
ICANN86 | Prep Week – Approaching the finish line: Update on the ICP-2 Review
Wednesday, May 20, 2026 – 18:30 to 19:30 CEST

OZAN SAHIN

Hello and welcome to Approaching the Finish Line, Update on the Internet Coordination Policy 2 Review Webinar. My name is Ozan, and I'm a Participation Manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and ICANN Community Anti-harassment Policy.

During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod. Interpretation for this session will include English, French, and Spanish.

If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, unmute your microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record, the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English, and speak at a reasonable pace. I will now hand the floor over to Hervé Clément.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you very much, Ozan. I am Hervé Clément, I am the Chair of the ASO AC, and we are here with Andrei, but it will be mostly Andrei who will present the steps, where we are regarding the drafting of the governance document, which is the update of the ICP-2, but it's

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.

something I think all the participants or many of the participants here present know.

Who is Andrei? Andrei is part of the drafting team of the ASO AC, so to be in charge of writing the document, taking into account all the comments we have received. And so, for the story, we are both attending the RIPE meeting in Edinburgh, which is pronounced in the BRA, something like that, locally. But we are very happy to see you and to be in part of this prep week webinar dedicated to the ICP-2 document update.

And with that, with this word of introduction, it's my pleasure to take the floor to Andrei, and I will take care also about the question you could have, because I understand there is an answer question part you could ask the question you could have regarding this presentation. Thank you, and Andrei, the floor is yours.

ANDREI ROBACHEVSKY

Thank you, Hervé, and welcome, everyone. My name is Andrei Robachevsky, as Hervé said, I'm a member of the Address Council of the ASO. And today I'll provide an update on the ICP-2 review and the development of the RIR Governance Document, which is a successor of the ICP-2. I'll provide some background, we'll talk about the milestones, community engagement and feedback we've got on the way, and more importantly probably where we now in this process.

So, before we begin just a few words about the Address Council and the Address Supporting Organization. As many of you probably know, Address Supporting Organization is one of the three supporting organizations of the ICANN. It consists of 15 members, three from each region, two are elected and one is appointed.

And its duties include advising ICANN board on the issues regarding the internet number resource management, the address council oversees the global policy development process, as well as appointing two board members and a member to the ICANN nominating community.

But last few years, one of the maybe main focus of our work was the ICP-2 review and the development of the document. These are, so you can see, the members of the Address Council, and I mentioned 15 members but unfortunately due to AFRINIC situation until recently, there were only 12 from four regions. Luckily, we got Saul Stein at the end of last year. He joined our group from AFRINIC community and we are looking forward to welcome two additional members from the AFRINIC community once they are elected by AFRINIC.

Regional Internet Registries, there five at the moment. They cover those RIRs and they are responsible for the distribution and management of the internet number resources which are IP addresses and autonomous system numbers.

This management includes also providing related technical services such as WHOIS, reverse DNS, RPKI. But those regional

Internet registries, they are doing more. They also support Internet infrastructure through technical coordination, community-driven policy process and training, and capacity building.

There is another entity which is, well, basically coordinating body among the five regional internet registries called Number Resource Organization or NRO. What's important in this context is that this organization serves as the address supporting organization that ICANN.

So, let's look at the timeline where we can see where the ICP-2, which stands for Internet Coordination Policy, which sets the criteria for the establishment of a new RIR, a new Regional Internet Registry, when it was adopted.

It was adopted at the time where RIPE NCC, APNIC and ARIN, including ICANN, were already established. And it was used and tested by establishing LACNIC and AFRINIC. But ICP-2 is 25 years old, and obviously the internet has changed over the last quarter significantly as well as the relationship between the RIRs and ICANN, they matured a lot.

And if you look at the ICP-2 it was mostly concerned with the establishment of a new RIR. It didn't take into account the whole life cycle, and of course, there is no more need to more explicitly articulate the RIR ongoing responsibilities as long as they operate, but also potential derecognition of an RIR when the organization

can no longer adequately provide the needs for the numbering community.

So, in October 2023, the NRO EC, which is an executive council of the NRO, asked the ASO AC to help with two tasks aimed at strengthening the RIR system. One was short-term, which was implementation procedures for the ICP-2, to review and advise the NRO EC on those draft procedures for validating and addressing ongoing RIR compliance with ICP-2.

And the second task was a longer-term, and that's why we're still dealing with this task, to revise the ICP-2 to make the RIR system more accountable to the Internet community and more aligned with today's landscape of the ecosystem.

This is a visual of the process, and we've gone quite a long way in this process. You see the blue blob, that's where we are, the final review. And I will talk a little bit more about different phases of this process.

But you can see also that this process includes three extensive consultations with the community or both RIR community and ICANN community. And this feedback allowed us actually to draft the first version and then update it, and still we are working with the feedback that was collected through the second consultation.

This is the timeline. You can see some of the dates and what happened on this timeline since we started working on that project. And the latest milestone was May 8, where the ASO AC

published a status report, May 2026, on issues that are in progress or in drafting. And those status reports, they inform community where we are, what issues we are working and how they're being resolved. And we'll talk about this in more detail a bit later in this webinar.

And when we started this work, instead of jumping right into drafting or updating ICP-2, we took a step back and we decided to start with core principles. And let's agree first on the principles and collect feedback on the core principles that constitute operation governance and lifecycle of an RIR. These principles were shared with RIR and ICANN communities for feedback and we got extensive feedback.

More than three 100 responses were collected, analyzed, and the summary report of the questionnaire and ICANN consultation were published in February 2025. You can use this QR code or the URL to look at the consultation report, what kind of feedback was collected.

But this feedback was crucial. It informed us in the drafting of the first version of the governance document for recognition maintenance and recognition of regional internet registries and that's the successor or reviewed version of the ICP-2. And I will refer to this document in my following presentation as RIR governance document.

So, the first version actually represented a comprehensive review and update to ICP-2. We introduced detailed governance

structures, operational requirements, and procedures for the full lifecycle management of RIRs. And I cannot stress more that all this was developed through extensive community input and consultation. Again, you can use this QR code and you can use this URL to get to the first version of the document if you're interested.

And this first version was put for another consultation with ICANN and RIR communities. And again, we got a lot of feedback on more detailed feedback, more narrow feedback on the version one, and that informed the changes that we needed to introduce in the second version of this document to address community input, community concerns, and feedback.

We did minor change to the title of document, that's maybe not important. I think the document changed the title because the ICP series is discontinued, it's no longer supported, so we needed to come up with a different name for this document. And I think the document, what I said, the RIR governance document, it reflects the nature of the document better.

We also provided a more extensive, more elaborate preamble explaining the role of the RIR system in the overall governance framework. And this preamble set the document in the right context through which you can read the document.

Additional protections were defined in recognition and derecognition for affected RIRs, including the possibility for a candidate RIR to be recognized on less than unanimous approval of existing RIRs. In the first version, it was unanimous approval and

community feedback was that we need to loosen this requirement a little bit to allow for possibility of one descending RIR in that process.

We also tried to maintain the document at the high level. There was a lot of feedback on how that will work out and how this will be implemented. And we provide, instead of sort of embedding this in the document itself, which will make it probably more rigid and less lasting, reference to separate implementation procedures that may provide further implementation details on any of those obligations.

Audit, which was in fact introduced in the first version, but it was elaborated, added new criteria for RIR members or ICANN to request an ad hoc audits or proposed recognition. And new emergency continuity procedure to temporary transfer an RIR's responsibility to emergency operator when force majeure happens, when either RIR cannot make decision, cannot respond to anything, cannot provide the services or there is really disaster and RIR again cannot provide the services to the community.

Then emergency operator stands by and implement those services for a limited period of time. It's certainly a temporary provision. Again, on the right, you can see the QR code and you can see the URL that you can use to get the document and read it.

So, I mentioned community consultations, and yes, both versions went through extensive community consultations both for the RIR communities and the ICANN public comment period. Summary of

reports, you can find using those URLs. What is important to highlight is that we try to achieve maximum transparency in this process and maximize community engagement as well.

That's why we conducted those consultations. But also, we reported to the community back on the comments that were received and we are reporting on status reports how we addressing those comments.

So, second community consultation on the second version was we spent quite some time in Montevideo. We dedicated three days, full days of working on the feedback we receive from the community, discussing how, what's the best way to address this feedback. As a result, we believe that all substantive issues are captured. Q1 status report was published to provide transparency, I just mentioned, and track drafting process based on feedback received.

So, the whole idea of the process now is that while all the issues identify, we resolve them one by one and publish periodic reports so community can track our progress and provide some feedback if they disagree or if there are some concerns. So, in the report, again, you can download the report using the QR code or the URL. It highlights the topic still requesting discussion. You can see them marked in progress.

Where approach has already been agreed but we haven't had a real text to agree on, it's in drafting and those topics that have already

been addressed or are out of scope and require no change, you can see that there is no change required. they're marked as such.

So, now we're approaching the current state of affairs. Where are we now? ICANN85. So, it was a very busy week for the Address Council at ICANN85. Joint sessions were held with GAC, ALAC, RSSAC, ICANN Board, and ISPCP.

We also held two public sessions. Enormous feedback was received, very useful feedback, and included concerns around audit procedures, public interest, multi-stakeholder balance and jurisdiction. Our response emphasizes that the governance document sets high-level principles, it's not detailed, with detailed processes to follow in the implementation phase.

And governments, I'm going to stress that are recognized as important actors. RIRs remain independent legal entities and close ICANN RIR cooperation will be critical for adoption. You can see the summary here on the slide, summary of responses that we provided addressing this feedback we got at ICANN85 meeting. It was a busy week, not only by joint sessions and meeting with committees, but also, we had 10 working group sessions to discuss the open issues.

And I mentioned this milestone on the 8th of May, a status report was published. You can access it using this URL or QR code. And our plan, ambitious maybe, to finalize the draft document by Q3. 2026.

Now, let me walk you through the topics of the May 2026 status report. So, this is the latest status of the document, of the drafting of the document as it stands now. And I will focus mostly on topics in progress and under drafting. So, recognition threshold.

I mentioned that already in the first version, we got feedback that unanimous decision by the RIRs is maybe the bar too high and maybe too rigid. There might be also possible conflict of interest for some RIRs whose territory is being affected. And in this case, unanimity may be counterproductive.

But in the second consultation we got even more feedback that really, we should loosen this requirement. Feedback included, yes, conflict of interest among multiple RIRs. Existing RIRs will be required to cooperate with any new RIR. Recognition process should account for effective cooperation and coordination.

And possibility that an RIR may be unable to act or take decisions on recognition. So, all of these factors take into account, I think what we agreed is that we should require a supermajority threshold. instead of unanimity requirement. And we must consider possible conflict of interest.

Now, we are discussing the ICANN role in this process, this is in discussion with ICANN, this is still ongoing. I don't want to stay long on this particular item, Independent Third Party Review, because it was part of this previous process on unanimity minus one.

And in that case, we had an opportunity to create this minus one by recognition review. And I think we're accepting that we still have a majority. That process may not be needed. So, we'll not stay longer here.

I mentioned emergency continuity. I think that's a very important thing, and procedures are obviously required. In version 2, procedures required unanimous agreement of all other RIRs in ICANN.

Now community indicated that emergency procedures with such a high threshold may be too high, and when emergency happen a quick reaction is very important, and achieving unanimous agreement may take time. But there are also concerns that emergency measures could be extended without enough oversight.

So, there was a clear request to add clear criteria for extending emergency continuity procedure. And there was also concern that 90 days may be inadequate to recover from an emergency situation. So, what we are discussing this and agreeing on that, we decided to simplify initiation mechanism.

So, the affected RIR can initiate emergency continuity for themselves if they feel they are in dire straits. The threshold to initiate will not require unanimity. There is no limit for renewals, but any renewal should follow the process, and that will allow the emergency operator to take a stage approach in providing the affected RIR services. Either if the situation is getting worse, or if

the situation is improving. And again, clarification of ICANN role is still under discussion.

Derecognition threshold. Again, the anonymity for some of the comments was not so much disputed, but the initiation of derecognition threshold by any RIR or group RIRs or by the members which the threshold will put 25% of RIR total membership or 2000 members, whichever is local, or ICANN. So, the range of comments was please lower the threshold for members initiation, and maybe even lower threshold for the RIRs, and please add anti-capture mechanisms.

Now, looking at the document, the version 2 document, we decide, we agree that no change is really required. Derecognition is final recourse and threshold is deliberately high. So, decision was made, no change to derecognition threshold. And audit threshold is separated from derecognition process, and we'll discuss this later.

Audits. That's a very important component, probably one of the most important components that were introduced in this RIR governance document, because it allows to periodically measure commitment of an RIR to the criteria, to the principles and requirements that are outlined in this document.

So, how the audit can be initiated, what the version 2 document says that any RIR or group of RIRs can initiate the audit. Again, group of members, 25%, the same threshold, 2,000 members, whichever is lower, or ICANN. Again, what we heard, lowering the

threshold, because maybe we don't want to delay audits too much if the threshold is too high. And again, anti-capture mechanisms should be added so audit is not being abused.

What we decided is that frequency of audits updated to once every five years. Agreement that there is a differentiation between regular or periodic audits and ad hoc audits and that they might have different scope. We renamed ad hoc audit into compliance review because that's what really it is and it may have a limited scope. And definitions of ad hoc audit and compliance review will be included in the next version

So, Ad Hoc Audit, which is now renamed as a Compliance Review in the version you will see when we release it. So, reviewing criteria for initiating compliance reviews and the feedback we got the balanced approach required to initiate Compliance Reviews.

Requests for Compliance Review must follow good faith resolution efforts, clearly identified governance provisions, and demonstrate urgent material issues. And this is in the status drafting. We are drafting the criteria to request a Compliance Review, and it will be specified in the document.

Now, another change that is introduced in Version 3 to be is document structure. We got feedback that the document is very hard to read. For instance, if you are concerned about derecognition or recognition, you need to jump from one section to another. So, not the repetition, but different facets of the process are described in different sections of the document. So,

what we are doing, and this is on the drafting, we are improving document structure for better readability and clarity.

Transition and Continuity. The background is that smooth transfer of services and operations of a direct recognized RIR to an interim or successor entity as directed by ICANN. And the feedback was that it's very important that transition should be as smooth as possible, that the rights of affected resource holders should be protected. So, that's why we started drafting and we will add text outlining requirements for a transition plan that ensures continuity of services and protection of resource holder rights.

Audit obligations. In the previous version of the document, actions are not really specified. So, the only thing was the obligation to conduct an audit, but the findings of the audits, what happens with that is what's not really articulated.

And that's the feedback we got, that document doesn't explicitly oblige an RIR to act on recommendations of an audit. This is again in the drafting state. We are clarifying that RIR obliged to follow up on recommendations as they came up from the audit.

One thing that was brought up in the context of derecognition process is that probably audits should be included as part of that derecognition process. And while that makes sense at first sight, if you look at the requirements, the regular audit is done every five years and there is a possibility for ad hoc audit.

So, adding yet another audit, which is not a very light process, to be honest, might trigger, might delay, and might slow down the process of derecognition unnecessarily. And if you look at the document Article 6.2, it already creates an obligation to help and rehabilitate an RIR before any derecognition process.

So, there are checks and balances in place that derecognition cannot be just taken lightly. It will be done in good faith and the rehabilitation will be attempted.

Well, speaking of rehabilitation, there was feedback that our rehabilitation in the document Version 2 was sort of standing apart as a general spiritual principle, but people would like to see this as part of derecognition process. So that's what we're taking on board and text will be amended to include the obligation to attempt to rehabilitate an RIR before further derecognition steps are taken.

Status Report, May 2026, that's what I mentioned. You may be interested in reading through this report which contains not only the highlights I provide in this presentation but also more detailed update on issues that are in progress, no change, or in drafting. This is the URL you we can use to access this report.

Now, ICANN86 week, we are preparing for that. We already scaled 15 working group sessions to finalize the RIR governance document. There will be ASO information session on Thursday, 11

June, and we are still discussing the agenda, so some changes may come up, of course.

Looking ahead. So, that's where we are now. So, we've published the status report, we're sharing the status report and the current status we shared with ARIN and LACNIC, and now as Hervé said, we have RIPE 92 tomorrow, we have a presentation similar to this one where we'll update the community on the status.

ICANN86, I mentioned this as well, we have a significant amount of time reserved for in-person working group to continue drafting final version. The objective is to deliver the final version of the document of the draft to the NRO EC in Q3, Q4, and the final version of the document presented in RIR meetings in the fall and ICANN87. So, that starting from Q4, the NRO and ICANN can begin working on the approval and adoption process.

And that concludes my presentation. I hope it was informative, but if you have any questions, happy to answer them.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

I would say thank you, Andrei, and thank you to have made the effort to be comprehensive and to have commented on all the slides all the work the SO/AC has performed. And as you said, it was a big work. We have still a big work to do, and it will be specifically during ICANN86.

We have questions and answer space. I think that type of question we still add during former ICANN presentation as well. So, it's more

up about the upper governance, so regarding the ICANN, regarding the IANA, for instance.

So, I can read the question from Sivasubramanian Muthusamy, so I hope I'm not [00:33:52 – inaudible] pronounce well the name. In the ICANN gTLD process, there is a contractual requirement for registries, so if they are not the same registries for gTLD as the registries we are talking about within the IP resource global and hierarchical management, of course.

There is a requirement for registries to escrow data to a third party with a view not to arm the registered domain name, even in situations where the registry becomes inoperative and malignant, and perhaps to eventually transition the registry to a qualified alternate by some process called IANA institute such escrow ICANN requirements on the regional territories with whatever required design modification from that on the name as pro policy and another regional internet registry in the neighborhood could act as an emergency regional internet registry operator along the line of emergency TLD operator.

I think that was the two of the question. So, I started when saying that, of course, this question is related to the emergency continuity you were talking about. And I said so at basics, so there is this notion of coordination between the different regional internet registry to protect, of course, the data, the resources, and so between that.

So, I don't know if, so Andrei, you want to add more knowing that, at the ASO AC, so this document, draft recommendations about the way the system works, but in terms of implementation, so we don't go to the details of which part of the ICANN, and is a function of the ICANN, can operate, of course.

ANDREI ROBACHEVSKY

Yeah, you said it right. Yeah, I have little to add, just to maybe repeat what you said, that implementation of this, how emergency operation happens, is outside the scope of this document, it will be in implementation procedures, while this document is trying to achieve our conditions and the process for this initiation and the whole existence of this concept which was missing in the previous versions of the document. So, those ideas are welcome but I think we need to consider them when the implementation procedures are being developed.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

There is this time a question from Anil Kumarjan, “Does this recommendation also cover NRO?” So, NRO is, in a certain sense, the group of the regional internet registry. So, I don't know exactly what covers this question about also covering NRO, because if we say that it will reinforce the regional internet registry system, it will per se reinforce the NRO by definition, I would say, or is it a legal question at the same time? So, I don't know specifically.

ANDREI ROBACHEVSKY

Yeah, and just to know that NRO is not a real organization, it's not incorporated, it's more coordination activity than the real organization.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Exactly. Another question from Anil Kumarjan, “When we expect from the formation of AFRINIC,” as I can imagine, but AFRINIC still exists. So, I don't know what exactly is the sense of this question, to be honest. And still from Sivasubramanian, sorry. “Wouldn't that be better safeguard than to leave the RIR, the regional internet registry, as I can imagine, exposed to the risk of being captured by the locally powerful actor with an eye on the regional internet function?”

There are still recommendations and principles within the document about anti-capture, something which is part of the work, of course. And finally, the primary idea of the document on the initial question from the NRO EC is to find solutions with inputs from the community to reinforce the system. And of course, I think it could answer this question as well.

And with that, in this part, I have no additional questions. No outgoing questions. Thank you, Hervé. So, you're welcome. But we have a little time, so even using -- I don't know if people can speak directly for clarification.

OZAN SAHIN

Hi, Hervé, this is Ozan. Yes, people can raise their hands, get in the queue, and speak if they wish.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you, Ozan. And so, it was a prep week webinar presentation, and so we will be in Seville for ICANN86 with at least one open session so we can be able to interact with the community. I see Anil Kumar Jain raising his hand.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN

Thank you. Anil, for the record. A question which may not be related with this webinar, but definitely with ASO. What we are thinking about IPv8, which is coming up, and have we also calculated the reasons why IPv6 is not successful as it was expected. Thank you.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

I would say it's more a regional operation per se. And I will be transparent with you. I see that there was an article in Italia via the RIPE Lab regarding this question, and it's more a prospective question. And so, to be honest, but be sure that I will answer very personal, on my personal act and perhaps personal for my own activity action as well, we are mainly, I think happy with IPv6, and what actors promote is still the development of IPv6.

But I have not read the article entirely, so I couldn't answer further to your interesting question and be sure. So, I don't know if no additional question, perhaps, I don't know if you want --

ANDREI ROBACHEVSKY

I hope, Hervé, that lack of questions is related to the clarity of our presentation. That's our hope. But as Hervé said, we will be at Seville and we'll be happy to engage with you either in open sessions or in hallways and answer questions, whatever questions you might have.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Definitely. Definitely. One of the reasons we will be present in Seville, is to interact, of course. But nevertheless, thank you for your participation and thank you for the interest you have regarding our work and this document, which I think is a very important one for the robustness and the strength of the global system.

ANDREI ROBACHEVSKY

Yes, I can only support that. Thank you very much.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

And, Ozan, we can give you the floor.

OZAN SAHIN

Right, thank you, Andrei and Hervé, and thank you everyone for joining this ICANN86 Prep Week webinar. This session is adjourned. Please stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]