
ICANN85 | Prep Week – Approaching the finish line: Update on the ICP-2 Review
Wednesday, February 25, 2026 – 11:30 to 12:30 AM IST

OZAN SAHIN

Hello and welcome to the Approaching the finish line - Update on the ICP-2 Review webinar. My name is Ozan Sahin and I'm the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

During this session, questions or comments should be submitted to the Q&A pod. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the moderator of the session. Interpretation for the session will include Spanish and French. Click on the interpretation icon in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during this session.

If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in the Zoom room, and once the session facilitator calls upon your name, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Before speaking, ensure you have selected the language you will speak from the interpretation menu. Please state your name for the record and 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 Hervé Clément.

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.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you, Ozan. Hello, everybody. We are here, Constanze and I, to present you where we are on our work about the ICP-2 update. I think that now the ICP-2 is a famous document, ICP, Internet Coordination Policy 2. It's about the list of secretariat to form the original internet registry, and it's now three years that we have started working on it.

Constanze and I, we are part of the NRO NC, the Number Resource Organization Number Council, which fulfills the function of the ASO, Address Supporting Organization, AC, Address Council, and we are both part from the RIPE regions, which is Europe, Russia, and middle East as well. Sorry. And I am presently, this year, the chair of the ASO AC.

The idea of this presentation today is to present you, as I said, where we are and to explain you what we will do during the ICANN85 in Mumbai, where the Council will be present as of whole. And having said that, I will give the floor to Constanze who will introduce the presentation of the document. Thank you, Constanze.

CONSTANZE BÜRGER

Thank you, Hervé, for this kind introduction. Just some words about myself. My name is Constanze Bürger, I'm from Berlin, Germany. I studied computer science years ago, and I had been reelected to the ASO AC in the last year, and I'm really glad and

happy and proud to serve and to work with the internet community and with my ASO AC colleagues.

So, let's start the internet coordination policy review and update. Next slide, please. About us some words. Next slide, please. So, what can I say about the ASO AC? The ASO, the Address Supporting Organization body was established by ICANN to advise on internet number resource policies. We are a supporting organization of the ICANN.

There are three supporting organizations, and the ASO AC is one of them. We have 15 members, and now are from each regional internet registry region are three people elected. In each region, two persons are elected and one person is appointed by the registry. How long we serve, this varies per region. And what are we doing?

We care about numbers. And this sounds easy, but it is not. I can explain you. We advise the ICANN Board, we oversee the global policy development processes. We appoint two members to ICANN Board, and we appoint one member to the NomCom. We meet as virtual monthly, but not in the moment. We meet more than monthly to additional topics and issues. We meet annual in-person. The focus of the actual work is to conduct ICP-2 review process, to conduct the election of the Seat 9 of the ICANN Board, and to monitor support global policy development processes.

Next slide, please. Picture says more than words, so you see the faces of my colleagues, and you see here all members from the

actual ASO AC. Next slide, please. Regional internet registries. What we are doing, we care about numbers.

Next slide, please. You see here this picture and you see the registries. We have five registries, the ARIN for the North America, we have the LACNIC for South America, we have for Europe for Middle East and East Asia, Hervé mentioned that, the RIPE NCC. We have the AFRINIC for Africa, and we have the APNIC for the Asia Pacific region. And all serves and managed IP address resources and care about numbering. Next slide, please.

What we do, the number resource organization is the body who cares about the coordinating for all the five regions, and so we care as Address Supporting Organization, we serve these number resource organizations at ICANN. We are a support organization since 1999, and we charged with reviewing and developing recommendations on internet protocol, address policy, advises the ICANN Board, and care about policy issues relating to operation assignment management of IP addresses.

Next slide, please. In detail, functions of a regional internet registry. We care about IPv4 and IPv6 addresses and autonomous system numbers. No one in the internet can't survive without these functions, and it's absolutely necessary to figure out and to emphasize the relation and the importance of these issues. It's very important to have V4, V6, and autonomous system numbers. We maintain directory service, including WHOIS, WHOWAS, routing registries, provide reverse DNS, and also we support internet

infrastructure through technical coordination, community driven policy processes, training, capacity building, or labs.

Next slide, please. And now, why Internet Coordination Policy Review? Let's talk about the background. We will give some information and the process and the timeline where we are. Next slide, please. First of all, the timeline about the regional internet registries. So, the first registry was established in 1992 when the APNIC was established. Then the ARIN arrived and the ICANN was established in 1998.

And in this time, the registries focused and figured out that the coordination policy is necessary. So, ICANN adapted internet coordination policy in the year 2001 to manage and coordinate all numbering issues over the registries. After that, LACNIC established AFRINIC established, but what we see is that this coordination policy is nearly 25 years old, and the internet has changed a lot over this time.

The relationships between the registries and ICANN and between each other have changed a lot. We figured out that we need more explicitly provide for an ongoing responsibility of a registry, but also we need an adequately provide for the needs of an RIR, even RIR has to derecognized. If the RIR is not serving the community with adequate issues, then the internet ecosystem is not stable anymore, and that's the reason why we have a look of the ICP-2 and review the ICP-2. Next slide.

The ICP-2 review project started in the year, Hervé mentioned this, in October, 2023. The NROEC, that's our bosses, the registries have chairs and the NROEC, these are all the registries chairs, and they ask the ASO AC to help with two tasks. First task was to review the current implementation procedures of each registry if they come and are compliant with the ongoing ICP-2. And the second task that's more important to strengthen the ICP-2 and to revise the current ICP-2 to make the RAS system more accountable to the internet community. That was the task we started in 2023.

Next slide, please. Now you can see the timeline until now what we did, and we jump in this timeline a bit more deeply and we want to explain what we did. But we did a lot of work, and this work is absolutely transparent for you. We published a lot of documents and we want to go through this timeline now. Thank you.

Next slide, please. First of all, we wanted to check what are the needs in our time, and the principle documents came up. Next slide, please. In October, 2024, we published proposed 25 core principles. And after that, we have had a public consultation and reviewed this, and the ASO published the ICP-2 questionnaire summary. But in detail, we see this on the next slide. We drafted core principles. We thought about to draft principles, to close the gap between the needs and the current ICP-2, the current policy.

And therefore, we thought about these issues and proposed principles as a basis for updating the ICP-2. These principles were shared with the RIRs, with the registries, with the community, and

the ICANN community for feedback from 8th October to the 6th of December in 2024. We got comments from the ICANN colleagues, 14, and we got a lot of comments from the RIR colleagues.

So, we got roundabout 300 responses. These responses were analyzed, we put them in a big spreadsheet, and we reviewed every comment from every person, and we figured out a summary report of the RIR questionnaire, and this was published in February, 2025. This input from this process was a base for the new RIR Governance Document that is our aim to publish in this year.

Next slide, please. You can see with this QR code, all principles and the consultation report. Next slide, please. Very important had been the impact of this community feedback. We learned about the feedback and we adapted this as a base for the ICP-2 version for the RIR Governance Document. First of all, we clarified the role of the community, the RIR decision making process, and that's a governance process based on multi-stakeholder governance model. And this is really important to clarify this.

We addressed concerns about the recognition and clear recognition procedures. We added a provision for appeal and ICANN's review process respectively. We aligned requirements for common privacy and corporate governance requirements, and we elaborated when necessary to address questions about the principles.

Next slide, please. And now I hand over to Hervé to make a deep dive in the RIR Governance Document, version one. And that's your turn. Thank you, Hervé.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you, Constanze, for your excellent explanation about the first step of this update, the work of update we have performed. After the agreement about the core principles you talk about, we were able to draft the first document which we called the Governance Document. It was a version one, and that's not completed about the version one, and then you can go to the next slide.

The timeline still, this document as the first version, we published it in April, 2025, and we launched a consultation in front of the different communities, the five communities, and the ICANN also, and this consultation on May 27th. You can go to the next slide. The version one, what it is, it's a comprehensive update to ICP-2 introducing detailed governance structures.

So, it was clear what will be finally the bodies dealing with the recognition, the ongoing way of Regional Internet Registries, detailed operational requirements and procedures for the full life cycle management of Regional Internet Registries. So, the recognition, the ongoing way, and in extreme case, the derecognition.

All developed what I said through extensive community consultation, it was a consultation before. The draft document, the version one clarifies scope and life cycle management, formalizes governance structures, strengthen operational requirements, and clarifies role responsibilities and procedures as well. You can go to the next slide. And as we have a lot of documents, a lot of steps, a lot of versions, you have a new QR code if you want to read this first version of our Regional Internet Registries governance document.

You can go to the next slide. And another QR code because there was another document. You have a document about the ICANN public comment, the answer from the ICANN, and the answer from the communities as well to have a look and to make you clear that, as you say, circumstance, we study all the comments, all the answers to be sure that we were able to answer everybody and try to take into account everything in a comprehensive document.

You can go to the next slide. And this is a QR code to the version one, first consultation summary report to explain what we did in term of analyzing the different answers. Next slide. And after that, there was a turn of the version two of the Regional Internet Registries Governance document.

Next slide. Because there was the consultation in spring 2025, we published in July, 2025 the governance document first consultation summary report. And after that, we published, because we draft it of course, and we published Regional Internet Registries Governance documentation two. And from August the

28th till November, 2025, we launched another consultation to the regional communities on one side and to the ICANN community on the other side. And we had the result in November, 2025 and we were able to analyze the answers in the LACNIC premises in Montevideo in November 2025.

You can go to the next slide. Version two. What are the key changes compared to the version one? Because we started with the beginning of the document with the title, there was a small change to the title of the document to take into account what we think about what is the document. We expanded the preamble to explain the goals of the document because [00:21:42 - inaudible] to answer a lot of question we could have regarding what is the document, because we have some question.

Finally, we deal with which was outside the document. Regarding the implementation procedures, there is a reference to separate implementation procedure document that may provide further implementation details on any obligation. There was a work about the recognition and the derecognition process.

There are additional protections in recognition and derecognition procedures for affected Regional Internet Registries, including the possibility for candidate Regional Internet Registries to be recognized, unless that the anonymous approval of existing Regional Internet Registries and be sure that this notion of anonymous was very debated in the council.

About the audits and the proposal of audits, we added the document, new criteria for Regional Internet Registries member or ICANN to request audits or propose derecognition. And there is also a notion of emergency continuity. In the version two of the document, there is a new emergency continuity procedure to temporarily transfer a Regional Internet Registries responsibility to in case of necessity to an emergency operator. You can go to the next slide. And another QR code because there is another document.

And this QR code directs you to the version two of the governance documents, which is called the Governance Documents for the Recognition, Operation, and Derecognition of Regional Internet Registries. You can go to the next slide. And we added some document to explain what we did compared to the previous document.

The first document on the [00:23:58- inaudible] is the QR code to access it, it's the red line of changes. So, to see clearly what are the differences between the version two of the document and the version one of the draft documents. You can go to the next slide. And we explain why we changed some paragraph, some words deleted or added.

And for all the changes we made, we prepare a document explaining one and it's a document containing the rationale behind the changes and the same logic, so you have a QR code to access this document also. You can go to the next slide. And you have also

as the version one and as the last consultation, the two document, I will say gathering all the answer from the different consultations and from the community consultation and from the ICANN consultation as well.

One more time, you have a lot of documents, a lot of information, the idea is to be as transparent as we can and for you to access all the element to really see that we make effort to take into account all the answer or the comments we could have from the consultations. You can go to the next slide. And there is a timeline, another time.

We analyze, as I said, all the answer in Montevideo in November. After that, we have, I would say, only started the work on drafting the new document. We have within the council two, three people in charge of drafting the documents. It's something we have just started that we are here also to continue to analyze and to see what we can do to complete the next document.

For that, in February, so, it was at the beginning of this month, the SO/AC, the council published document, which is called the Regional Internet Registries Governance Document Second Consultation Summary Report. So, it's to summarize one more time all the element we add. And four days after that, we publish document, which is a report of the issues in progress and the issues in drafting. But I will explain just after what it is exactly. You can go to the next slide.

Okay. The first document I talked about, it's a Regional Internet Registries Governance Document Second Consultation Summary Report. You can go to the next slide. Okay. So, that was a document about the summary, and finally, it's February where we are now in term of process. You can go to the next slide. Okay, I see some noise. I don't know where it comes from.

I will talk now about the consultation feedback we proceeded. As I said, before the NROAC, which is the ASO AC as well, we had a workshop in the LACNIC premises in Montevideo in November to review the community feedback. Most of the Regional Internet Registries governance document is complete now, but some areas required additional discussion within the ASO AC.

That's the reason why we publish quarter one status report to provide transparency and track drafting process based on feedback received. There are two sets of elements and two sets of issues. We highlight first topic, still requiring discussion and that are the in-progress issues and we list the topics and the issues which have already been agreed, which are the drafting issues.

And so, to give you an idea of the work we plan to do, so we plan to finalize the draft document on the document finally, which will be the update of the ICP-2 by and in accordance with the NROEC, which has the different CEOs of the regions. We aim to finalize the document by Q4 2026, because it started in 2023, remember that.

You can go to the next slide. Okay. And of the timeline we are now, and it's a document I just talked about. It's Q1 status report of issue

in progress on the drafting. So, it's a document which was published, and you can have access to. You can go to the next slide. Status report of quarter one. So, it's where we are now.

You can go to the next slide. Okay. And this status report Q1, so you can access one more time there these QR codes, so you have a list of QR codes, so be attention not to mix everything in term of codes of course.

You can go to the next slide. The topics in progress. So that has the topics and the issue which we need to discuss within the council because there have been a lot of comments and we have to be sure that we go to agreed something about these issues.

You can go to the next slide. First, the recognition review and with the notion and the presence of independent party. So, what is the background? What is the context. If the existing Regional Internet Registries do not anonymously recommend recognition of a new candidate RIR, the candidate RIR may request an ICANN recognition review potentially conducted by an independent third party.

So, what it is written in our current document, but we had a lot of feedback. And the example of feedback is the document should prescribe minimum attributes of the independent third party, which is something we clearly understand. There were questions whether the qualification for the third party should be in the implementation details instead of the Regional Internet Registries governance documents because we agreed that there will be this

governance document, but we need to have also an implementation details document for the details of course.

And another point, if that ICANN may wish to evaluate whether it wishes to use a first party, basically. [00:31:42 - inaudible] different question on the reasons, so the status of each issue is in progress, and it requires input from the ICANN clarifying the role in the process. That is something, so that would be done.

You can go to the next slide and to another issue. It's an issue regarding the recognition and the tool of unanimity minus one to recognize a new Regional Internet Registries. What is the backbone, the background, sorry. So, in the document, the grand document, it allows for recognition of a Candidate Regional Internet Registries with one dissenting Regional Internet Registries under certain condition. So, to recognize somebody, there could be the possibility of one Regional Internet Registries cannot agree. And what is the feedback regarding this context?

So, there could be conflict of interest among multiple Regional Internet Registries, there could be existing Regional Internet Registries would be required to cooperate with any new Regional Internet Registries, so there is a need for everybody to agree.

So, if there is a dissenting RIR, that could be an issue. The recognition process will account for effective coordination and cooperation also. It's a similar problem, and there is a possibility that the Regional Internet Registries may be unable to act or to take

decision on recognition also. There are different elements. We say that the current text is not okay for the moment.

So, the status of this issue is still in progress, and there are discussions on whether the current thresholds and process are adequate on the range of scenario also because threshold for the fact of recognize Regional Internet Registries. You can go to the next slide.

And the next issue is about derecognition. So, the fact that we can delay, I will say the Regional Internet Registries, but it's in extreme occasion, and ad hoc audit, as we say, thresholds is about that. We need a minimum members of Regional Internet Registries or a minimum number of members to decide an ad hoc audit, for example. What is the background and the phrase in the document?

The background, so it can be initiated by any Regional Internet Registries or group of Regional Internet Registries, a group of members of the impacted Regional Internet Registries. So, it's 25% of the total of the members, or 2000, whichever is lower. The feedback we had, there was a number of comments saying that we can lower the threshold and there were proposals that anti-capture mechanism can be added.

The response we had is that recognition is a final recourse, as I said, very extreme. And threshold sold to trigger that is deliberately high and no change to the thresholds. So, status of each issue is in progress. We can discuss whether ad hoc audit results should be lower than that of recognition is something we'll discuss and we

can ensure that ad hoc audits cannot be continuously triggered by disgruntled parties.

I see a question there from Michael Palage, but I propose that for us to complete the presentation and we can take the questions just afterward, but your question is very well noted. Thank you. You can go to the next slide. It's about emergency continuity initiation and renewal process. What is the background source of procedures we are and which has written in the document require anonymous agreement of all other original Regional Internet Registries and ICANN to put in place this emergency continuity.

But as a feedback, there could be concern that emergency measure could be extended without enough oversight, unanimity requirement may be too high. There is still this issue of unanimity. We need to add a clear criteria for extending emergency continuity procedure. And there is a concern that 90 days may be inadequate to identify your successor identity as well. And still, the status for this issue is in progress.

We have to discuss whether the thresholds we decided that need to be lower than unanimity, and we need a clearer text for more clarity on procedure for initiating and extending procedure to ensure transparency and decision making for affected communities.

Next slide. Okay, so those were the issues on progress or issues that are under discussion, and you have Items under drafting. So for information, we can go to the next slide. First, the Document

structure [00:37:31 - inaudible]. So the background is that we noticed that in the document, in the search of the document that the same issue is addressed across multiple sections and we had the feedback and it's something, so we understand that the document is too complex and would benefit from restructuring.

And the status of the drafting is that the document will be restructured for improved flow and clarity. So, it doesn't add new ideas, but we'll make effort to make the document clear. You can go to the next slide. About transition and continuity, the background is that, so in term of change, in term of derecognition also, a smooth transfer of service and operation of derecognition Regional Internet Registries to an interim or successor entity as directed by the ICANN.

So, the feedback we had from that is that this article should address transition in more detail to ensure communities remain engaged during the transition and to protect the rights of affected resource holders. It's a drafting status regarding this issue and us, the NRO NC, will add the text outlining requirements for a transition plan that ensure continuity of service and protections of resource holders rights.

So, to be sure that the rights of everybody remain consistent. You can go to the next slide. So, it's about this time, audit obligations. What is the background? So, document allows for ad hoc, sorry, audits and Regional Internet Registries audits no less than once in

three years, but does not specify the actions to be taken following the audit.

The feedback we had regarding that is that the document does not explicitly oblige Regional Internet Registries to act following the publication of an audit report. The status we have regarding that is that we will amend the text to clarify the Regional Internet Registries obligation in that case. You can go to the next slide, please.

Derecognition this time, and is a part that there could be or not an audit as part of the derecognition process. Background in the current document, so derecognition process does not include an audit as one of the necessary steps. The feedback we had is that audit be a mandatory part of the process. But what we answer to that is that we won't change that because the document requires Regional Internet Registries to be audited no less than once in three years.

So, the audit plan, it's possible that the derecognition process is triggered after Regional Internet Registries has already failed one or multiple audits, including an audit requirement could further delay the process, so there should be audits. And in the document, if you read it, the Article 6.2 already creates an obligation to help and rehabilitate Regional Internet Registries before any derecognition processes.

You can go to the next slide. Derecognition one more time. It's the possibility of rehabilitation as part of the derecognition process.

Why this question? Because in Article 6.2, this article requires efforts to be made to rehabilitate a non-compliant Regional Internet Registries before the recognition. So, you see that we had a lot of efforts for a Regional Internet Registries not to be recognized.

However, rehabilitation is not listed as a step under derecognition process. The feedback we have that there is a need to include rehabilitation as a step into derecognition process. The status of that is drafting. The text will be amended by us to include the obligation to attempt to rehabilitate Regional Internet Registries before further derecognition steps are taken. Next slide, please. And with that, I will give the floor two Constanze for the last slide. Thank you very much.

CONSTANZE BÜRGER

So, you got a lot of information and we will ask you now for aesthetics. No, sorry, just a joke. So, we meet in person with the colleagues at ICANN85. Next slide, please. And we will discuss with you, with the colleagues, and we'll open our results. In this timeline, you see this, we have a session with the GAC, we have a public session first, and we have also a second public session.

We have ALAC session, and with the RSSAC, we have a session with ICANN Board, we have a information session. This is really cool how it works. And we have a joint session with the ICPCP. And we invite you to join us in these sessions and also to we are there in

person and you can talk to us and to have, if you have questions we can ask us.

Next slide, please. We, looking ahead, what's next? Please. The next timeline is coming up. We mentioned that we will finish on this RIR document, governance document in the end of the year. And so, we work ahead in person working group and we start with the final version of the RIR Governance Document at ICANN85.

We shared our knowledge at APNIC already. In quarter two, we want to give the status report with the ARIN, LACNIC, RIPE community, and we want to work as a group in person at ICANN86 and we want to draft hopefully the final version. In Q3 and 4, we will have the final version of the document and we will deliver this to the NOEC and present this in the RIR meetings at ICANN87. In Q4 as well, it'll begin the NOO at ICANN, the approval, and the adaption process. Next slide, please.

So, which questions do you have? We already saw some questions on the chat, and yeah, I will switch to the chat now. And I think we start this one question, "Has ICANN provided any legal opinion on this provision from a competition and stand from various national competitions authorities conflict of interests based on economic interests?" Hervé, do you want to start?

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

I think, but I see it's a question from Michael Palage, but I see your hand up there perhaps. So, you want to speak directly, perhaps.

MICHAEL PALAGE

Yeah, Michael Palage for the record. If that's possible. So, I just want first compliment the two of you on just an excellent presentation and what I think is really important, someone who has never heard of an RIR or does not understand what an IPv4 or IPV address space is, it was really good to give that his historical analysis and kind of go forward. So, kudos on that.

Most of my time in the ICANN space has been in the name side, not the number side, but I really do think the second N in ICANN is equally important. So, some of the questions I have here, and these are high level, so maybe I could just run through them and ICANN Org or the ASO can kind of address them. So, my first question, and this is something that goes back to my time on the ICANN Board, I believe that the NRO is not a legal entity.

So, ICANN in the bylaws, it mentions ICANN having an MOU with the NRO, the NRO itself, my understanding was not a legal entity. Has that changed over the past couple of years? Does that have legal standing or is that just a affiliation of the five RIR?

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

In my perception, so we are still in this case, so, the sets of the five RIRs, so, you said about MOUs about that. So, I don't know. So, I prefer to report so the question, I don't know, but I see in the attendees of the participation that could be illegal from the regions who could answer your question more clearly about that.

JOHN SMITH

Hervé, this is John Smith. The question is --

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

I see you, John. Thank you.

JOHN SMITH

Yeah, if the question is, is the NRO illegal entity? No, it is not.

MICHAEL PALAGE

Okay, excellent. Thanks. And the reason I ask that and I think it is important is, ICANN, particularly in the naming space, part of what is very important is privity of contract. So, if ICANN has an MOU with a non-legal entity, that I think potentially raises some legal issues that would be good to undertake as part of this. And again, my second point here talks to some of the initial comments raised by Constanze about this being 25 years.

So, one of the things that I think is important, and I've raised this as part of ICANN's budgetary process, as well as some of the other Prep Week's calls, I really do think it's important for ICAN to undertake a comprehensive economic review of all of the unique identifiers that it is responsible for coordinating. And if they do, should they undertake that economic analysis, I think it would be important to look at primary and secondary markets just like that is important in the name space as well.

The third question that I had, and I don't see Xavier on this call, I don't know how much the RIRs currently contribute to ICANN's budget. John, would you happen to know how much the RIR directly or indirectly contribute towards ICANN's current?

JOHN SMITH

I don't have that figure, but I know they still do, and they do it based on their income.

MICHAEL PALAGE

Okay, thanks.

JOHN SMITH

It's shared between the five RIRs.

MICHAEL PALAGE

Excellent. And again, maybe someone from ICANM Org could just reach out to Xavier. And the reason I'm asking that as part of ICANN's five-year strategic review, which it's currently undertaking right now, it would be good to understand what the revenue or what the fees that ICANN is taking in and what are the potential expenses, including the operation of the .arpa TLD, as well as some of the AFRINIC litigation costs, et cetera.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Michael, if I may interrupt you, so there is an answer from some to one of your questions. So, she said that the Regional Internet

Registries still contributes at least 650K per year to ICANN pursuant to their SLA.

MICHAEL PALAGE

Excellent. Thank you, Sam. And you were channeling your inner Xavier. And it would be helpful, Sam, has that number increased, or is that been pretty steady? Again, I just want to get through one or two more questions and then turn the floor over to other participants that may have questions.

So, I think, and this is something that I did raise in the chat, given the fact that certain RIRs have the ability to evoke or prevent the recognition or revocation of other RIRs, has ICANN undertaken an economic, or if you will, a legal analysis on some of the potential competition concerns with this current framework. So, I think that is really important. So, those are my questions. Again, kudos to the presenters. Up, Sam.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Sam, so it's a pleasure to see you on, I would say on stage, but within the participant, and we can give you the floor to answers Michael issues and concerns.

SAM EISNER

Thanks, Hervé. Good to see everyone here. Michael, I just wanted to confirm, ICANN is watching this space very closely, we're contributing to the conversations, and we're monitoring for issues. So, if we see any sort of competition issues arising within the

proposals, we will be flagging those and addressing those. So, we are monitoring this regularly.

MICHAEL PALAGE

Thank you, Sam. And if participants have specific competition concerns, who should they address them to, ICANN Legal, yourself, JJ?

SAM EISNER

You can share them with me and John, that would be fine, and you can also be sure to, if there are things that impact the proposal that the ASO AC is working on, I'd encourage you to include a minimum Hervé in this or the group as you'd like to see.

MICHAEL PALAGE

Okay. Thank you.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you, Michael. So, except of your question, Michael. So, a bit at this point, I don't think I see a question from other participants, and I have nothing because I have opened the Q&A screen as well, so I didn't see. But I can realize that we have shared a lot of information, and if you have not, I would say read the document.

I admit that it could be difficult to follow, not because it's very difficult, but it's a lot of information, and so to be honest, at one moment we have drafted some schemes to understand really what

we wanted to present also. So, after that, Ozan, perhaps I can give you the floor back.

OZAN SAHIN

Yes. Thank you, Hervé and Constanze, for the presentation. And thank you everyone for your participation today. I believe we are wrapping up, so have a nice rest of your days. This session is adjourned. Goodbye.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you very much.

CONSTANZE BÜRGER

Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]