right. Sorry, there is the AFRINIC Executive Board appointee member to the ASO AC. And very soon, I think until June, before June, I think we could have

the two of us from the community, appointees from the AFRINIC, normally at the middle of this year, we will be 50, really. We hope to. We hope to. Next slide.

That's the reason why I won't comment anything because especially within the ISPCP, you know the story of that. You can go to the next one. ICP-2 project is really the same. I won't come back just for you if you have new members because sometimes you have new members within the ISPCP, so it's good, but perhaps I don't know if within this assembly there are members who was not present during our last presentations.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Hervé. Philippe speaking. I don't think I don't see any new ISPCP members. Now, that's a good question. I think everyone is familiar with this. By the way, on this, given the history of the document, and I don't know whether down the road we will be providing new inputs in the public comment, but if that happens, and if during this meeting or during the public comments, we sort of reiterate comments that we've made already, don't hate us for this because we take them as we move along, but feel free to discard them.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

And with that, I totally forgotten on the mistake to praise him because you are, I would say, new regarding the process of having a joint meeting with the ISPCP, Jia Rong, who is the chair of the NRO

EC, the CEO of the APNIC, and the Chair of the NRO EC this year, Jia Rong.

JIA-RONG LOW

Thank you. Hi, everybody. So, my name is Jia Rong, I'm the APNIC CEO. Some of you know me already from when I was working for ICANN. So, just different hat now, same face. And so, this year, because we rotate the chairs for the NRO Executive Council, so I'm the chair, fortunately or unfortunately, for this year. But again, the key deliverable for us, all of this whole process, ICANN would have to run this process for approval for the Board.

So, it would include the public comment process. So, Philippe, exactly like what you're saying, the whole point of these sessions right now is that if you have any other questions or comments, we can take them and then we can work on either incorporating them or responding accordingly. And we've got very constructive comments throughout the whole week from the different constituencies.

And some of them, the comments are actually quite similar along the same lines, which also means that for us, we need to communicate the points better. So, we are working on, as part of the wrap-up, we will summarize the comments and questions we've received. We are also working on publishing a document that captures all the comments as well. So, that will be a place for people to refer back to.

Now tied to public comments, though, and also tied to hoping to get your feedback and comments in this session, if you think that what we put down is good, a public comment to say that, great job, we support it, it's good. So, we would appreciate that very much as well, because very often people think public comments or any comments must be a question, it must be something that is a critique. It's doesn't always need to be that way. So, I think, Philippe, we are on pretty much the same page.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Jia-Rong. Well, on this particular point and given the history, I think we've posted two comments at least of that nature, because the first one was really thorough indeed and we've been here a couple of times already and we we've posted two liners essentially saying excellent job, keep going, and we'll try and do that for that iteration as well. Thank you. But that's a very good point, obviously. Thank you.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

And really appreciate it. Thank you, Philippe and thank you Jia-Rong. Next slide. So, we finally spent a lot of time and we went through a good way finally which is called the final review. We are at the stage of the blue rectangle there which is finally the final review specifically of the version two of the document we talked about.

There will be another drafting process, and that's the reason why we went there in Mumbai, to go to version 3, it's something we will try to complete until Sevilla, and after we have to adjust the way the document will go afterwards. Next slide. And so, the same. So, you know the story, but the cool thing is you will have the slide with the story in it if anybody within the constituency wants to read it.

Next slide. And it's just you will have three slides and each of the one correspond to each of the consultation, I would say. Each of the good of the document we have drafted and each of the related consultation as well. The first document we have drafted were a list of core principle to help to draft the version one of the Regional Governance Document. There was a consultation held from October to December 2024.

We received 14 responses from the ICANN and probably I don't remember but for sure there was one from the ISPCP as well. Of course, we analyze and it's something we did each time each of the answers with different outputs. It's not on the scope of the document, it's on the scope and we take into account in that way.

Next slide. It was a version one we could draft via the outputs from the consultation about the core principle document. The QR code you have there is to access to the different version of the document we have provided. And with the version one, it was an important step to clarify the scope of the document first on the lifecycle management of the Regional Internet Registry recognition ongoing life and derecognition as well. And because Regional Internet

Registry has operational functions, these documents strengthen operational requirements as well. If you go to the next slide.

And the same, so there was a consultation, we analyzed all the answers of the consultation, and with that we have been able to draft a version two when we change a little the title. Important thing, there is no preamble explaining exactly what is the scope of the document, because one more time, when we receive comments, there was comments out of the scope of the document, so it's important to explain why we didn't take it into account.

Okay, with that, we can go to the next slide. Community consultation. Just a summary of the consultation held. And this slide is because you have the link to the summary of the different outputs from the different communities as well. So, we try to do as a more transparent way as we can to provide that and all the information. Next slide.

Where we are now, and it will be my last one as I can remember, there was a third consultation between September and early November, as I can remember. We met then in Montevideo in November because it's the headquarter of the LACNIC. Because it's the headquarter. Yes, a good place to go in November. Yeah, I can confirm that. But even if it's a good place to go, we work a lot.

We were able definitely to work on all the comments. We created subgroups within the Council in different rooms. Each one was

given a specific topic to work on. It was very structured as a work. And with that, we could provide some documents.

And thanks to the, not the CCG of the Review of Review, but our CCG with a group of the communication team from the different regions and Badrika [ph], you are part of the CCG from the APNIC, and thanks to your support, we are able to provide documents as outputs, analyze, and so on. And it's where we are because we continue this work here in Mumbai and we have been able to resolve some issues but the issues you will talk about. And I think it's your turn. Amy.

AMY POTTER

Hi. I'll get into the ongoing issues that we have been discussing this week. Go to the next slide. Topics and process. All right. So, one of the issues that we have been working on this week has to do with our recognition review process. So, under the current version of the document, if the existing RIRs do not unanimously recommend recognition of a new candidate RIR, the candidate RIR may request an ICANN recognition review, potentially conducted by an independent third party.

We've gone back and forth about whether or not an independent third party should be conducting the review or whether ICANN should be conducting that review. And so, we've been just in the process of getting some feedback clarifying ICANN's position on the

role it would like to take in that step of the process. Next slide. Also, during the recognition process...

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Just being curious and mindful that it's not really an ISP. Although we did point out the issue of how you actually vet the recognition. And that would be very early on, we pointed out that that was sort of a crucial element to it. I'd be curious as to your thinking around what the threshold might be.

Is that that you would like to qualify the third party what sort of entity you would expect to be able to file that sort of request in terms of recognition? How would you approach this? Or do you have initial thinking around how you would define that third party? Or is it just...

AMY POTTER

Sure. So, we've gone back and forth about, one, whether or not that role should even be performed by an independent third party or whether that role should be performed by ICANN. If it were to be performed by an independent third party, we've gone back and forth about whether it would be appropriate to have that level of detail about the vetting of the third party within the document itself or within the implementation procedures.

At this point in time, we are, as a first level question, getting clarification from ICANN about whether or not they want to perform that role themselves or have a third party. As soon as we

get a clear route there, we can dig in deeper into where the appropriate place would be. But I think if we were to go down a route with an independent third party, I think there would need to be some sort of criteria somewhere about that. It might live in the governance document itself, or we might decide that, hey, this is supposed to be a high-level document.

Those detailed requirements are really more appropriate in the implementation procedures. But I think that there's a feeling that if we did go down the independent third-party route, it definitely makes sense to have some sort of criteria somewhere. We don't want to ignore that entirely, if that's the route that we end up going down. But first, we really need to clarify with ICANN.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

I can put up on this, and I think I understand that. And speaking personally, if that were to be a third party other than ICANN, at least from a sort of gTLD PDP standpoint, that sounds like policy space rather than implementation space, but that's just me, maybe. Just a side note in passing. Thank you.

AMY POTTER

Thank you for that feedback. It's certainly helpful to have that from parties that clearly know so much about the process.

THOMAS RICKERT

Yeah, I like the idea and the concept. I was just asking myself whether you think there can be possibly any independent third

party. I mean, somebody who's knowledgeable in the space without having any relationship to any of the parties.

AMY POTTER

That is absolutely a good point. We've also talked about that as well. So, certainly taking that part under consideration. Any other?

All right, next slide. Also, another issue that we've been discussing during the recognition process, the current version allows for the recognition of a candidate RIR with one dissenting RIR during that process. There's a mechanism that allows for a candidate RIR to move forward if not all of the RIRs agree, because the thought behind that is that a new RIR coming into the fold is necessarily going to take some of the region that belongs to a currently existing RIR. And we've received a lot of really interesting feedback on this issue because there can be conflicts of interest that pop up there.

And how do you take that into consideration within the process? So, we've been going back and forth on how do we create a process that really took out in a serious way the conflict of interest issue, but as well as the issue that all of the existing RIRs will still need to be able to cooperate with a new candidate that comes into the fold. So, that's one issue we've been talking about quite a bit this week. Next slide. Sorry.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. This is Philippe Fouquart. As a general question, which would apply here, but also elsewhere, I'm sure. In terms of work

method, I remember that in our very initial input, we talked about stress testing this with scenarios, both with sort of amicable situations versus more threatening ones. I'll take the latter, for example.

I'm making this up, but in this, assuming that, I don't know, people get together within the non-terrestrial networks and consider that, given that it's not within the, strictly speaking, and physically within the existing region split, they consider that operating satellite services may require, I'm making this up, a specific regional, even that's on the regions.

And you put that through, they want to be recognized, through the policy, you put that through a policy and how that works. You define other scenarios and how did you approach, did you do this? I'm not asking for this to be public, by the way, because I'm sure that there may be more contentious scenarios than what I'm talking about.

AMY POTTER

Sure. So, we've been thinking through a number of different scenarios. It's possible a candidate RIR might want to take a portion of some existing RIRs. And it just so happens that the members that fall within that portion, perhaps they make up a very large chunk of the fee basis, for example, of the existing RIR.

So, we've been trying to go through a variety of scenarios, sort of doing exactly what you're talking about, going through a stress test

to see how would it play out there. That's been a part of both a fun and concerning part of thinking through these issues, for sure. And if you have any specific scenarios in mind that you want to tell us about later, that you want us to, in case we were forgetting about, it's a fun exercise.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

That would be, yeah, that's actually a good idea. Obviously, we're not going to do this now.

AMY POTTER

Yeah, of course.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

We may provide some emails to sort of figure out some scenarios that people may come up against in some areas. Yeah, that's a great idea. Thank you.

AMY POTTER

Yeah, feel free to find us after, sure. All right. And so, yeah, we're really looking through figuring out whether unanimity minus one makes sense there and how do you deal with the conflict issues. Next slide. So, a third issue that we've been talking about quite a bit this week has to do with the thresholds for initiating both the derecognition and the ad hoc audit process.

Both of those processes currently can be initiated by three different parties, either by the RIRs, by ICANN, or a group of members of the

impacted RIR. And so, we've talked quite a bit about whether or not it makes sense to have the same threshold for members initiating derecognition as we have for members initiating the ad hoc audit process. And what thresholds really make sense there in light of wanting to prevent abuse of the system, but also wanting to enable the membership to take action if they see an issue there.

So, that's been another fun one we've had a lot of talks about this week. Next slide. We've also been talking about the emergency continuity initiation and renewal procedures. So, currently initiating the emergency continuity process requires unanimity among all of the other RIRs and ICANN. And we've received some really helpful feedback throughout the consultations on this aspect.

And some people have expressed a concern that perhaps emergency continuity procedures initiating that process needs to be something that's nimble to be able to respond to an emergency situation that arises. And perhaps it makes sense to lower the threshold for initiating that process. But again, we also want to prevent abuse there.

We've also talked about the emergency continuity process under the current draft lasts for 90 days and then it can be renewed. And we've talked about whether or not we want to put a cap on the number of times it can be renewed, or if we want to maintain flexibility, depending on the situation, for it to be renewed as many times as it needs to, to ensure that the affected region is still able

to receive RIR services in the event that something detrimental is happening there. So, yeah, that's, I think the last one that we have on there. Let me see next slide. I think it's gonna -- yes.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, this is Philippe here. A question for clarification on this. So, if you say that this 90-day period might be renewed, there's a sense that well that it may be too short to figure out an alternative, but on the other hand people don't feel that an "emergency" may require an urgent solution. From a distance, it looks a bit odd, if you see what I mean, to say that it's urgent, but then we may take twice, three times, three months to fix this.

AMY POTTER

Sure. So, we're built into the emergency continuity processes after. So, it currently requires Univity to initiate among all of the other RIRs and ICANN. It currently lasts for 90 days. It has both at the initiation stage and following the completion of the 90 days, a requirement for publication of the reasons for initiating the process, what went on during the emergency continuity process, a review of how effective that was, etc., to provide transparency into what's going on there, because we really want to be cautious about not abusing that process when it's not necessary. Any other questions before we -- next slide. I will hand it over to Esteban.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Thank you, Amy. Well, finally, we have some items that are under drafting. Next please. Following the feedback received from the consultation on version 2, well, there is some point that do not request a discussion inside the ASO AC, but to improve some wording on the document. For example, one of these is the document structure. We received feedback saying that the document is too complex and will benefit from restructuring. And we are working on that to improve the flow and clarity. Next, please.

Our drafting issue is related with the transition and continuity, and the background here is the smooth transfer of service and operation of derecognized RIR to an interim or successor entity as directed by ICANN. And well, the feedback that we received that the document requires more details to ensure in that case the community engagement during the transition process. Then we will add some text that specifically provides the existence of a transition plan to ensure the continuity of services and protection of resource holder rights. Next, please.

Regarding the audit obligations, we received feedback that the document does not explicitly oblige a RIR to act following the publication of an audit report. That is correct. We need to amend the document and clarify the obligations in case of an audit discovered that there is something that is not in compliance with the RIR document. Next, please. Yes.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Esteban. It's not so much on the audit, but the principle of an audit and the fact that it's in that governance document. I remember talking about things like SLAs, et cetera. Anyway, governance requirements that you put on the newly recognized regional internet registry, and whether some of those may be compliant or aligned with good common practices or even regulations sometimes of non-for-profit or even that's not a listed company, but you see what I mean. In some countries, for example, in France, we have regulations and best common practices about, I'll take something that's not contentious, piracy on the ball, for example.

And that's something that if you're based in France you have to comply with. On the audit it's pretty much the same, although that would be your best common practice for listed companies. Did you come up against requirements of that nature that might, mindful that you can't double guess where that newly recognized regional interest will be based eventually, whether you can match those two?

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Yes, it's a good question. The document established in Article 4, all the requirements that has to be fulfilled in order to be recognized as RIR. But those obligations or requirements are also requested in the life cycle of the RIR, during the whole life. Then, for example, one of the requirements is to have a corporate governance in line with international practice and maybe because I don't have here

the document but maybe one of my colleagues can read just the article to confirm.

But the idea is that you have to be good standing of your corporate practice. Well, the audit will check because we are talking about regular audits in three years for example, a regular audit in which the RIR will be checked, will be reviewed about the compliance with these general principles.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Okay, just a follow up on this. Actually, I refer to sort of national regional frameworks, but you're right, there are international like we IFRS or things like that reporting financial reporting.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Yes, but it is important to mention that the audit is not only on financial issues. It's just how is the RIR compliant with all the requirements that has to fulfill in order to be recognized as RIR. Yes, and there are a lot of, well, we have different requirements related with good governance, also with anti-capture, also with membership-based organization, also about independency from governments and particular members or organizations.

I think that this is connected with how we perform the work and how the document we're drafting, that we began with the general principles. Then we thought which are the general principles that the RIR has to show in order to be recognized. And then in the

different versions, we try to land those requirements to specific commitments during the life of the RIR.

JIA-RONG LOW

Thank you. So, this is one of the FAQs now. We tend to get a lot of comments related to this and the challenge is that of balance. Because we want to keep it to a high-level document, whereas like if we go down the weeds, there's a discussion it could be a 400-page document. And the thing though is I think the problem statement will be quite clear. The RIR governance document provides a clear problem statement, which is we need to do audits.

And the audit should go back to the basics, which is what would make you cease to be an RIR that functions like an RIR? That's the key thing. So, behind that would be registry, ability to allocate resources, registry accuracy, ability to be accurate enough as a registry, a as part of the RIR, being able to update your policy accordingly. So, some of the key functions behind those, the audit should focus on those as the main thing, whereas part of that could be tied to service level satisfaction, et cetera.

But they may not be in the first phase when we're working on it because you can build on top of that. But the base should be what makes you an RIR and what would cause you to fail as a result. So, those would be the baseline. So, the document, if it captures this principle, then it provides a very good way of guiding what the implementation will be.

But same problem becomes if we add too much detail, then likewise, it then incapacitates the ability for us to implement this as well. So, again, is that a balance? But I think it's important also that from your perspective, is this enough? Because the challenge becomes also to provide an input to say, if we add too many requirements, actually it goes against what we're trying to go for.

So, community response to say, yep, it's good to keep it tight, good to keep the language in such a way that provides that guiding direction, it would be something that's very helpful as well. But right now, we tend to be hearing more like very high level, yep, we want to see more criteria.

But I think the better way of having the community provide the guidance would be, it's not more criteria, but it's more solid criteria that's really bound to what makes it RIR and RIR. I think that's the piece that we need to work out. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, that's very helpful. Just as a side note, taking a step back on the next steps, given that it's been a while already that you've been working on this, I would just note that, and there are many others in the ISPCP who've been involved in gTLD developments, it would appear that the more time you give, it's like smoke, and the more time people get into the specifics and cannot stay at the high level that you're describing.

So, the work method itself tends to promote this or not, for that matter, just as a side note. And indeed, some of these things can stay, and again, coming back to gTLD development, policy development, it could be left to implementation. Thank you.

JIA-RONG LOW

Yeah, I think, Philippe, hearing that comment coming from you is helpful for us because it shows that we have good leadership from the community to provide that, yep, this is how we should be working rather than adding more, which is then harder, because if we would try to collaborate, we try to consolidate all the comments, the ones with good guiding direction from you would really help us rather than we are hearing like, 10 comments all saying we must have more criteria.

Actually, you will help us pull them back and say, I think more is not that helpful and you share the experience. Yeah. So, we'll make a note of this, and if you'd like to, again, later on as part of public comment. If you want to add this again, we can do that. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Philippe, again. But although that's a sort of high-level sort of comment, we can certainly say that the more time we will give, the more likely you're going to get tiny, minute details to be inserted in the procedure.

So, sometimes, and on a totally different topic, we're actually having this discussion in the context of the DNS abuse PDP and the

rest of it as to whether you have a long time frame so that you make sure that you're going to end up in the weeds eventually or rather you have a hard stop and people get their act together so that you stay at a certain high level. We can have that in our input. Thanks.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Thank you, Philippe. It's very useful for us. Next one. In that case, well, the community presents some proposal that the audits will be mandatory as part of the process of derecognition. We discussed a little lot and we understand that it's not needed to include an audit as a specific requirement for the recognition process, because when the recognition process is initiated, the idea is to finish it as soon as possible, because the continuity of the services of the resource holders could be affected and then it's important to finish the process.

For example, in that particular case we decided not to make changes to our document. Next please. Another issue related with derecognition is the rehabilitation. Rehabilitation as part of derecognition process. We understand that the feedback here was that need to include the rehabilitation step and expressly step in the process and we understand that we can include that because the recognition is like the last resource.

Then the process has to allow to give all the helps all the support to the RIR who is in in problems or who is not complains with its obligation to solve this and to come back to the track of good standing. And then we are working on that. Next please. Well,

looking ahead is the future of the process. Next please. Well, we are in Q1, we already published the status report that was shared in APNIC 61 and here in ICANN.

We had all these joint meetings trying to socialize the process, the document, to receive feedback from the different constituencies. We also work a lot during different closed sessions. We discussed the open point. And now, the idea or the goal is to finish the process and to have the document approved by the end of the year. Once the ASO AC finishes with the drafting of the document, we have to present it to the NRO EC for approval.

And also the NRO EC has to present it to ICANN for approval. We will meet in Seville in next ICANN meeting in a face-to-face to continue working and with the idea of drafting and adjust the final draft of the document. Next please. Yes.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Okay. So, coming back to the public comment, this is likely to be after 87 then, you will present the final version.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Yes, in our design of the process, we have already fulfilled three public consultation and in some way for us is enough because we have to finish and the process have been taking two years and we have to conclude. But there will be this open consultation in case ICANN requires it for its final approval. And also, we will socialize

the advance in the process during our regional meetings in the second part of the year.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

And formally, I guess it really depends on how much change you have between the latest version that was submitted to public comments versus the one that you will be submitting to the ICANN Board, but ultimately, off the top of my head, I don't know whether you have to have prior to a vote by the Board a public comment or not. I don't think it's hard wire, is it? But on a document like this one, I suppose it would be...

JIA-RONG LOW

Yeah, we realized there's a small gap in how we describe the process fully. And some of it also is because ICANN has not fully confirmed what the approval process may look like. But just broadly, from a high-level principle perspective, each of us must check the box in terms of our own approval processes. So, for example, with RIRs, we have to make sure we have done the consultation, we have done those processes to get to where we are today.

Now for ICANN, likewise ICANN must run through its own processes to get to where it can get the board to approve, which means as part of ICANN's own process, they have to have a public comment period. So, what we have not fully ironed out is, do we do two public comment periods or should it be one? From the RIR side,

we've checked most of the boxes. So, actually, we are missing a bit of the ICANN side for clarity.

So, that's something from this week, we realized we have to provide some clarity and communicate those clearly. So, we are taking that back and we will talk to ICANN, and then we will publish, okay, these are the updated milestones on how the whole process will look like. And that will provide better clarity for everybody, including for ourselves. So, that's the next step we are doing. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

On this point, if I may, and given the discussions that we've had over the years on this already, I'm confident that as I said, the ISPCP would be supportive of this. I can't speak for the constituency but certainly I'm just in light of what we said already.

But I think regardless of, and we would welcome some clarity on this, but I hope and I'm confident that regardless of that approval process, even if, say, for argument's sake, there were no, which I doubt, but no public consultations at all and only a vote by the Board, there's being a constituency within the ICANN community will have a way to express our support for this, even through a letter, if you see what I mean.

I haven't thought this through, but either on behalf of the constituency or the stakeholder group, even the house. So, I think

that for us, at least it's sort of easy, we can find our way to whoever approves this within ICANN. Thank you.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Very appreciate, really. Ozan, I think perhaps you have a question.

OZAN SAHIN

Thank you, Hervé. This is Ozan Sahin from ICANN Org, supporting the remote participation. We have two questions in the Q&A box, both from Nitin Walia. So, I can read the first question. “From the ISPCP perspective, maintaining a stable and scalable internet infrastructure is critical. How does the revised ICP-2 framework anticipate future challenges, such as increased demand for internet resources, emerging technologies, and evolving governance expectations?”

JIA-RONG LOW

Yeah, thanks, Nitin for the question. This is Jia-Rong speaking. So, there are a couple of interrelated parts. The baseline is, and I covered it in the opening ceremony speech where we have to make sure that the governance elements they serve as the foundation. Because we have to make sure that the institutions that the RIRs are uplifted and have a stronger foundation. So, the audits would do that, having backup systems would do that.

So, they provide a stronger foundation for the RIRs to then carry out the work. So, that's the baseline. So, what the RIR governance document does is to strengthen that foundation. Now everything

else that is on top of that then is delivering the work in itself. So that's what you mentioned about increase in demand for internet resources, emerging technologies, these sit above the foundation that is the RIR governance documents trying to support and further strengthen.

So, I can answer the second part regarding increased demand for internet resources, how do we support emerging technologies and so on. Now, on the first one, on increased demand for internet resources, this is not less of a RIR governance document issue, but more of a NRO coordination issue as well as the RIRs themselves. So, for example, during the opening ceremony speech I mentioned, APNIC partnering with our NIR in India, we've kept pace with the growth of the internet's network here in India.

So, they grew almost 100 million users a year for more than a decade to cross 1 billion users. So, we managed to support that. And in supporting that, there is continued demand for increasing internet resources. But in which area? If we talk about specifically our space, then for India to grow at 100 million internet users per year, the only way to do that is if we use IPv6. And that's exactly what they did.

So, the underlying question, I'm guessing, that meta question of, will we have enough internet resources to support the internet of the future? Right now, if we all use IPv6, short answer is yes. There's more IPv6 than there is sand in the world. Yeah, so we will. And that's the challenge. But fundamentally, at the governance

level, this is not a question or problem for the RIR governance document to solve. But across us, RIRs, individually and coordinating as NRO, that's what we need to do, continue to push for IPv6 adoption, deployment, continue to push for that.

So, that's the fundamental piece versus to what we need to do more going forward. And tied to this resourcing versus supporting emerging technologies, these are closely related. Because now we're talking about AI, and there's a lot more investment in infrastructure to support AI, building data centers, this entire ecosystem that needs to be supported. The current sense we have is, well, the requirement on IP addressing is not going to be that much more.

Well, that's fine for us. But if for some reason the next technology that's tied to AI requires a huge increase in devices that need IP addresses, then we stand ready to be able to support that. So, at this point, really, it's about providing the foundation so that the RIRs can continue to deliver our work. That's the problem that the RIR governance document is solving. But everything else on top then becomes part of the operations of the RIRs themselves. Thank you.

OZAN SAHIN

Thank you, Jia-Rong. So, I'm reading the second post from Nitin Walia. Also, another question. "The document mentions the possibility of direct recognition of an RIR that can no longer adequately serve its community. Could you clarify how this

process would ensure stability for Internet number resource holders and operators in that region during such a transition?”

Sure. Reading the question again. “The document mentions the possibility of the recognition of an RIR that can no longer adequately serve its community. Could you clarify how this process would ensure stability for internet number resource holders and operators in that region during such a transition.”

AMY POTTER

Thank you. Sure. So, if an RIR is unable to provide its core services to its members and to operators within that community, this document provides a number of steps that could be taken. The first one, if there was some sort of force majeure or something urgent and quickly that happened that sort of took them out of commission in terms of being able to provide those services, the emergency continuity process allows for an emergency operator to come in and ensure that the operating community and the members within that community are able to still receive those core functions and core services that they need.

And then we also have the derecognition process, which is a little bit more of an extreme long-term step where if not only the inability to provide services to a region occurs, but if any of the sort of ongoing obligations that we have laid out in section four of the document that gets into good governance matters and the ability for the community to participate in the governance of the RIR.

If those things occur, the derecognition process allows the members of that community to have a next more extreme step in more extreme situations to allow them to continue to receive the services they need. The entire principle and idea behind the document is about really protecting the operators within those communities to make sure that they're able to receive the services they need.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

And so just to answer, but just a little completely tell what you said. After the first request, we had from the NRO EC in 2023 to strengthen the document, and so it was asked to study all the life cycle of Regional Internet Registry and to be sure to cover all the aspects and all the scenario that could happen.

It was, at a certain moment, necessary to figure out all the point of the life of Regional Internet Registry and derecognition could be a part of, but in our views, it's an extreme part when studying the scenario and analyzing the document.

In our views, it's really an extreme, extreme, extreme result to derecognize, and we think of a lot of possibility for Regional Internet Registry for instance to be rehabilitated in case of issue. So, I would say perhaps as members of part of the communities, the idea for us, it's not our wish is to derecognize something even if it's part of the document.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Philippe here. As a side note and as a reader of this, that procedure derecognition and even the whole policy came across as that minimal impact to the end user and ultimately the assignee of an internet resource was sort of the north star, I don't know if that's the right word, but the notion that that would be, if not transparent, but at least minimal in terms of impact. And that comes across through the high-level governing principles. So, that's what we appreciated very early in the process. Thank you.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Any other question?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Just looking forward to the final stages. Congratulations for the hard work.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you. And so, we repeated it. We definitely, definitely appreciate your support on the very, very interesting discussions we have with this group. We definitely appreciate. Just a word to, I will say mine, but I am not the owner of the group, to the group and CCG and Legal if they are there and ICANN also, we have at half past four, a photo session. So, be there for the ASO AC At-Large photo session, and then we will have our wrap-up session at three in this room as well. Thank you so much.

OZAH SAHIN

Please stop the recording. Sorry, please do not stop the recording yet. Please stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]