ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – GAC Operational Updates and Meeting with the ASO
Saturday, March 7, 2026 – 10:30 to 12:00 IST

JULIA CHARVOLEN

Welcome to the ICANN85 GAC Operating Matters Session on Saturday 7 March at 10:30 local time. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During the session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted in the proper form in the Zoom chat pod. Interpretation for this session will include all six UN languages and Portuguese.

If you'd like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in the Zoom room. And please remember to state your name for the record and the language you will be speaking in case speaking a language other than English. And please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. And now I'll hand the floor over to Nico Caballero, GAC Chair. Thank you. Over to you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Julia. Welcome back, everyone. I hope you had the time to enjoy the fantastic Indian coffee and tea, by the way. They have excellent tea from Sri Lanka, I think, or the southern part of India. Fantastic tea in any case. So, welcome to this GAC operational updates session from beautiful Mumbai or Bombay in Portuguese. I'll give you a very brief overview of the agenda for this session.

We're gonna be reviewing the GAC Communique Process given the fact that we didn't have time to address it during the opening plenary. Right after that, we'll talk about CIP. CIP standing for Continuous Improvement Program, as usual our acronym romance which is the way we do things in ICANN. And then we'll talk, as I as I told you at the at the beginning about the GAC leadership election and the whole process and the internal mechanics and what really happens under the hood.

And then also hopefully a meaningful discussion on the GAC contributions to the NomCom, the Nominating Committee. So, let's dive in. Without further ado at this point, I'll give the floor to my esteemed colleague Fabien, who's going to walk us through the whole process of reviewing the GAC Communique and communique drafting and so on and so forth. Fabien, the floor is yours.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Thank you, Nico. My name is Fabien Betremieux from the GAC Support Team. And I'll do our usual review of the process, which we hope is useful as a reminder for those of you that have gone through this explanation several times, and useful for those of you who've never gone through the explanation and have joined the GAC more recently.

The communique, the GAC Communique, is one of the key outcomes of an ICANN meeting for the GAC. It's not the only outcome, the only output. Another one is the GAC minutes. So, we as a support staff make sure that we record the proceedings of the meeting in those minutes. And so, if you are not familiar with those, please go on the GAC website and explore the minutes, and you'll see the type of content that there is there in addition to the communique.

So, the communique is the key output of the meeting for the GAC as it includes a report of the engagement the GAC has with other community groups. It includes references to key internal activities of the GAC such as elections, for instance, leadership elections. This is where the GAC states its positions on issues of importance to the GAC. You've heard how those are discussed between the GAC and the Board. And also, this is where the GAC, when it deems the need to, addresses consensus advice to the ICANN Board.

The way the communique is developed is in three phases. As you see on the screen, there is a communique preparation phase before the meeting, a communique drafting phase during the meeting, and a communique review period after the meeting. The communique preparation phase is those two weeks before the meeting, and you may recall the emails that the GAC Chair sends during those two weeks to call for GAC members to consider potential topics for the communique, as well as potential text for consideration in advance of the meeting.

The point of this preparation phase is to help GAC members start considering issues for the communique and prepare nationally potential deliberations in advance of coming to the GAC and during the drafting phase discussing those issues and reaching consensus. There is a particular increased role that the GAC leadership has thought from the GAC topic leads during the preparation phase to help the GAC understand the type of issues that are being considered for the communique.

And for instance, for the ICANN85 Mumbai meeting, you may have seen earlier today my sharing of a number of topics that the registration data topic leads and DNS abuse topic leads have identified four considerations in the communique for ICANN85. I'm not gonna go through the list. Please refer to the emails that were sent and you'll see the various topics that were identified. So, this was for the communique preparation phase. During the meeting, we are entering the communique drafting phase.

Obviously, the purpose of that phase is to write the communique all the way to its adoption at the end of the meeting. The way this is done is that for the first few days of the meeting, during the GAC plenary discussions, the GAC topic leads that lead those sessions are expected to take time during the sessions, particularly towards the end of the session, to enable time for the committee to consider what could be potential topics for the communique, and also to identify themselves as topic leads as potential drafters of some text, be it for issues of importance or for consensus advice, should it be considered.

And this enables GAC members who are interested in contributing to the drafting of potential text for issues of importance of communique to getting in touch with those topic leads the purpose of this encouragement is for deliberations between topic leads and GAC members to have occurred before the GAC considers the text as a committee. And this is to increase the efficiency of those communique drafting sessions that come later on during the meeting.

And you see, starting day four, day five, day six, this is when we will have on the agenda a number of those communique drafting sessions. The purpose of those sessions is to ensure that there is an agreement in the GAC on all the text that is proposed. And so, we're trying to find ways to encourage for the text to be ready as soon as possible, potentially even before the drafting sessions. That way, the drafting process can proceed efficiently.

For those of you that have the most experience in communique drafting, you might recall some very long sessions in the past of drafting. And so, we're trying to make the drafting process more predictable by trying to organize deliberations before we get to those drafting sessions. That said, this is not to preclude any deliberations that need to occur during those drafting sessions.

And as you may know or you might discover, we use a Google document, to which everybody is invited to contribute.

In the context of those conversations, we encourage between any interested member and GAC topic leads. So, you can directly contribute to the document. And I'm going to send an email right now so you have the link to the communique as a reminder. So, you should have that in your emails. Please be careful not to share that link on a Zoom chat or in any public communication so that there is no interference with the process. This link is meant only for contributions by GAC members.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much for that, Fabien. Let me interrupt you here to add that an important detail we have identified in the last, I would say, three years, during my tenure, is that the more wordsmithing, the more careful and detailed we are with the wordsmithing, the better and the less tiring and painful the process is. So, what Fabien is saying right now is very important.

Otherwise, the drafting process itself, when we try to -- and we're going to have to do it on the spot, and we're going to have to correct things and change paragraphs and change sentences and little words and sometimes we get stuck for, I don't know, 30 minutes because of a single word, and this is lovely for lawyers, it doesn't make that much sense for engineers, but anyways, I understand the difference and the importance.

And in order to avoid those, getting stuck for 30 minutes or for half a session because 30 minutes at the end of the day is half a session, and we only have six drafting sessions. So, in a nutshell, what I'm saying is that the more we concentrate on the previous work to the drafting session, the better. So, please do send, as soon as you can, whatever ideas or suggestions you have regarding the communique. Back to you, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

And I think we can also highlight those parts of plenary sessions that are dedicated to potentially discussing communique text that would be proposed eventually between interested members and topic leads. I also want to highlight that those drafting sessions as you see are distributed over three days. The point of doing that is to enable some synchronizations with capitals in the various time zones.

And it's particularly important when a sizable portion of the participants are remote because that will also give them time potentially if they can't attend a given drafting session because of the time difference, the fact that we're going to be spreading the communique drafting over several days will enable and sort of facilitate the participation of those remote participants.

That said, this could also slow down the drafting process because they may not be able to participate to all the drafting sessions. And so, I think it puts the onus on really preparing the text as early as possible and making sure that all the proposed text for instance can be in the communique by the end of Tuesday, day four, so that the next two days are allocated to ensuring that everyone agrees with the text, that the GAC as consensus, and then including from members that are attending this meeting remotely so that the communique can be adopted by the end of the sixth session on Thursday.

And one last comment on the document. You'll see that the document currently is open, you can suggest text. At some point, don't be surprised when the GAC Chair calls that we're stopping contributions directly in the document. This is to ensure stability of the text once the text has advanced far enough, and at that time we as a GAC support team become your conduit for edits in the document.

And please also rely on us if you would like our assistance with references, with prior practice in ways things are mentioned in the communique, with accuracy of references to previous developments, et cetera. So, we can also do some research for you if you're looking for particular precedents or references. So, that's for the drafting phase, which will end with adoption of the communique in plenary.

Once this is done, the review period shortly thereafter will start, and you'll receive an email that explains that. The point of that 70 hours review period is to facilitate, again, participation of those who may have been impeded by circumstances. And so, for those of you who have been here long enough, you might recall that the review period was proposed back in ICANN70, that's five years ago in 2021, as part of virtual meetings during the COVID pandemic.

And this was meant to address those concerns that some may not be able to participate as actively as they would want in the drafting process because of time zone difference, because of connectivity issues, because of language barriers potentially. And so, this review period has been instated back then and have been followed all along for all meetings since then be they fully virtual for a few more meetings back then, until now in the hybrid meetings.

And today, I suppose, is a bit of a more intense hybrid meetings than usual, potentially. Those 24 hours provide an opportunity for all GAC delegations to review the text of the communique as adopted and for potential GAC members or observers to make an objection if there is a particular issue with the text. This is meant to be exceptional, and it's in fact never occurred that there was any objection to the finalization of the communique.

And the reason for this is that should there be an objection on a substantive part of the text, the GAC would need to reconvene after the meeting to address the objection before the communique can be finally adopted and published. So, this is why the GAC leadership has called for objections to be considered very conservatively and very carefully while still providing that possibility should it be needed. And with that, Mr. Chair, that concludes the explanation of the process.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Fabien, for that detailed explanation. Hopefully, it was clear for everyone. Are there any questions or comments as regarding Fabien's explanation of the whole communique drafting process?

I see no hand online and no hand in the room, which means that we're okay to move on to the next agenda item which is the CIP framework. Again, CIP standing for Continuous Improvement Program. And for that, my distinguished colleague Rob Hogarth is going to walk us through the background and the next steps and so on and so forth. The floor is yours, Rob.

ROBERT HOGGARTH

Thank you, Nico. This is a perfect example of the need for written pre-meeting briefings that you all receive. Today is a good example of compressed time. So, I'm not going to get into the background or the details because you've all read about all of them already, so I don't need to do that. We're going to use the rest of this session to focus briefly on the CIP framework, briefly on the GAC chair election, and then give as much time, you'll probably have about 10-15 minutes just to tee up the NomCom contributions.

Suffice to say that the continuous improvement program framework is something that you will all hear much more about for the rest of this calendar year and likely the next couple of years. This framework was created fundamentally to underscore the value of accountability and transparency in ICANN. Later on, this weekend, you'll hear from topic leads who are responsible for the review of reviews cross community group. And fundamentally the CIP, Continuous Improvement Program is allowing that review to take a long period and a thoughtful period of community consideration.

The CIP framework is essentially something that you will all hear and participate in for the next calendar year and likely the next two or three years because there's an expectation from the rest of the community that the GAC as a part of the community will take a look at, consider, and review how it does business.

The concept here is continuous improvements over time. There's a whole structure for how this gets employed. The leadership team is going to be meeting next month as part of their annual planning process, and they'll set up the cycle, they’ll share with you some ideas as they have about fundamental principles that you'll all discuss probably at the Sevilla meeting.

And so, this is something just to bring to your attention, to encourage you to think about, and when you have the opportunity on a plane ride or during a break to learn a little bit more about it. What's important that you take away from this issue spot is really that it's an effort on the part of the entire community within ICANN to make sure that you have the comfort level that not just within your own community, but that the other communities in ICANN are doing the work that needs to be done, doing it consistently and doing it effectively.

And it's really an opportunity for you all to focus on figuring out the best ways that you can be productive. So, it's a very noble cause, there's a framework for how you might approach it, but it's something that you'll have control over how much you want to contribute to it. So, Gulten, if you want to just jump then to the election slides Nico mentioned in the opening plenary.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Before you move on, Rob, just let me make sure that there are no questions or comments in the room or online as regarding the CIP. Any question? Is it clear? Any comment before we move on to the GAC election topic. I see no hand in the room. All right. So, back to you, Rob.

ROBERT HOGGARTH Thank you. This was the second time we've had an opportunity to mention this to the committee in an open plenary. We sort of flagged it in the Dublin meeting. but this will be something that you end up spending a good deal more time at ICANN86. The election of the GAC chair is scheduled to start at the end of this meeting. Many of you who are not new will recall that it was just under a year ago where you all agreed on a new election cycle and how you would be approaching GAC leadership elections.

The key intention there was to align those elections with the annual general meeting of ICANN. And that's created some interesting research and examination on the part of staff to figure out how that all gets transitioned over time. This is the first transition opportunity where essentially Nico's term ends just a little bit earlier than the typical two-year part of the cycle.

Consequently, because of the new procedures that you've all put in place, every aspect of the election cycle has moved up one meeting so that the next GAC chair can be installed literally at the end of the annual general meeting can walk right out of this room down the hallway into the Board meeting and be installed on the Board as well.

So, great intentions, a lot of thoughtful timing considerations that we've had to do in terms of calculating things. For some of you who've been around the GAC for several years, it's almost a thrilling change at least in terms of the timing cycle. You'll no longer have two and a half months to consider who to nominate for chair, you have more like four weeks. So, there a lot more challenge there in terms of just being aligned and ready to roll and go.

Fortunately, this only happens every couple of years as far as the chair is concerned. What it means for you in terms of timing is that I will be sharing an email with the full committee on Thursday of next week. You will be given an opportunity from that point until April 24th to make nominations for the next GAC chair. If there are more than one candidate then there will be a balloting period, and the balloting period will start a few weeks before the ICANN86 meeting and will end at ICANN86. Yes, please.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Just on the point, on the point. And that's why it's so important to keep the records, that's why I insisted on the join of the system. What's the name? I forgot the name.

ROBERT HOGGARTH JOIN-GAC.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Exactly. It's very important to keep the records updated, who the voting delegate is and so on and so forth in order to make sure that everybody is going to have the chance to properly vote and participate in the process, basically.

ROBERT HOGGARTH Yeah, thank you. The only real change in terms of the election cycle that you'll need to be alert to is that you don't have the luxury of contemplating conversations or even your own personal interests for the next two and a half months. You pretty much have to be ready to roll on that in terms of either nominating yourself or nominating somebody else within the committee to do that. What has typically happened is human nature being what it is, people typically wait till the end of the process.

I think we'd want to encourage people who are interested to think more and earlier in the process this time around. The balloting period won't change, it's just the nomination period will be a much shorter time frame. And so, this is not the time for me to explain balloting periods and things like that. Julia will explain that to you if it becomes necessary, but just wanted to tee this up for you.

The GAC has enjoyed a very consistent sort of leadership cycle. Nico has been in place now for almost four years. His predecessor, Manal, was in place for about a six-year time frame. And so, you've all managed to work on a very consistent approach, one that preserves historic knowledge, preserves sort of just the general appreciation for how you conduct your work traditionally and flexibly. This is just one of those more unique moments where Nico will be stepping down and you will have a new chair.

So, I'm sure it will go smoothly, and looking forward to helping you all support that process. We can continue on in the slides, and I'll turn it back to you, Mr. Chair. Again, more in the spirit of teeing up the issue, you've got about 15 minutes before this segment of the session block is over and the ASO leadership comes in, so I'll let you tee this up. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much again, Rob. Let me open the floor for comments or questions at this point, but this is very straightforward, no rocket science here, so, you can see the process. Start thinking about nominating yourselves or thinking about somebody you would like to choose for the position for the next two years, it's going to be a two-year period, and the next GAC chair can actually be re-elected according to the procedures that we decided all together last year. So, I see a hand from India. Please go ahead.

T. SANTOSH

Thank you, Nico. This is T. Santosh for the record. So, again I would like to get the information regarding the period of say what is the timeline period of GAC chair as well as vice chair. What is the period?

ROBERT HOGGART

The term of office?

T. SANTOSH

Term of office.

ROBERT HOGGART

The GAC chair and the vice chair has now served for two years after they're elected. The chair can be re-nominated and served for up to three terms. So, one of the changes that you all employed was now the chair can serve for six years. Vice chair terms were also expanded the idea being consistency, I think, recognizing it takes some time to get up to speed, and before you know it, someone's stepping down.

So, that's the time period, but there's the recognition that if someone needs to leave the role or change positions or go somewhere else, then you do have that choice opportunity every two years.

NICOLAS CABALLERO So again, it doesn't mean that the GAC Chair will be there for six years. Of course, you're gonna have a new election, if need be, after two years, and then four more years, I mean, yeah, four years all in all, and then maybe another two years, but it's gonna be up to you, of course. The idea was to you know to keep consistency in case, of course, the GAC chair is doing a good job, otherwise you choose somebody else. That goes without saying. So, thank you for that India.

Any other question or comment? I see no hands in the room or online, so we're okay to move on. And we need to talk a little bit about the GAC contributions to the ICANN NomCom very quickly, and we'll try to do this in 10 minutes before we welcome the ASO in the room.

So, some quick background, the ICANN Nominating Committee or NomCom, again I'm translating this for the benefit of the new ICANN reps in the room or online, is an independent committee tasked with identifying and selecting individuals for ICANN leadership position not only for the Board but for other ICANN leadership positions in other constituencies as well. For years, the

GAC had a reserved, let's say, non-voting spot or liaison position on the Nom-Com.

However, this position has gone vacant for some years due to a lack of agreement within the committee, that is, among ourselves, on the proper role for this position. There are different opinions. There are some GAC representatives that think that we the GAC should have a more active participation in the process. Some other GAC representatives think that we shouldn't get involved in a more consistent way with the whole process.

Again, it's not for me to decide, it's for all of us to decide. At the end of the day, we'll do whatever we as a team, as a whole, as a committee, finally decide to do. Since at least 2018, we have developed criteria to be submitted annually to the NomCom, as everybody knows, and we basically circulate these emails from time to time whenever it is needed mainly as guidance that could be used in selecting appointees to the ICANN Board.

But as I said before, it's not only for the ICANN Board, it's also for -- and that's part of the reason, maybe, I'm assuming, that's part of the reason why some countries have a different opinion about our potential more engaged participation or not, because whoever we nominate and however active that GAC participant might be will have a direct influence not only in selecting the appointees to the Board, but also to other constituencies. If that is good or bad, I don't know, but it's for us to decide again.

In that time, every year the GAC has shared essentially similar criteria. There's not that much variation over the years because the logic behind the rationale is basically the same in place of the committee appointing an individual to serve on the NomCom. So, we made sure to emphasize that the lack of a GAC appointment to the NomCom in any given year should not create an assumption that no future appointments will be made. And I'm saying this because we had some, anyways, all kinds of weird requests about that spot, that clearly belongs to the GAC and whatever we decide to do with that.

So, with a new NomCom, and we're talking about the year 2026, the 2026 version of the NomCom, so to say, now in place and plans for that group to be more proactive, again, times change, we're not in the same situation as 25 years ago, 20 years ago, not even 10 years ago. I mean, a lot has happened in the last 10 years. I remember the good old times, I always tell Rob, our meetings used to be closed, behind closed doors, nobody allowed except for GAC representatives, super secret sessions, no transcriptions, nothing, and everybody waiting outside the door in order to see what was happening.

We would stay discussing issues till 2, 3, 4 a.m. I'm not joking, this is real, ordering pizzas. You remember, that was Durban. I think it was 2013 or something. I always remember the pizzas in Durban. Crazy. I mean, the world changes, times change, and I guess we should evolve according to the needs and according to the times and according to, again, at the end of the day, whatever we decide to do or not to do.

So basically, we plan for that group to be more proactive in seeking community input on the one hand. The GAC leadership considered we, with the vice chairs, consider that the committee resume some of its previous discussions, not powers, discussions, and we'll decide all together what to do, to determine if GAC views of these topics have evolved or not. We stay the same, we do something different, we keep it as it is.

Again, it's for us to decide. Let me stop here in order to see if we have -- before we open the floor for more discussion. Is there anything I am forgetting at this point, Rob or Ian, in terms of historical, in terms of background? I see a hand from Switzerland, and then I'll give you the floor, Rob. Switzerland, please go ahead. I see two hands, actually. Switzerland and then Egypt.

JORGE CANCIO

Hello, everyone, I hope you hear me okay. I guess that's very complete what you just explained, Nico, and maybe what is missing or what could have been mentioned is that we have included in our strategic plan, in our strategic objectives that we will discuss this in this period, in 2025, 2026.

So, I guess that today in five minutes, we won't be able to have that discussion. And so, as far as I see, we don't have any slot in the agenda for Mumbai, but I guess it would be good that we agree here that we discuss this in Sevilla so that we have at least a 60-minute slot, and maybe the strategic objective number one caretaker, which is myself, together with the volunteers who are helping in the implementation of strategic objective number one can prepare together with support staff a briefing document or a sort of a document with pros and cons or factors regarding the participation in NomCom so that we can have a sensible discussion in Sevilla, could be also Oman.

I don't think it's a question that is super urgent, but I just wanted to propose this because I see that we had had the plan of discussing it here in Mumbai, but some somehow it fell between the cracks. So, maybe we should make sure that we have a proper discussion in Sevilla or Oman. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much for that, Switzerland. Well noted. I wholeheartedly agree about allocating a 60-minute spot in Seville for this. I have Egypt, Australia, and then we need to wrap up because we already have the ASO in the room. So, Egypt, please go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you very much, Nico, and nothing much to add in addition to what you and Jorge said, and I support Jorge's suggestion to have a longer time for this discussion. As you rightly mentioned, we have never had a GAC-wide consensus on the matter, the two views were split between the importance of participating to this committee, which selects ICANN leadership positions, and concerns regarding the confidentiality of the process, and that the GAC doesn't get to know how their liaison participated.

Also to note that the GAC, at the time, chose to have a non-voting liaison, but now this seat has been vacant, and with a new NomCom in place and many new GAC representatives joining the GAC, as you mentioned Nico in the opening plenary, and I have to say also several follow ups with the GAC on whether we would like to keep or give away the GAC seat.

I think it only makes sense that we reopen the discussion and determine if GAC views are the same or not. Also noting the significant participation needed which might mean that whoever will participate is gonna miss the GAC sessions itself. I'll leave it at this. Thank you, Nico. Back to you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Egypt. Before I give the floor to Australia, and then I need to close the queue, as I said before each year the NomCom selects appointees not just for the ICANN Board but also for the GNSO, for the ccNSO, and for the ALAC, we need to keep that in mind. If that is good or bad for us, again, it's for the GAC to decide. But a more engaged, a more meaningful or a voting position, just to give an example, and that's why it matters. Sorry to keep you waiting, Australia. Please go ahead.

IAN SHELDON

No, thank you, Nico. Manal summarized a lot of the comments I was going to make. It's worth noting that this debate boils down to the importance of the NomCom and the role it has within the broader ICANN leadership structure and the confidentiality and transparency restrictions that accompany a NomCom appointee.

So, I think it's quite a complex issue, and I encourage this committee to think through that dichotomy over the next couple of months so we can come to the next meeting prepared to have a substantive discussion on this. It's vitally important that the GAC exercises its influence where we can, and we need to do so in an appropriate manner, whether it's through refreshed guidance in a written document or an appointment directly. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Australia. In closing, let me just remind you that participants in NomCom serve as individuals, not representatives. So, again, that's something we need to discuss. And we'll have the opportunity, all GAC members will have an opportunity to share your views about this matter and identify future actions or expectations or the next steps in general, if any, of course.

Again, it's for us to decide. So, thank you so much for this. Let's wrap up this part of the -- and thank you, Rob and Fabien. We're going to take a two-minute break in order to welcome the ASO to the head table. Thank you, Rob. Thank you, Fabien. Thank you so much. The ASO, please, if you could please join us here at the head table.

So, welcome to the ASO, Hervé and his fantastic team, Esteban, more than welcome to this joint meeting, the GAC and the ASO. We're going to be discussing some very interesting topics related to the RIR, and again, for the benefit of the newer GAG representatives, RIR standing for Regional Internet Registry.

And I mean, Hervé and his team, they're going to walk us through all the details and everything there is to know as regarding updates, mainly dealing with ICP-2, the ICP-2 review and a process update and everything. I don't want to get ahead of myself, Hervé, so without further ado, let me give you the floor. You and your team, Esteban.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT Thank you, Nico. It's an honor to be seated near you, so I learned that it will be the last time.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Not really. Not really. Not really. The last time will be in October.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT Okay, so not the last time, definitely. Good morning, everyone. It's always a real pleasure to be in front of the GAC, and for us, it will be very important to present or represent our work, and so we know that there could be a turnover between you as a member, so it's very important to present or represent what we did in terms of, which is a very famous acronym, now ICP-2. Just to present ourselves, I am Hervé Clément, the chair of the ASO.

Jia Low, that he will tell about that, is the chair of the NRO EC. Esteban and Amy are the vice-chairs of the ASO EC. And you have there the group of the rest of the council, the ASO, with the legal and the communication team and some ICANN representatives also. To present our work, I will first present the ASO EC and who we are. Then Jia Low will have a presentation of the NRO as a large. And I will continue about the work we have performed.

And then Amy and Esteban will present the work we are currently doing during this ICANN meeting. The ICANN, everybody knows what is ICANN, Address Supporting Organization. We are a supporting organization of the ICANN, but we have one part of the ASO, which is the ASO address concealer. We are here to support, to advise the community on internet number resource policies, because it's something very specific. We are normally 15 numbers. Only 13 currently because we are one from the AFRINIC, the other will be elected shortly as I can imagine.

We are free from the five different regions. What do we do in our day-to-day activity? We advise the ICANN Board on numbering activities. When there is a global policy, a global policy is common to all the regions on dealing with the link with the IANA. So, the function of the ICANN dealing with numbers on the regions. When there is a global policy discussion, we oversee if the discussion on the process to adopt this policy is conducting in a good way.

We appoint two members to the ICANN Board, the seat 9 and 10, and we appoint members to the ICANN Nominating Committee as well as the same thing, they are nomination from the GAC also. We meet monthly, our meetings are public, so you can participate as an observer as well. And we have generally one in-person meeting which is the first ICANN meeting of the year.

And this year, we have the activity as mentioned before, and also a big one, which is the ICP-2 review. You can go to the next slide. And you can see where we are. And you can see this, so during this meeting, all the people there displayed there except Ricardo who was not able to attend personally.

NICOLAS CABALLERO How come we don't see Jia there?

HERVÉ CLÉMENT Sorry? Yeah.

NICOLAS CABALLERO How come we don't see you there?

JIA RONG LOW I will explain.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT And so, you will explain because the floor is yours, Jia Low.

JIA RONG LOW Thank you. So, for those who know me, I'm staying here in the capacity as APNIC CEO. I used to work for ICANN for 11 years. So, you have to remove the impression that I'm speaking on behalf of ICANN as ICANN staff. I'm here in the capacity as APNIC CEO. I joined APNIC in October 2024. So, I've been I've been in this role for over a year now. I'm here also, this year I'm rotated as the chair for the NRO Executive Council.

I'll explain that in a little bit. I thought also, because when I was working for ICANN, I do know that at the GAC, there's a regular rotation. So, how many people don't know what Regional Internet Registry does? Don't know. Okay, we've got all those people, thank you. How many people know what a Regional Internet Registry does? Okay, I guess the other side in between, not sure. So, I'll explain that a little bit. So, maybe I take a step back and again talk about what internet is in our space.

So, for us, from the regulator's perspective, from your policymaker or regulator's perspective, you have a tendency to be talking about what are the latest issues, right? Right now, it's all AI. How do we regulate AI? That's on your desk day to day. But for us in this space, internet is not AI. Internet is also not all the buzzwords we've been talking about over the past 10 years, which is 4G, 5G, IoT, Blockchain. It's none of these things.

Internet is just the technology for your device to connect to mine, and for that to happen we need to have three things. First is we code our devices to speak the same language, i.e. we use the same protocols. Who manages protocols globally? IETF. Thank you. Next, we need to have an address. All devices have address. So, this address is IP address. So, we have IPv4, IPv6, these addresses. And who manages the allocation of IP addresses? The Regional Internet Registries.

And the third one would be domain name system. Because humans cannot remember numbers, therefore we need names. And the organization, the platform that manages domain names and where it's going is the ICANN community. Now all three though are related to ICANN because ICANN's IANA function acts as the secretariat to that. And importantly, the global policy that Hervé mentioned, the ASO AC mix, is in relation to how IANA allocates IP addresses to the regional internet registries.

So, that relationship, all of us as one group in one community, must have that important common understanding. So, our relationship, we further allocate the IP addresses to internet service providers, telcos, network operators. And our relationship to ICANN is the IANA function broke up the entire pool of IP addresses into five blocks and gave them to the Regional Internet Registries. So, our role is to make sure that anyone who wants to run a network will get access and allocation to IP addresses and AS numbers.

It is very important that we understand this because that's our entire mission. Anyone who wants to run a network can get access to IP addresses. It is not motivated by any other issue, whether it is more economic resources or geopolitics or politics whatsoever. So, our mission entirely is that we support the growth of the internet. Now, the unique nature of Regional Internet Registries is that we are member-based organizations. In other words, for APNIC for example, we allocate IP addresses to Reliance Jio.

And Reliance Jio is on the one hand our customer, but they are not our customers, they are our members. Our members have the right and responsibility to govern the regional internet registries. So, they have the power to change our board if they want, because they are the ones who vote for our board composition. The community is the one that decides on how large an IP address block we can give out at any one time. So, it's the same governance model as here in ICANN, that bottom-up multi-stakeholder model is the same model by which we are governed.

So, I thought to just share this so that we are all on the same page. From the policymaker's perspective, when it comes to regional internet registries, it is important that we as one community from governments understand that the regional internet registries' job is to serve you, to serve the growth of your network operators in your country, in your jurisdiction, and that we have to work together to ensure that this system continues to work.

And that's where, right now, we have evolved and as the global landscape is changing, as all of us, the organizations are growing and evolving. We've come to realize that there will always be weaknesses. No system is perfect. So, we've come to realize that there are weaknesses. For example, no one has thought about what if an RIR were to fail.

We've not thought about that. If an RIR fails, would IP addresses continue to be allocated? And each of us are registries, so, how can we maintain that single source of truth? On which IP address box are allocated to who if an RIR would fail.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Let me interrupt you there in order to give more clarity or try to give a clear example. Let's say I'm LACNIC’s CEO, and whatever magical powers I might have, I became crazy all of a sudden, and I stole all the money, and I went to live in Antarctica, and voila, goodbye the money, what do we do? What happens with the resources allocated?

It's obviously ridiculous. It's just an example. It's just to try to know that there's no direct relationship with anything that actually happened, but I'm exaggerating on purpose. So, what happens with Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, with IPv4 and IPv6 numbers already allocated, not to mention the money, of course.

JIA RONG LOW

Thank you, Nico. So, those are the things that we have to further strengthen and make sure that the system, the overall global system, continues to support the allocation and accuracy of the IP address allocation. So, that's the purpose behind this document about ICP-2 and the RIR governance document. So, I'm going to use that to segue back to Hervé to talk about the details.

Now, I'll just cover just one very quick point which was the question Nico had, why was my name not on the ASO AC? So, I'll just explain this composition very quickly. So, as a group, the Number Resource Organization, the NRO, we are essentially a cooperative body, we are not an incorporated entity. We are really just a cooperative body comprising the five regional internet registries. and the NRO has two parts.

So, one part comprises of the elected and appointed community leaders of which Hervé and our vice-chairs are here and also our leaders over there who are sitting with us. So, that's one portion, one part of it. The other part is the NRO, so this group, the elected leaders are called the NRO NC, the Number Resource Organization Number Council. Now, in ICANN, they function as the ASO AC, so that's where we are part of the SO/AC structure.

Now within NRO, we also have this other part, which is the Executive Council, and that comprises the regional internet registries CEOs. So, basically the executive council is the other part that is the NRO, and both of us together as one group, we are called the Number Resource Organization. So, I just used that to make it clearer for everybody. But with that, I'll come back to segue back to Hervé about the importance and what are we working on regarding ICP-2. Thank you.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you very much, Jia Low. Because we are full of acronyms and I can understand it's not very easy, and there is another acronym with ICP. ICP is a document which is the Internet Condition Policy that was accepted 25 years ago, and as Nico said earlier that in 10 years, in 25 years, a lot of things happened. This document seems to be very old. What is ICP-2? It's a list of criteria to form a regional internet registry to create an internet registry.

This document was adopted in 2001, this ICP-2. Before that, there was a RIPE NCC, there was the APNIC, and there was the ARIN established, and then the ICANN. So, the ICANN was not the source of that in that history. And after via the ICP-2, there were the LACNIC and the AFRINIC established in 2005. It's an old document first, and this document is only for the formation of a new Regional Internet Registry, but it had no power to, I would say, survey and look after how a Regional Internet Registry is going currently, and for, in extreme cases, to de-recognize a Regional Internet Registry.

The ICP-2 review project, the next slide. It was in October 2023, so two years and a half, if I am correct, the NRO EC asked us with two tasks. The first one is to advise you, the NRO EC, on your procedures for validating and addressing ongoing regional registry compliance, so it's for the continuing life if you could do that. It's something we've done. We thought it was okay for that.

And the most important part, and it's something we are working with since more than two years, is to update or to strengthen this document, ICP-2. You can go to the next slide. I will go quickly, because it's something done and we want to spare time for the questions. We are now on the blue square or rectangle, which is, we call that, we hope, the final review, because we draft two or three documents, including the principle, and each time, we went to consultation to be sure to have the input on the support of the communities about our document. You can go to the next slide.

Then it's the same, I will go quickly with that and I will let you read the different step of our work, but I will go further during the next slide since October 2024 because we need one year to complete the first document. Yeah, next slide, please. The first document we drafted, it was the list of principles for the drafting of the new document. It's something, so we needed one year to draft this list of principles, and the list of principles went to a first consultation from October to December 2024.

We had 14 responses from the ICANN and near 300 from the different regions, the Regional Internet Registry. We analyzed the answers, of course, by each to be sure to capture all the outputs from the community. And the output has been used to start drafting the document which is called the Governance Document for the recognition maintenance and the recognition of regional internet registries, and you have a QR code to see the list of principles we have drafted first.

You can go to the next slide. After the consultation regarding this list of principles, we were driven and we learned finally that we have to clarify the role of the community in each of the regions. The community is an important part of that. We have to address concerns about the recognition and derecognition procedures. There was a role of the ICANN we added. On that, there was a question and issue about the token common privacy and co-operative governance requirement.

And there was a specific question about the principle we drafted, of course. And after that, we drafted the first document, you can go to the next slide, which is called the version one of this document. There is a QR code to it. Some example that was resolved, we have this document. We clarify the scope of the life cycle management of the regional internet registries. Governance structures have been formalized. We strengthened the operational requirements, so in terms of implementation. And roles, responsibilities and procedures have been clarified also.

This document went to another community consultation and to the regions and to the ICANN, and you have the outputs from the consultation from the regional side, from the ICANN side, on the other side, and you have the QR code to access the Version 1. You can go to the next slide. And after this consultation, we drafted a Version 2 to be sure to take into account all the commands. With the Version 2, there was small changes with the title, title is always important.

There was a preamble added to really explain what is the scope of the document because there have been many questions not corresponding to the very scope of the document, so it was important to explain what is this document. and a lot of explanation about implementation procedure recognition, etc. You can go to the next slide. And as we are digital, we love QR codes, and there is another QR codes to reach this Version 2 of regional international registry governance document and to help to read the document and to the see the changes made after the Version 1.

We have created a document which is a red line of changes. So, I won't explain which is the red line document, but you have the QR code to reach it. And we have also provided, in the next slide, the explanation of the changes between the Version 2 compared to the Version 1. And after that, so it went, this document went to another consultation.

It was between August and November, and you have a different QR code to the different steps I explained. And with that, we are now today. And I will give the floor to Amy, as I can remember, first, to explain what are our current jobs. Thank you.

AMY POTER

So, following the second community consultation, the ASO AC met in Montevideo to review all of the feedback that we received during that consultation and really give consideration to all of the issues going on there. To provide transparency to the relevant communities, we put together a status report and published that that just outlines the issues that we've discussed there.

So, within the status report, we outlined open issues that we are still considering and working on, and we also went through the issues that we had enough feedback and agreement among the members of the ASO AC to move forward towards drafting. So, I'm going to go over with you the open issues, and then my colleague Esteban will go through the ones that we are moving forward with drafting. So, you can find the status report with that QR code.

All right. And so, in terms of the open issues that we're still discussing, one of them is recognition review. So, when a candidate RIR, so a new potential RIR, wants to join the RIR system, they submit a proposal to the other RIRs and ICANN. The first step of review is for the other RIRs to consider that proposal and then make a recommendation whether or not to accept that candidate RIR into the RIR system or not.

Under the current draft, if all of the RIRs agree to move forward and bring in the candidate RIR, then the proposal moves forward to ICANN to approve. However, if any, if it doesn't reach unanimity at that first step, then what happens is it's rejected. However, the candidate RIR has an opportunity to appeal to ICANN for a review of the conclusions of the RIRs and their decision-making process. Currently, that process allows ICANN to use an independent third party to conduct that review for them.

The issue that's still under consideration that we need to receive input from ICANN on is whether or not they want to have a third party do that review or if they want to do that in-house. So, that that's the first issue there. All right, so let's say that the candidate RIR submitted their proposal to come in and there was not unanimity and it goes through this review process, they appeal to ICANN, it goes through this review process, the independent third party or ICANN, whoever performed that review, determines that any of the RIRs in making their recommendation made a material error of fact or provided inadequate justification for their conclusion, then it goes back to the RIRs to reconsider the matter.

At that point, the threshold is lowered from unanimity to unanimity minus one. So, currently there are five RIRs, if a sixth one wanted to come on board, you could get through that process with four of the five. So, we are still considering whether or not that threshold really makes sense. We received feedback that there's potential conflict of interest among the RIRs that would be considering that since currently the entire globe is covered by the five RIRs that exist and any new RIR would be taking some of the jurisdiction that is held by another RIR.

So, we're currently considering how to deal with that issue and move forward there. Next slide. So, one mechanism that we have for ensuring that RIRs continue to abide by the requirements of the document and the ongoing commitments that this document lays out for them is the concept of an audit. Every three years, there's a standard audit that each RIR must go through. However, there's a concept of an ad hoc audit that can be initiated more frequently.

Currently, under the current draft, there are three parties that can initiate an ad hoc audit. It can either be any one of the RIRs, it can be ICANN, or it can be a group of the members of the affected RIRs. So, I'm from the ARIN region, right? So, say, I thought that the ARIN RIR was not complying with the document and really causing harm to the ARIN community, if I could go and find, currently we have a threshold set at 25% of ARIN's membership or 2,000 members, whichever is lower, then that could trigger an ad hoc audit to review for compliance.

That same threshold or standing procedures can also be used for derecognition in a more extreme circumstance where the RIR is thought to be so far out of compliance that it's really harming the system and the best way to move forward is to de-recognize them. Currently we're considering whether or not those thresholds make sense and whether or not there should be a lower threshold for, say, ad hoc audits than de-recognition because de-recognition is a more extreme circumstance than ad hoc audits.

So, that's another thing that we're working on and discussing this week. A sort of in-between measure that we have prior to de-recognizing an RIR is something called emergency continuity. So, this is a procedure that allows another operator to come in and take over in the case of an emergency for 90-day periods. It allows for renewal of that 90-day period. The procedure requires unanimous agreement among all of the other RIRs to move in and do that. Currently we are still in the process of discussing whether there should be a lower threshold than unanimity and how that fits in with the other thresholds that we have for de-recognition and audits, and that's another thing that we are currently working on this week to review.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Finally, we have some items that after the public consultation and after the discussion inside the ASO AC last year in Montevideo, we decided to finish. Those items are under drafting and we are working on the document this particular week, and I will give you some examples. For example, the first one is the document structure. In that case, we receive feedback about the document is too complex and will benefit from restructuring, then we are working on that.

Another issue is related with the transition and continuity of the RIR services to allow smooth transfers of service and operations in case of de-recognition of an existing RIR. In that case, the community feedback request us to provide more details to ensure the transition process and also to allow communities that remain engaged during the transition and protect the rights of the affected resource holders. In that case, we are adding text to the document in that sense.

Next, please. The other issue is regarding the audit obligations. The document establishes two types of audits, regular audits and ad hoc audits. We established that this type of audit cannot be no less than once every three years, but does not specify the actions to be taken following the audit. Then we are including in the document an amendment to clarify the RIR's obligation to follow the recommendations that comes from the audit process.

Next one. In that case, we received some comments that request that the audit process will be mandatory as part of the recognition process of the existing RIRs. And after a full discussion of this point, we decided that it is not needed to change it because the de-recognition process is the last resource, and also because if we include an audit, it will be a delay in the process. Then we understand that the document has enough clarity on that point, as for example Article 6.2 already creates an obligation to help and rehabilitate a RIR before any recognition process.

Next one. And the last point under drafting is, for example, what we mentioned before, the rehabilitation process as part of the de-recognition. That belongs to this idea of the de-recognition as the last resource because it has implications on the RIRs, on the community, on the services provided to the region, and in that case, we receive feedback asking to include rehabilitation as a step in the recognition process. Then we understand that this feedback is correct, is appropriate, then we are including this in the document.

Next, please. Well, as was mentioned before by Hervé, we will have a lot of work to do in this particular ICANN meeting. We will have 10 closed sessions dedicated to the discussion of the open issue list and also for drafting purposes. We will have, I think, four joint sessions with different constituencies inside the ICANN ecosystem. And we will have also two public sessions, informative sessions, to provide the community the opportunity to meet the ASO AC and to catch up the process that we are working on.

Next, please. What are the next steps in the process? The idea and the purpose and the goal after two years of work is to have this document finished this year, before the end of the year. We are making progress, we are on time. In that particular week, we will try to draft a B3 or to begin the drafting of B3.

And the idea is to finish that process for the next ICANN meeting in Sevilla because once we finish as ASO AC, we finish the document, we have to present it to the NRO EC for approval and then to the ICANN Board for approval too. That's the general overview, sorry, overview of the process.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

No, no, we’re finish. I'm open to questions or comments. And thank you very much for.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. Thank you so much, Hervé, Esteban, everyone. Before I open the floor for comment, I already have two hands. And this is a question for my distinguished GAC colleagues in the room and also online. Why should we care about this? Why is or should this be important for the GAC?

I can use my imagination a little bit just to help you with the example I gave before, Nico being the CEO of LACNIC, and having stolen all the money and the resources with my company, and by the way, I'm friends with the judge because obviously I was prosecuted, and I'm in trouble with the law, but I happen to be friends with the judge, and those kind of things happen, it would be a total political scandal for you, for your minister, and even for your president, and it would be a total disaster.

Anyways, that's just my opinion. I'm in your hands and I have a queue. We need to be short and sweet and straight to the point. I have the Netherlands, India, and the European Commission. Please go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, colleagues. This is Marco, for the record, speaking as the Netherlands, and not as a vice chair. We are, of course, one of the host countries to an RIR, so we're following this with keen interest. Thank you for presenting it. For the sake of time, I'm going to quickly ask two questions. Feel free to come back in writing, but one of them is, I noticed you mentioned multiple audits being failed?

Does this document have any particular items that explain how audits should be handled and in what timeline corrections should be made should an audit be failing? The second one to the table on our screen, could you please elaborate in your projected timeline at what point the ICANN community, including the GAC, should be able to comment on the final version as it flows through approval by the Board. Thank you.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you, Marco. And so, we know because of your history that you are totally aware of the regional internet registry system. For the audit, so what's one of the points so he was mentioning Amy and Esteban about so we need to complete and to elaborate a little more the implementation of the detail about that, and if we are here during this specific meeting is also to see how we can link more deeply with the different organizations and with GAC particularly. So, your question and concern is taken into account to respond it. Perhaps you want to complete.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Just to add that from the ASO AC point of view, we are not foreseen for a new public consultation because we already did three public consultations on the document, but we know that when we send this to the ICANN Board, ICANN has to follow the general process of approval of everything, but it's not in in our side to establish a new cycle of public consultation.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you so much. I have India next.

SUSHIL PAL Thank you, Nico, and thank you to the delegates for clarifying all this. Responding to Nico's point as to why the government should at all care, I think when we're discussing, we don't want to actually have a role in the governance of the RIR. That's not the intent. So, from that, however, it's important, it's a critical resource, IP address is a critical resource, and it's actually a public good. And the public good left to completely for profiteering purposes, then we already have seen the results.

So, we just have to make sure that there are adequate mechanisms in place and that's the reason I think the consultation is on. I just have two concerns. One is, and thank you for it, since we're looking at the accountability part in the governance framework. For the de-recognition part, I think everything seems fine, I think 25 is a good threshold, however, we still need to evolve some objective criteria, which in a normal corporate field, any contract which we implement, we normally have SLAs, we have been giving this feedback.

I'm not saying that let's attempt to have SLA of the broad key parameters which the audit will actually evaluate, or which the community will reflect upon. Those key SLAs should be published by RIRs in open so that the community can actually see, and then they can decide whether we should be going for recognition or we should not. Otherwise, it's kind of a shooting in the dark. Why should suddenly, I think, no wisdom will dawn upon the community that they need to move the proposal for de-recognition.

So, that's one part. I think we have been giving this feedback. But I'm not saying it can be. It will be a process, but let the first step be taken, at least on the broad key parameters, which needs to be monitored, on which the RIRs needs to be monitored, or should be answerable to the community. The other one is for the governance framework. Thank you for accommodating whatever feedback, but I still think that our suggestions are not being fully taken because this governance framework still does not represent the multi-stakeholder approach of the ICANN, which we espouse so much.

Here is still RIR is primarily the judge in its own cause. Tomorrow the CP's, Contracted Party may also show that we are the person who will decide whether there has to be any amendment in the contract or not. And when I say this, I don't mean that any service area or any geography is left unserved. That's not the point. It's all very well served and the RIRs are doing a very good job. But the approval process for the recognition of RIR should be done by a multi-stakeholder body.

RIR could be an important stakeholder there, otherwise this multi-stakeholder thing of ICANN will only rest with the Board. So, it's important that these multi-stakeholder principles are further kind of transmitted down to each and every stakeholder so that -- I cannot be judge in my own cause, that's the whole point. You make one judge less, it doesn't help. That's what the unanimity minus one is. So, it doesn't help even that.

So, when I say this, I'm not saying that you have an independent review panel which is completely in isolation, don't define that. Just make it more multi-stakeholder process. Have AS role of supporting organizations, have a role of advisory committee so that there's a wider consultation. That's all. Thank you so much.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Can you quickly? Okay, because I have one more hand from the European Commission and then we need to wrap up because we're already over time. Gemma, please go ahead.

GEMMA CAROLILLO: Thank you very much, Chair. Gemma Carolillo from the European Commission. Thank you so much for the very interesting presentation and I think you have given a comprehensive account of where we stand. If I understood correctly, there will not be a third round of public comments and that you are currently finalizing the draft so we will have to see again if and correctly with ICANN whether there is an appropriate moment for the GAC to possibly intervene.

We are among those who participated to the public comment together with six EU member states, and you know that we have raised the issue of the thresholds for the recognition and the de-recognition. I understand that for de-recognition, this is currently under discussion, but we also address two other issues which concerns the general principle that would be beneficial possibly to include either in the governance or in the implementation phase about promoting effective behaviors, discouraging speculative behaviors, including in the promotion of the deployment of IPv6.

And there is the other point which we want to stress again as important, I think the colleagues from India have just also raised it, that it is important that government and stakeholders at large, are involved, that the mechanism be found, perhaps in the implementation phase, at the time of the recognition or the de-recognition of a registry, especially from the affected territories, because again, this needs to happen into a multi-stakeholder process. Thank you very much.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you so much, European Commission. Jia, very short and sweet and straight to the point, please.

JIA RONG LOW	Thank you. I just want to reflect quickly so that everyone knows we understood what the comments are from the GAC members. So, I appreciate all the comments. I think Netherlands asked a question about can we explain more about how the audits are handled and the criteria and the timeline is very similar to India's question about SLA's, what is the criteria. I think it's useful for us to look at it because we are discussing whether that's part of implementation or this document should articulate something. I think that's something which we can take back with. The second one on the process whether it should be more multi-stakeholder in its current form, unanimity minus one, point taken. We'll look into it and see whether there's any way we could take that together because that came from both India, I think European Commission said the same thing and also ask the question about the government's role, especially for the affected territories. It's useful for us to just take those points. So, I just wanted to reflect that we have taken those points from the GAC, and let's see how we can work on them. Thank you very much.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you so much. I agree with you. We should have allocated less time for presentations and more time for discussions, but that's a lesson learned and that's all we have time for at this point. Thank you so much, Hervé, Jia, Esteban, and Amy. I'm sorry. Thank you so very much. So, we're going to have a lunch break now.

Please be back in the room at 1:15 for the next session, which is going to be about Universal Acceptance. Thank you so very much. Enjoy your lunch. And thank you again.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]