
ICANN86 Seville | PF – ASO Address Council Work Session (7 of 15)
Tuesday, June 09, 2026 – 14:45 to 16:00 CEST

HERVE CLEMENT

The ASO AC is meeting there in Seville during ICANN86 to complete its job after the request we had initially from the NRO EC. It was in October 2023, now. And we had a lot. So as you can see in the agenda, it's the seventh working group session. This one is open to observers. And so observers, with the role of observer, are to observe, I will say it, only. We are here primarily to agree finally to the last principle of the document. Within the ASO AC, there is a subgroup, which is called the drafting team. One person from each of the regions. There is Amy Potter, there is Esteban Lescano, Andrei Robachevsky, Saul Stein from AFRINIC, and Nicole Chan from APNIC as well. This group of very clever people are here to draft a document, so for people who are very good in drafting a document. Here during this session, we will particularly focus on two specific sections, regarding definitions and so on. But with that, perhaps Esteban first, because Esteban is one of the vice chairs. Amy, one of the vice chairs as well. We have two vice chairs here, and so it is a pleasure to give you the floor if you want to complete something I could have forgotten. Thank you.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Thank you, Herve. Just to welcome you all to this public session. Glad to see a lot of people in the room. And maybe just for you to

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.

know, in the other sessions, we were analyzing and reviewing the different articles of the RIR governance document. And we already covered section three, sections four and five, and six. Now we need to cover sections one and two. With that, I pass to Amy.

AMY POTTER

Hi all, and again, thank you for your continued interest in our work here. This has been a really fun and interesting project, looking to increase the stability of the RIR system. We started this all the way back in 2024, so it has been quite a journey. And we're coming up on our last leg here, so we're excited to have all of you with us, and you can get a sort of peek into some of the work that we're finishing up here. As Esteban noted, we've had some really productive sessions this week, going over the sections on recognition of a new RIR, as well as the ongoing commitments that RIRs need to continue to meet over time. And so now we're just going to be jumping into some of the initial sections of the document, which I think will be a good intro for everyone here. So with that being said, let's go ahead and jump in.

So we're starting out with article one. And actually, I'll take a step back and give a bit more context for our observers here. We've gone through multiple drafts of this document over the past, what, two years now. The draft that we're working on now, we have already sent it to ICANN, who's been incredibly collaborative. ICANN's lawyers have provided us with some feedback and some redlines that we are going through now. This is just trying to coordinate

before we send off the final version of the document to the EC, and then they will be taking it from there. So right now we're going through ICANN's comments on sections one and two, articles one and two. So article one, the most exciting one, is on definitions. I'm sure everyone's thrilled about that.

So, jumping in, we're just going to be going through these redlines one by one. Oh, thank you. I'm trying to expand this here so it's a little bit more visible. All right. So the first redline here is a pretty minor one on the definition of audit. So the addition that we have here is the word "with." Reading the sentence in full, "Audit means an audit performed to assess whether an RIR is in compliance with its obligations under this document." For the other members of the ASO AC here, does anyone have an objection to this addition? Hearing nothing, I will pause.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

No, Amy, and let me also say that this is in connection with our previous session, in which we defined that also the document is the whole document, also including the requirements for recognition and the ongoing commitments. Then I think that is okay.

AMY POTTER

Yes. But thank you. That's a good reminder. I'll provide a little bit more context for the group here. In section four, we have some audit requirements and some compliance review requirements that provide an opportunity to just make sure that an RIR is

continuing to comply with its obligations set forth in this document over time. And so that's what this definition is getting towards, is the audit aspect of that. Kevin.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Thank you. It's a good reminder that we're at the 23rd hour. We're fixing egregious mistakes. Hopefully, there aren't that many. And we're making sure we're not adding in new things that really have not been through the process. This is hopefully the final cleanup that we're now in. So my question for all of these things is, does it create something new? It's great to reword it, it's great to simplify it, but does it create a new scenario? And with the two that you have on the screen, I do not see that. I just see it as cleanup, and I'm happy with it, but I'm sort of having to go through on each of these, and it's helpful for everybody to do the same. Does it create something new, is really the question.

AMY POTTER

Thank you, Kevin. That's a helpful point there. I agree with you. I don't think that this particular addition creates anything new. I think it's just cleaning up language. I'll give a quick opportunity to anyone to object, otherwise we can accept that and move on. So are we all good with adding the word "with"? All right. Cool. Hearing no objections, we'll move on.

Now, compliance review is the next definition. I spoke a minute ago about where audit comes up. Compliance review also comes up

within section four of the document. We have built-in periodic audits that each RIR regularly has to go through, but we also have a concept of a compliance review, which can be triggered by a number of different parties and is a more specific review based on a specific issue that someone might bring up and want to make sure that an RIR is complying with just that one point. So it's a little bit less onerous of a process to really go through for the compliance reviews. But here's the definition that we have and the suggested changes. So compliance review is a review to assess whether an RIR is in compliance with specific provisions of this document as identified in a request for compliance review. Again?

ESTEBAN LESCANO

No, I think that is correct, the proposal to change. That is better in that way.

HERVE CLEMENT

Yeah. I see Kevin and then Alyssa.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Just a quick confirmation. Is document defined even though it has capital D? Are we planning to add that in?

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Good point.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

I know we've talked about it, but are we planning to add that in?

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Yes. It's not defined as document, but it is as RIR governance document. At the very beginning. This governance document, the RIR governance document. And when the text refers to document, it's referring to the RIR governance document, that is the title of this document.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

I understand. The issue is that the RIR governance document is encompassing multiple documents, which are the little D, and I just want to make sure that it's all in there, all of the different documents are listed as part of it. That was the only question. Is that something that we're assuming that everybody understands? But I think we got a little bit of feedback from that related to the document, and it includes the implementation, and that forms the whole RIR governance document. But would it be better just to copy the wording that we have there and put it into the actual definitions rather than leave it on its own?

AMY POTTER

So I'll note that this is actually an interesting point that we didn't catch earlier, so thank you for that, Kevin. If we go up to the preamble here, the first sentence adds in a definition within the text here, but the definition is the RIR governance document, not the document. So perhaps if everyone agrees, we can strike out RIR

governance and just leave it as document so that we're consistent throughout.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Yes, I think that is a good catch. Yes.

HERVE CLEMENT

Yeah. It's consistent.

AMY POTTER

That's exactly what I was going to flag. Thanks, Amy.

HERVE CLEMENT

Nobody particularly after Alyssa? I don't think so. Eagle eyes.

AMY POTTER

All right. Continuing on. All right. When we get down to the definition of recognition, which is the process by which a candidate RIR joins the fold and becomes a new RIR within the RIR system, and there are some suggested changes here. So I'll read out the edited sentence. Recognition means a decision made pursuant to the terms of this document to delegate the responsibility of providing RIR services to a service region, to an entity through which that entity is recognized as the official RIR for the service region. How do we feel about these changes?

ESTEBAN LESCANO

I think that here, the idea of entity, with our previous discussion, has to be incorporated. It has to be an incorporated person. And for me, I think that it's okay. I know maybe legal has another opinion, but I think that here entity refers to somebody that is already established in a particular jurisdiction.

HERVE CLEMENT

Yeah. Athena?

ATHENA FOO

Yeah. I think indeed there is a definition already for the candidate RIR, and it clarifies that it's indeed like an entity. I would stick to the previous wording.

HERVE CLEMENT

Thank you. Andrei.

ANDREI ROBACHEVSKY

Yeah. I thought it had some legal meaning. That's why I think, Athena, thank you. You clarified that. It's very convoluted language. The only thing, my question is, should we say a legal entity or is it not relevant?

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Okay.

-
- AMY POTTER What was that, Athena? Legal entity or just regular entity is fine?
- ATHENA FOO Legal entity, I think, is fine.
- AMY POTTER So add legal to the definition of candidate RIR, and then accept or reject the other changes. Is that okay? One second. Legal entity.
- HERVE CLEMENT Kevin.
- KEVIN BLUMBERG A legal entity. Is it? With the changes, I'm just trying to work through why. So we have a definition of candidate RIR. By taking it out of here and saying entity, it could be different than the candidate RIR, and that's maybe why we leave it back in. So again, back to the question, does it change something? By having candidate RIR there as a defined term and not calling it candidate RIR here, we're saying it could be something different. So that's why I agree with Athena, leave it, because it is an actual change that will have unintended consequences.
- AMY POTTER All right. I'm going to go ahead and reject the insertions here so we can see what that looks like. Just a note for everyone on editorial processes here. If we're rejecting a suggestion here, I'm actually

making the changes in the document. I haven't gone through and accepted all of the ones that we're accepting. So if it's red in there, it's accepted, but we're going through the dirty work of it later.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Can you go again, Amy? Because I don't know if you clarified what I was going to ask, or you were saying a different thing. Can you repeat what you had said?

AMY POTTER

Oh, I was just noting for anyone watching, if we are rejecting the suggested redlines, I'm going through the process right here of rejecting them within the document and leaving the redlines that we're accepting for cleanup later, because you don't all need to watch that go through. I just meant for our own processes for the drafting team later. Apologies for the delay.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Just in case, what I was going to say is to make notes when we are rejecting some of ICANN's suggestions, so we can provide an explanation. This is pretty simple, but maybe in other ones.

AMY POTTER

Yes. All right. Thank you. Here, I will add a comment right here noting why.

HERVE CLEMENT

Yeah. Kevin.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Okay. But so we've said legal entity under candidate RIR, under the definition, so why are we then doubling up on it again here? So I know that we've rejected this change. We've added the word legal to candidate RIR, which is fine. I agree with that. But when you're done typing, if you can just go to the left, up. I think we've got some duplicative text now. And I know this is a little odd for us to be doing this drafting on the fly. Usually we hand it over to the drafting team, just as an FYI. So, service region to a candidate RIR and to recognize it as the official RIR for the service region. Why would we say such entity when?

AMY POTTER

I think because it was redundant, because we have the concept of a legal entity built into the definition of a candidate RIR. So we didn't need to add that back in as ICANN suggested here, because we have the term candidate RIR in there that already encompasses the concept of a legal entity.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Okay. So we don't call it a legal entity here. Entity is good enough.

AMY POTTER

Here, we're calling it a candidate RIR. Up earlier, the definition of candidate RIR incorporates the concept of a legal entity there.

KEVIN BLUMBERG I understand. I'm saying you've got the word entity in the second one.

AMY POTTER In the first one, not the second.

KEVIN BLUMBERG Go back to what we were looking at.

ESTEBAN LESCANO I see your point, Kevin, but I think that is not needed to be there. Because it's already defined that the candidate RIR will be a legal entity.

KEVIN BLUMBERG I know this may be a surprise, but I'm probably over-engineering some of this right now, and I'm happy if there's consensus among the group to throw it back to the drafting team.

AMY POTTER I agree with you there. All right. Moving on. All right. We have some minor changes here under section 1.4. Any decision by an entity under the document shall be made according to such entity's relevant procedures, including, where applicable, the ability to

challenge or appeal such decision. And it's just a little bit of rewording suggestions here.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Yes. This particular phrase, what is back is the idea that each entity has to comply with its own procedures. For example, if a public consultation is needed, the entity has to do that, but this document is not the place to specify each of the procedures that will apply. I think that it's okay for me, the changes.

HERVE CLEMENT

Andrei?

ANDREI ROBACHEVSKY

Yeah, I agree. And I think that's important because I think, I remember in previous discussions, this was RIR decide, and it usually associated in people's mind that managing director or CEO of the RIR decides, or sort of NRO EC in some cases. Here, we're underlining it's not. It's a decision made according to the processes, which might include community consultations, which might include board decision, whatever is appropriate here. So I think that's a very important statement here.

HERVE CLEMENT

Thank you, Andrei. And Kevin, you were?

-
- KEVIN BLUMBERG So the rewording is great. It cleans it up. But there is an addition here, which is "where applicable," and I think it's an appropriate addition, but "where applicable" is not in the previous version of this, and I think it reads better and is more appropriate to have it where applicable, but I just wanted to call that out.
- ESTEBAN LESCANO But it gives more flexibility or not, this is better.
- HERVE CLEMENT Yeah.
- AKINORI MAEMURA I also agree with this modification, yeah, because it is according to the procedure, no matter what kind of a company or NGO or association. Yeah. So I think, yeah, I agree with it.
- HERVE CLEMENT Yeah. Thank you for your clarification.
- ESTEBAN LESCANO I think we are comfortable with that.
- AMY POTTER All right. Thanks, all. I know it's a lot of nitty-gritty getting into the details there, which is perhaps not as exciting for our observers here. Really, we are sort of at the last mile or kilometer, depending

on where you're from. So this is just sort of getting some final cleanup here.

All right. Getting into some more substantive portions of the document. Not that definitions aren't important. Definitions are very important. Here, let me change the size here so we can see the comments. All right. Under section 2.1, roles and responsibilities. Under the IANA functions operator. Actually, let me zoom in so you can see the text on that one. All right. There's a small addition made here. So now it reads, "The IANA functions operators' responsibilities are defined in the service level agreement for the IANA numbering services agreed to among ICANN and the RIRs." Any thoughts on the addition of agreed to among ICANN and the RIRs?

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Yes. I see it a little bit redundant, but I think that it's okay, because we are talking about the SLA, and the SLA is agreed among ICANN and the RIRs.

HERVE CLEMENT

I see that perhaps a potential reaction from the legal team. Athena?

ATHENA FOO

That's the only SLA for the IANA numbering services. There's no other one. I would say it's redundant. I would like to understand

why we need to specify that. Just maybe we can take it with ICANN and ask why they added this.

HERVE CLEMENT

Yeah. Perhaps, Kevin, to complement perhaps the question?

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Oh, I agree with Athena. In fact, I'll take it one step further. It's an agreement, it's a contract between the parties, the RIRs and ICANN, that we, as the common folk, don't see. So I don't even think that we should call it the services-level agreement because we don't know that that's what it's called. We're making the assumption that that's what it's called. It's the agreement between, for IANA services, it's the contract between. If I could leave that for, I'm not going to wordsmith it, but clean it up and have it as what it is. It's a singular document that is between ICANN and the RIRs.

HERVE CLEMENT

Yeah. So Alyssa, if you want to.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

No, no, no. Alyssa.

HERVE CLEMENT

Alyssa. Sorry. Excuse me.

ALYSSA QUINN It seems like a friendly amendment, and so I'd like to understand from Sam before we accept or reject this one. Let's put it on our list.

HERVE CLEMENT Athena?

ATHENA FOO Just to clarify, the SLA is publicly available. It's a public document. It was a product from the IANA transition process.

ANDREI ROBACHEVSKY That's what I said, and we evaluate performance of IANA based on this SLA, so that's public knowledge.

ESTEBAN LESCANO We can inquire with Sam why, no?

KEVIN BLUMBERG I'm trying not to be pedantic. The SLA is the performance metric document, but is it the IANA numbering services contract? Is that part of what the functions operator is? Is it just the SLA?

HERVE CLEMENT There's nothing else other than SLA.

AKINORI MAEMURA Service level agreement. Yes.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Okay. Thank you.

HERVE CLEMENT

There is Saul, who wants. So for the information, Saul is part of the ASO AC, but remote there. Saul.

SAUL STEIN

Yeah, these actually aren't really, this is more informational anyway. This is not a requirement that people have to oblige to, or this is just more of an FYI kind of thing, if I'm reading this correctly. So I don't think there is necessarily the relevance of being too pedantic here. Keep it simple.

HERVE CLEMENT

No. No comment, I think. So if you're okay, you as the drafting team noted the last remarks.

AMY POTTER

Yes. Yep. And we will follow up with Sam to get some clarification on that there. All right, so moving down into subsection D on ICANN's roles and responsibilities. So ICANN has some suggested text here. I'll go through and read the current version, and then ICANN's suggested text, and we can weigh which one makes more sense. So the current version of it states that ICANN provides overarching coordination for the Internet numbers registry system, including oversight of the IANA functions operator, facilitation of

global policy development in collaboration with the RIRs, and other related tasks as agreed with the RIRs, including responsibilities set forth in this document.

Now I'll go to the suggested alternative text from ICANN, which is in this bubble right here. Let me see if I can make that a little larger for everyone on the screen. All right. The suggested updated text. ICANN's mission includes ensuring the stable and secure operations of the Internet numbers registry system through coordination of the top-level allocation of Internet number resources, facilitation of global policy development in collaboration with the RIRs, including the responsibilities set forth in this document, and other related tasks as agreed with the RIRs. ICANN also is the parent organization to, and sole member of, the IANA functions operator. This one might be a little, we might have a little more conversation on this one. Kevin?

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Nope. I have no issue with this. All we need is a cage match. Let ICANN and the RIRs duke it out for responsibility on this one. I don't want to define ICANN. I don't think that's appropriate for us to do. It's for ICANN to define who ICANN is in a definition, and as long as the RIR legals agree with that definition in terms of the responsibilities, I'm perfectly happy. There's too much nuance here, I think, for us.

HERVE CLEMENT

You have an eye to the legal team? Athena, go ahead.

ATHENA FOO

I think that's a very fair suggestion. Indeed, our description was not the appropriate one if you look at ICANN's mission. So I think in principle, yes, having a reference to ICANN's mission with regards to the Internet identifiers is appropriate. I believe the suggested text tries to make a summary of this description. I would rather have a reference to the mission in the bylaws of ICANN, and then we would have the same text without any misunderstandings.

HERVE CLEMENT

Okay. Makes sense. Akinori.

AKINORI MAEMURA

Yes. Just, I'm telling what I found from here, that the original text of the C and the D is kind of the ICANN at the D section is ICANN minus IANA functions operator. And then, in the case that ICANN's comment back is the entirety of ICANN. So it is a little bit different approach. So maybe it's, I prefer the original document, original text, because it is written in the sense of that kind of distinction. Then if we change the description of ICANN to ICANN's suggestion, that's a little bit, I feel like a little bit redundant in number C and D. So that's my finding. I have no idea which way to go.

HERVE CLEMENT

Thank you, Akinori. Yeah, Esteban. Akinori, it's a good point. We can review it. I think that maybe the difference is that it refers to the specific roles that ICANN has in this particular document, in a way it's not the ICANN function as a whole, or for this particular document. Maybe we need to tune it up or, yes. Yeah. Kevin, and then Andrei.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

So pointing to the actual definition is the preferred, I think, way. Again, if this is a definition, do just that. Define. End of story. The last is a marketing explanation. ICANN, well, right now they're the sole operator. That's what's being contracted. But that may change. It's not needed in here. It is a marketing designation. But I think ultimately the best thing to do is have an external reference here to ICANN's own definition, their own mission statement of what they are. And I will, again, defer this to the drafting team to defer it to ICANN and legal, because ultimately it's their definitions of who they are.

HERVE CLEMENT

Andrei?

ANDREI ROBACHEVSKY

I think I support what Kevin just said. Because if I look at this, ICANN's description is so elaborate, and if I compare this with the description of RIRs, it's so thin. And if you look at the mission of the RIRs, it's much more than what is described in this document. And

that makes this perceptive imbalance, I think, that might not be useful for this document.

HERVE CLEMENT

Athena, you seem to agree.

ATHENA FOO

That's a very good point. I think in this section, we talk about the roles or responsibilities of the entities within the Internet numbers registry system in general. So I agree, we should also add a further, broader description of the RIR's role in the system.

HERVE CLEMENT

Thank you. Well captured.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Sorry. But if we take note of Athena's proposal, then we have to add some wording also to the individual RIRs, no? That's the idea? To the definition of individual RIRs, we have to add some wording there. Okay. Thank you.

ANDREI ROBACHEVSKY

Maybe what Kevin suggested, to add references to actual mission statements.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

I'm worried that this becomes an arms race. Let's see whose definition we can increase more, the RIR definition or the ICANN definition. My key suggestion is scale this back to what is actually needed to help a reader and not turn the definitions into a smorgasbord, even though this is the wrong country, whatever, a whole tapas plate. Doesn't need to be that. It just needs to be the definition of ICANN, and if we can point to what that is, great. But I don't actually like the idea of let's expand the RIR definition. Then it just becomes an arms race.

HERVE CLEMENT

Andrei, sorry.

ANDREI ROBACHEVSKY

I'm not sure I fully agree with you. I think that, like preamble, remember we discussed the preamble, why elaborate preamble? In the first versions, we had a very thin preamble, just to the point. Because the RIR system has some design peculiarities as compared, for instance, to the design of the gTLD system, for instance, which is also anchored under ICANN. So I think to better understand the context and the roles of different entities within the RIR system, we need to elaborate rather than provide sort of very thin definitions. So I would rather lean to what Athena suggested than reduce all the definitions to the very, very pointed stuff.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

That's what a preamble is for. You called it that, Andrei. That's the point. A definition needs to be precise, not a preamble. But again, we're at the 23rd hour, so we've got very little to do here. I think that what we said in our definition of ICANN is wrong. What ICANN has said, we, I think, agree is wrong. We can find the correct term. But the, I'll use the term marketing, it's not the right term, is meant for the preamble. It's meant for a thing, not for a definition. Definitions are legal in nature, and we need to leave them as minimalistic as possible.

HERVE CLEMENT

Andrei? Yeah.

ANDREI ROBACHEVSKY

We're not going to do arms races here.

AMY POTTER

All right. So what I have noted for follow-up for the drafting team, I've noted Athena's preference for a reference to ICANN's own definition and mission statement, which it sounds like we're all on board with. And then the drafting team will collaborate with legal to work out more acceptable language here, and we'll run it past the rest of the group. Sound good?

HERVE CLEMENT

Okay.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Perfect.

HERVE CLEMENT

Legal team seems to agree.

AMY POTTER

Ooh, all right. Another fun one. Service region. I'll start with reading the current text and again go through the comment. The current text for service regions is, "In order to preserve the integrity of the Internet number registry system, each service region shall cover a large, continuous geographic area consisting of multiple countries and shall not overlap with that of another RIR." And if we go over to the comment here, let's scroll down. All right. "ICANN does not have specific language to offer here, but notes that the term continuous might not translate well into geography. Are São Tome and Mozambique continuous? We understand that this is not saying contiguous, i.e., no requirements for common borders, but we urge consideration of additional words." So do we have any thoughts here on synonyms for continuous and whether or not a synonym for continuous would be preferable?

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Just to remind that we have, in some way, a long, long discussion about this particular issue. And I don't know if there is a better word to replace continuous, but let's open the discussion. I think that

Alyssa, maybe you sent by an email another option or not. But, well, that is.

HERVE CLEMENT

Andrei.

ANDREI ROBACHEVSKY

Yeah. Well, just for the observers, I think why it was important, why we discussed so much, is that while it didn't occur to us that that might be possible, but in the future, when a new RIR is created, we don't want to create a Swiss cheese of the RIR system. So someone would pick up sort of assorted countries and form the region that way, which sounds like nonsense, but possible under the current definition. So that continuous was important, but of course, what happens with the islands? So I thought of this as a suggestion: a region where each country shares a land or maritime border with at least one other country in the group, forming a single connected geographic cluster.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

That's a proposal. Proposal.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

No, not the armpits. This particular one has about 400 hours of time invested in it. And if we go back to the original ICP2, which was continental-sized, which we, right, we were looking for something that was a little smaller than continental-sized or a little better

description of continental-sized because all of the continents have basically been taken at today, and you're not going to suddenly have a new continent. So that's where this wording came in. Instead of a really long geographic topology type of explanation, I would be more amenable to something along the lines of closely related instead of continuous, which is saying that you need to be within the same sort of general service area, but not touching borders or anything like that. That may be about as close as we can get to that, but I think the goal is to be similar to the existing ICP2 when it comes to the service region without being as silly as continental-sized, because it has to be a large region that we're talking about.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Yeah. Alyssa and then Constanze.

ALYSSA QUINN

Yes. And we want to be careful that it's geographically closely related, so you're not having them break up along lines of countries that start with R or by any other number of identity features.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Constanze?

CONSTANZE BÜRGER

I'd like to go with this large continuous geographic area. So in case we have exceptions, for sure, but we can't fix all the exceptions. And

for the need, it's necessary, and we discussed this already, and I like this wording.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Yes. Constanze has a point because that particular text was the result of our hours of discussion about that. I don't see an improvement here, but okay. Oh, you're right. Saul. Thank you, Amy. Saul, and then Kevin.

SAUL STEIN

I think, so firstly, continuous versus contiguous is an interesting choice of words there. But coming back to Alyssa's point, and a few others as well about Swiss cheese. We're trying to create a regional registry here, a big Regional Internet Registry, and I'm going to use Africa as an example, where we've got French countries, Portuguese countries, English countries, Arabic countries. If you're going to group them by languages, it's going to be very disparate across the continent. And I think that's why the word continuous is here originally, to prevent that Swiss cheese. So to take it out, whether we change it from continuous to contiguous, to have a cluster, or use the word cluster as Kevin said, you don't want to take the word out and have it all over the show.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Kevin?

KEVIN BLUMBERG

I don't have the right answer, but I do have the answer of continuous as being called out as wrong or potentially wrong. And not anything else. Everything else is fine, but the word continuous was called out. I know we spent a lot of time on it. I'm tired, to be honest, when it comes to this particular section. It's been a lot of work. Do we need to keep going through on continuous or do we need to come up with something with the drafting team?

AMY POTTER

So while I appreciate we've already spent quite a bit of time going over this with previous drafts, I'll note we're doing excellent on time in this session, and we have a little bit more time to go through. Well, no, I'm not saying that to waste more time. I'm saying that because I actually really liked, on first impression, Andrei's suggested text. I was wondering if maybe you could read that aloud. I'll type it up here so everyone can look at it. And just to make sure that we've covered all our bases and that we have the right term there, because this really is an important part. The reason we've spoken about it for so long is because it is important, and we have the time here. So Andrei, if you don't mind reading that out again, I'll type that in just so we can see what it would look like. We can decide we don't like it.

ANDREI ROBACHEVSKY I still remember it. "A region where each country shares a land or a maritime border with at least one other country in the group, forming a single connected geographic cluster."

AMY POTTER Maritime border with? So united geographic?

ANDREI ROBACHEVSKY Connected. Well, united, connected.

ESTEBAN LESCANO Yes, but is the case today? Because I'm thinking in some, I don't know, maritime territories that are far away and belong to the RIPE region. Or in our case, we have the islands of the Caribbean in some way split between ARIN and LACNIC. In those cases, I think that.

ANDREI ROBACHEVSKY Maritime, yeah. I think maritime border, diplomatically or in political geography, I don't know how that reflects, but it's the best we can do.

ALYSSA QUINN Well, Canada shares a maritime border with France. Or a maritime boundary.

ANDREI ROBACHEVSKY Yeah. Well, I think connected is a key here as well. So you need to.

HERVE CLEMENT

Perhaps we can go to the GAC and request to them to transform their countries.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

And you were complaining about arms races there. The one question I ask with the description there is, does it apply to the existing regions? As in, would this fall under the existing regions? And I don't think it would. I think there's enough complexity and confusion that is going on with how we've had to divvy stuff up historically, that this would be viewed as unfair. That's my gut reaction. So I would lean back on continuous, rather than that. But I think we can do more with continuous, and I'll leave it with that, with the drafting team. I do think that we know what we're trying to say. We're having a hard time elaborating on it, and we're being called out on that word. I think there is something. I'm drawing a blank as to what it is.

HERVE CLEMENT

There, Alyssa?

ALYSSA QUINN

What does it say now? Is there any kind of definition besides the continental size? Is that the only scope? Continental in size.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Well, but when we have the current text of ICP2.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Large geographical region of approximately continental size is the current definition in ICP2.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Yes.

AMY POTTER

So, I know this seems like we're belaboring the point because we've talked about this a lot.

HERVE CLEMENT

Andrei.

AMY POTTER

Sorry, Andrei.

ANDREI ROBACHEVSKY

No, but still, I think even if it's thrown back at the drafting team, I think it's really good if that definition invalidates current borders. If that is indeed the case, or it can be reasonably interpreted this way, that definition doesn't apply. We can't use that definition. But I don't see, if I look at the Caribbean, I can say, yeah, it makes sense. There is no isolation of any single country. If you look at the ARIN region and if you look at the LACNIC region, they form a connected,

well, maritime, land, geographic cluster. That's also the case. So I think I don't see contradiction at least. Kevin, you did see contradiction?

ESTEBAN LESCANO Yes, but, well.

ALYSSA QUINN Jerry.

ESTEBAN LESCANO Oh, Jerry.

JERRY

I was going to save this for later to avoid derailing the conversation, but even under the current language, it does cause issues for existing regions. The original ICP2 did not mention the word country. Under the current definition, if you have country, would American Samoa rightly sit in the APNIC region, sitting in the Pacific, or would it have to fall under ARIN's coverage? We also have French territories in the Pacific, so then the use of that language also creates more complexity. I don't want to derail the whole conversation, but even the use of country in that context, you might have a conflict. Yeah.

AMY POTTER

Just a follow-up question. Apologies for my ignorance here about the boundaries of APNIC's geography here. For, say, French territories, or based on whose territory it is, it might fall within, say, RIPE. Right? New Caledonia, right, is within APNIC despite?

JERRY

Yeah. It reflects geography rather than the country itself. Yeah.

HERVE CLEMENT

Sorry. Andrei?

ANDREI ROBACHEVSKY

Well, and I understand sensitivity. Countries were a very important introduction. We also discussed a lot. Because we don't want a situation where you just come, well, no, you take half of the membership of a particular country and call it a service region, attach this to another service region. So the country is divided, for instance. The border of the service region goes across the country. Let me put it this way. I know that APNIC uses economy as a term. I don't know if term economy in a global sort of scope or global context will be applicable. But in my opinion, at least, the notion that it should follow political borders and not just arbitrary borders, the service region is important.

HERVE CLEMENT

Kevin?

KEVIN BLUMBERG

I would rather have no change than some of the changes we're discussing here. Only because there has been, both from ourselves and the community, extensive feedback on this particular one, and I think we're making it worse, not better, at the end. I would rather have the ambiguity of continuous than any other suggestion, my own included today.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Principle, like a global guideline. And then give space for specific situations in which you have to apply that definition. But the definition has to be as flexible as is possible, but respecting in some way what is today or the state of the issue today.

HERVE CLEMENT

Yeah. Amy, and then Andrei.

AMY POTTER

Well, I agree that I'm not sure we're going to come up with better language here. I have one last-ditch attempt to give us at least some guiding principles for the drafting team to think about in considering whether or not it's possible for us to come up with some better text. What if we flip the question on its head? What are we trying to prevent?

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Isolation. Fragmentation.

HERVE CLEMENT

Yeah. Andrei, and then Alyssa.

ANDREI ROBACHEVSKY

I'm fine with ambiguity, but there are also limits to that. I think service region definition is very important, and I can live with continuous, and I can live with country, but we shouldn't remove those from the definition. We shouldn't go back to the ICP2 definition, for sure. Right. So I don't know what to suggest as a "let's keep it simple." The current definition that we see. Yeah. Okay. That's fine.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

You see the document on.

HERVE CLEMENT

Alyssa?

ALYSSA QUINN

So my instinct is that we're trying to prevent a situation where we're broken up along borders or boundaries that are not geographic in nature, that are something else, whether it's religious or linguistic or any other. Saul mentioned some others. And then a follow-on question to that is why exactly? And we talked about that in previous meetings in some depth. But the current

situation, and I think one that we need to maintain, is the geographic proximity to each other that's not broken up along other identity factors.

HERVE CLEMENT

Okay. Kevin?

KEVIN BLUMBERG

We're trying to be agnostic. We're not trying to be ideological with boundaries, and that in itself changes every five, 10, 15, 20 years. So the definition is to prevent the politicization of this service region, and to miss the mark on what an RIR is. Because then you have an us versus them mentality when it comes to the service region, which is not what anybody is looking to do. I think by clumping it all into continental-sized, it prevented that, and the RIRs have been agnostic historically. You mentioned economy. Is economy a better term than country now for us? Would that solve the problem, or does economy just create the same problems? I don't know. I'm happy with this text as is. I am more concerned about changing it again and having us create more problems. But to Amy's question, agnostic is the key concern. Ideology is the greatest concern when it comes to this, because it is unfair to everybody. You will have an us versus them inside of service regions.

HERVE CLEMENT

Yeah. And you have the support from Constanze regarding to keep the text. Yes, Michael?

MICHAEL

Yeah. To go to the question about what we were trying to prevent, I'm trying to recall, because we've had many, many discussions about this particular issue. So one, this isn't coming out of a vacuum because you all have had, we've been here for many of the discussions about how to define this. If I recall, part of this was to make sure that there wasn't an unruly proliferation of RIRs. That there weren't going to be, I think that there was a general consensus amongst the community and this group that you wanted, doesn't mean five is the only number, but it was also not 50. And there was somewhere in between, right? And that the thought was generally that both for operational use as well as just logistics and beyond a lot of other issues, that you would keep the number of RIRs relatively small. And that was originally why they said continental, because continental meant seven, because we agree there's seven continents, right? But that was not going to be useful here, so they came up with new language. You all came up with new language, and this has been through consultations. So while there may be some efforts to try to fix it, I would be careful not trying to go to reopen that box over too much because you all have had that discussion. It's been exposed with the public. There have been many times for comments. And to your point, Amy, when you said, "What are we trying to prevent?" There are a lot of things that we could try to prevent. I think the number one thing was to

keep it from having an overproliferation of RIRs that all of a sudden, because if we had said it was national size, now you can have 200-something RIRs, and that's not what people wanted. They wanted to have relatively small, and it wasn't for any political reasons as much as it was operationally and how the maintenance of the RIR system would be. So just as a thought that I recall that from our past discussions, it doesn't mean you can't change it, but I would be careful about how you change it because this has already gone through some iterations, and I think that was why we had it in there, and this was kind of our best efforts to keep it in that scope.

HERVE CLEMENT

Thank you, Michael. Amy?

AMY POTTER

All right. So I'll read out the sort of notes that I'm taking for the drafting team here. So key importance is geographic proximity and operational functioning of the system. We want to avoid geopolitics. The drafting team will consider keeping the text as is, or if we are able to come up with something better that is agnostic and avoids an overabundance of RIRs that makes the system less functional. Does that sound like good guidance for the drafting team?

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Yes.

AMY POTTER

And no promise that we will somehow be able to come up with better text having discussed this for the past two years, but we'll see what we can do. Sound good? Yeah, it's okay. Cool. Thank you all for indulging us in getting into the nitty-gritty here. I know that anyone that has observed some of our previous sessions at past ICANNs maybe got to see some more exciting content. I think that's just a function of where we are within this process. The major points have largely been worked at, and right now we're just trying to get through the fine-grained details to make sure that the document doesn't do anything we're not intending it to do. We want to avoid unintended consequences.

To give you an overview of what we'll be doing the rest of the week, so far we've gone through now sections one and two. We've gone through sections three and four. So we've gone through definitions, roles and responsibilities, the recognition process, and the ongoing responsibility of RIRs. In our later closed sessions, later today, we're going to start going through section five on emergency continuity, and then we will be meeting with Sam again in the morning. Just to let everyone know, I really need to brag about how great ICANN staff and the RIR staff have been throughout this entire process. Sam met with us earlier today. Sam is ICANN's lawyer for anyone that's not aware, and she has been so helpful throughout this entire process. It's been really a great collaborative experience, and so we're really looking forward to continuing to work with her. We'll meet with her again tomorrow and the next day on the

emergency continuity and derecognition sections of the document. And then towards the end of the week, I have to thank Andrei here. He's going to be leading us through some tabletop exercises where we're just going to stress test the document. Right? We're coming towards the end here. Sometimes when you go through a document so many times over such a long period of time, you can get blind spots, right? And so we just want to be able to go through our final version of the document and run through a variety of different scenarios to make sure that it holds up and is able to produce the sort of stability that we're looking for and make sure we're not missing anything. So we're really looking forward to that as well. So with that, we're coming towards the end of this session. Thank you so much for all of your continued interest in our work here. We really appreciate it. I know that this is a little outside the scope of what a lot of people at ICANN are focused on, so we appreciate that you care enough to come. So thank you so much for that.

HERVE CLEMENT

And thank you, Amy. Kevin?

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Thank you. A lot of the work that ICP2 has been through contributions of people like Alan Barrett, and I wanted to call him out specifically. There will be a memorial run by ICANN tomorrow, and over the many years, not just with the board, but he was participating with AFRINIC and the ASO. Alan provided a huge

amount of feedback and insight into these processes, and I think it's important to call that out specifically.

HERVE CLEMENT

Totally agree, Kevin. And so for the record, but perhaps so you have the information, CK. So there will be at 01:15 PM tomorrow, memorial to Alan.

CK

Hi. The memorial is tomorrow, 01:30 PM. It is in the GAC room. At least it's in the other building. Yeah, GAC room. The big one on the right side when you come in, 01:30 PM. Very quickly, a couple of people will talk. Then there is a 40-minute time for community members to talk. And there's remote participation as well. And on top of that, there will be a book on the side. So whoever doesn't have a chance tomorrow to speak, because we are a little bit limited, we borrowed the GAC room, which we have to give back, can also write himself in the book. Thank you.

HERVE CLEMENT

Thank you, CK. Absolutely, we will be there. With that, thank you for your participation. We hope that we have convinced you and shown you that we try to work in a very objective way, definitely to transcribe what the community says. And with that, Carlos, I can give you the floor to close. Thank you.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Please stop the recording.

MICHAEL

Recording stopped.

AMY POTTER

Carlos?