
ICANN86 Seville | PF – Address Supporting Organization Information Session
Thursday, June 11, 2026 – 14:45 to 16:00 CEST

OZAN SAHIN

Hello, and welcome to the Address Supporting Organization Information Session. 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. Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I will also post them in the chat for your reference. Only questions posted in the Q&A pod will be read aloud during the session, as time permits and when directed by the chair of this session. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in Zoom or otherwise as directed. When speaking, please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a moderate pace. I will now hand the floor over to Esteban Lescano.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Thank you, Ozan. Thank you, and welcome to everyone to this information session. We are here with Amy Potter and me, Esteban Lescano. We are the vice chairs. We have the apologies of Hervé Clément, who is the chair, but he had to travel back to Paris. Well, we are going to review what the ASO AC is, but the session will be focused on the work that we have been doing on the RIR

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.

governance document. As the title says, we are approaching the finishing line. And this particular week was a very busy week, with a lot of work, a lot of sessions, and a lot of discussion, and making huge progress in our process.

Well, what is the ICANN ASO AC? It's the Address Council. It's one of the supporting organizations in the ICANN ecosystem. It also functions as the NRO NC. We are organized in 15 members, three for each RIR region, and in each region, we have two representatives elected by the communities and one appointed by the RIR. How long do the members serve? Well, that varies by region. What do we do? We advise the ICANN Board, we oversee the global policy development process, we appoint two members to the ICANN Board, seats nine and 10. We also appoint one member to the ICANN Nomination Committee. How do we meet? Well, we have monthly virtual meetings and one annual in-person meeting that normally is the first ICANN meeting of the year. What is the focus of the work that we are doing? Well, we are conducting, at this time, the ICP-2 review process. We also are in charge of conducting the election for seat nine, which is vacant, for the ICANN Board, and we monitor and support the global policy development process. Here you can see how the ASO AC is integrated. Just to mention that currently, we are 13 people because, in the case of AFRINIC, we have only one representative. But we know that AFRINIC is currently going through the procedures to select the two representatives from the community. Kevin, please.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Thank you. So first and foremost, I actually want to thank ICANN, the organization, and the staff that made Alan's memorial service yesterday possible. It's not always that we get to recognize those that are no longer with us. And unfortunately, as our community gets a little older, that number grows. I was asked to say a couple words about Alan, who was the ASO-appointed seat nine, which is the very technical way of saying it. He was our appointment to the ICANN Board. Because I've known Alan for more than a decade, and I was actually trying to pull up when I first met him, and it was probably in Côte d'Ivoire at an AFRINIC meeting in 2015 when he was the CEO. And there wasn't a mean bone in his body. Even if he thought you were not necessarily speaking accurately, there was never a mean bone in his body. He was always there to help people. And I said yesterday at his memorial, one of the things that really stood out for me was that he was one of the people we call a pioneer, an Internet pioneer. But generally speaking, you get one kick at that can and then you're done. You're the Internet pioneer of X. And Alan kept on reinventing himself as a pioneer. He kept on being a trailblazer when it came to the Internet, and that allowed him to really shine within the positions that he took on.

Now, normally it would end there. Alan was appointed by us. He spent quite a while on the ICANN Board, and it was very touching to hear personal messages from the ICANN Board yesterday. But Alan kept coming to our meetings. He was on the ASO, and it was his obligation to make sure that he heard us, listened to us, and

whenever he could, updated us on the things that he was allowed to update us on. He did it at a level that was not out of a need to do it, but out of caring for our community, and I think that embodies everything that Alan stood for and did. Everything was about caring for the community. I think I speak for everybody when I say he will be sorely missed, and whoever takes over the next seat, it will be very big shoes to fill. But he will be sorely missed by all of us on the Council, and I think the ICANN community as a whole.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Thank you, Kevin. What happened? Okay. Why? No. Then why do we have to revisit ICP-2? Well, as everybody knows, this is a document that is 25 years old, and the Internet ecosystem has changed in all that time, and also the ecosystem has new challenges. And we understand that the document needs to improve, to reflect some things, for example, the RIR's ongoing responsibilities, or to establish the potential derecognition of an RIR in a case where the different responsibilities are not fulfilled well. That is why in October 2023, the NRO EC asked the ASO AC to strengthen ICP-2, and that project was to revise the document and to make the RIR system more accountable to the Internet community.

And then we were working since then. As you can see, now we are in the blue zone of the process. That is just the final review and next, or closer to, the approval and adoption. But that was a very long process that took more than two years. And, well, we

conducted three public consultations at the ICANN level and also at the RIR level, and we made progress and improved the document that currently is the V2 of the document. But with the work that we did this particular week here in Seville, we will be ready to define a V3 and the last version of the document.

Well, that is just a summary of the work done. As you can see, there was a lot of work. As I mentioned before, with the three public consultations, we received the feedback from the community, the global community, the regional community. We reflected that feedback in the different versions of the document. We had a lot of discussion inside our group to understand, in the case of the feedback, if it is appropriate or not, if it is under the scope of the document and the process. And we made a lot of improvement in the document. As I mentioned before, we are in the final draft of the document, and this week in Seville was very productive. If you want to find all the documentation that is behind the process and the different versions, as well as the feedback received in each of the consultation processes, we also have some status reports. The last one was published in May, very recently. You can go to the NRO website, where you will find all the documentation.

Well, where are we now? Well, as I mentioned, ICANN 86 was a very complete week. We had 15 working group sessions to discuss the updated draft. I think that we learned a lot in those sessions because we had a lot of analysis and discussions. Well, we also had discussions with the ICANN team to get clarity on ICANN roles and responsibilities. We had an open session to demonstrate our work.

The work done was to take each of the sections of the RIR governance document and discuss the particular modifications in the drafting. And now we have this information session that is just to provide an update to the community of the work done and also to recall the timeline and the next steps. As you can see, we are finishing the document, and we will hand it to the NRO EC in the coming weeks.

We mentioned that we had, first of all, a set of principles that govern the RIR's life cycle. Those principles were submitted into a public consultation. Then we provided a V1 of the document, and we submitted it to public consultation. Then, with the feedback received, we wrote a new version that is the V2, that was also submitted to public consultation, and now we are in the stage of that version three, which we hope is the last one. And just to give you some of the points, or an overview of the points, that we were working on. We were working on definitions. We updated many of the terms and also removed the ones that are no longer applicable to the document. We modified the document structure and improved the readability of the document and the flow. We made some changes in the recognition, establishing a threshold of two-thirds majority of the RIRs and ICANN approval for recognition. As you can recall, in the previous version, we had unanimity, and under the community feedback, we modified it to a threshold of two-thirds. We also worked on compliance review. At the very beginning, we had periodic audits and specific audits, and then we renamed those specific audits into compliance review. That allows

members, for example, of the RIRs to request the review of the RIR's compliance on a specific provision of the document in between the general audits. We also worked on the emergency continuity, and we updated the process and allowed the affected RIR to trigger this emergency continuity. And when we are talking about this type of process, we are thinking about, for example, a natural disaster that impacts the normal operations of the RIR, and to assure the continuity of services, it is needed to have an emergency operator. We also worked on derecognition. And in that particular case, as we understand that this is the last recourse, we include a rehabilitation provision as a step prior to derecognition. Well, now I pass to Amy for the update on the different key issues with more detail.

AMY POTTER

Thank you, Esteban, for that great overview. I'm going to jump in to provide a little bit more detail on those points that Esteban just walked us through. So when it comes to the document structure, the version two of the document, the last one that went out for consultation, we had received a lot of very helpful feedback during that consultation process about the structure of the document being a bit too complex. We had the criteria for the derecognition and recognition process in a different section than the actual processes there, and the community was absolutely correct, so we've done some restructuring so that those are all in the same sections to improve readability there and make sure that you don't have to jump around between different sections of the document to figure out what's going on at any given step. So thank you very

much to the community for that feedback, and we've started going through the process of making those changes within the document.

Another issue where we also received some very helpful feedback from the community has to do with the recognition process. So the recognition process starts out with a candidate RIR submitting a proposal for them to be recognized and brought in within the system. The first sort of step that happens from there is that there is an assessment that is done by the RIRs, and then after the RIR assessment, it goes on to ICANN. Now, during the RIR assessment process, we have a requirement that a certain threshold for support from the existing RIRs must be met in order for ICANN, during its next step process, to be able to bring in that new candidate RIR, because we didn't want to end up in a situation where the RIRs all said, "No, we can't work with this entity for a variety of different reasons," and then ICANN could sort of unilaterally bring them in. So previously, in the last version two, we had sort of set that threshold for RIR support that must exist in order for ICANN to recognize a new RIR at unanimity minus one. The community provided some very helpful feedback there that they wanted us to consider conflict of interest that might occur there. Because the five existing RIRs currently cover the entire globe, any new RIR that comes into the fold will necessarily take some territory from one or potentially multiple other RIRs, and with that, their fee-paying members. And that sort of concern that when the RIRs are doing their review of a candidate RIR, an RIR that might

be impacted by an issue like that might either actually be influenced in their decision in an improper way or might just be perceived to be influenced in an improper way, and the community really wanted us to think through that issue. Thinking through that issue, which we very much agree needs to be built into the system, actually came back and looped back to this threshold issue of unanimity minus one, because if we have an option where we are excluding from that threshold an RIR that might be conflicted, then that creates some practical concerns for how do we reach such a high threshold. So we decided to move down to a two-thirds threshold to incorporate this concept of consideration of things like this territorial move and the membership fees that go along with that to ensure that everyone is acting in a neutral way when making their assessments, and that there isn't any real or perceived risk of conflict influencing that in a negative way.

Also within the recognition process, we had this sort of concept in version two of the document about an independent third party. So version two had, if the existing RIRs do not unanimously recommend recognition of a new candidate RIR, the candidate RIR may request an ICANN recognition review potentially conducted by an independent third party. That independent third-party concept, we had included that in there because we were a little nervous that ICANN might not want to take on that role. But in light of the previous slide's changes, ICANN came back and said that they were comfortable conducting that review themselves. So again, the approval threshold for recognition was lowered to two-thirds. The

process is including transparency also around publishing the rationale behind the decision-making. So not only are we publishing the RIR's recommendations themselves alone, but the RIR's reasoning and the rationale behind that, just to give the community more transparency into what is going on there.

We also have this concept of audits and compliance review. In version two of the document, these are two sort of separate but very similar things, and we had used some confusing terminology in version two of the document. So we changed the language around there. So the concept of audits, there are regular audits that are being performed once every five years. However, we had used this term "ad hoc audit" to describe another similar but more limited process that could be initiated by a number of different parties to do a more targeted review in between these regular audits to make sure that there's still some accountability going on between the full, much more onerous process. Now, these previously called ad hoc audits, now we are calling them compliance review to avoid confusion. The compliance reviews can be initiated by three different parties. They could be initiated by an RIR or a group of RIRs or another RIR. They could be initiated by a group of members of the impacted RIR, and we'd set the threshold there for member initiation of a compliance review of their own RIR in version two at 25% of the RIR's total membership, or 2,000 members, whichever is lower. And then the third party that can initiate this process is ICANN.

We received some very helpful feedback during the previous consultation sessions, recommending that we lower the threshold for members initiating a compliance review of their own RIR. This concept of members being able to initiate some sort of action, the only place it appears is not just here in the compliance review. We also have the same concept that pops up within the derecognition process. And in version two, we had the same sort of thresholds for the amount of members required to initiate derecognition as we had for this compliance review. We received feedback that we thought was very helpful, that these are two different processes, and the derecognition process is a much more serious process than a compliance review. And we wanted to keep the compliance review process a bit more nimble so that it could be initiated quickly just to assess whether an issue is going on. So, thank you very much for that feedback. We agreed that we should have a lower threshold for the amount of members required to initiate a compliance review of their own RIR. We also received some feedback around some sort of anti-misuse mechanisms should be considered. So, the changes that we made there, beyond the ad hoc audit being renamed a compliance review, are that the membership threshold was lowered from the 25% or 2,000 members to 1,000 members or 15% of the membership. And a mechanism to prevent misuse of the compliance mechanisms is being incorporated in. By requiring members to first make efforts to address their grievances through the RIR's existing mechanisms for dispute resolution, we wanted to make sure that there wasn't this possibility of sort of a governance version of a DDoS attack. We

don't want these constant things coming in, so we want them to first take the first step going through their RIR's own dispute resolution process, and if after attempting that, they're not successful and they're not able to receive meaningful feedback, then they can go forward.

And with regard to the emergency continuity process, in version two, the procedures require unanimous agreement of all other RIRs and ICANN to initiate this emergency continuity process. Just to sort of take a step back in how this fits within this life cycle, emergency continuity is a much less permanent and much less severe mechanism for dealing with issues with an RIR than derecognition. And we want emergency continuity to be something that is nimble and can move quickly, particularly for issues of some sort of a natural disaster. We see this as something that is a temporary step to ensure the stability and to ensure that members in the region can continue to receive the services they need for a temporary period of time. Now, in version two, this emergency continuity process lasts for 90 days, and it can be renewed if needed, but each time you go to renew it, you have to restart the process, which includes a number of different transparency requirements to make sure that the communities involved know what's happening and why, so that it's not being abused. We had received some feedback that the process could just be continually extended without enough oversight, and we also received feedback that the unanimity requirement was too high because this mechanism does need to be able to move quickly. And we

received feedback that the community wanted to see some clearer criteria for extending the continuity procedures, and some feedback around the 90-day period. So we spent a lot of time going back and forth about the best way to address this and decided to go forward with a more simplified initiation mechanism where the threshold to initiate isn't going to require unanimity. And also to allow for the affected RIR to initiate emergency continuity for themselves, which was very helpful feedback that we had, because previously we were thinking of all these other parties, but the party closest to what's going on there is the actual RIR, and they might want to be able to initiate it for themselves, because obviously they care about their members continuing to receive the services they need.

We also decided not to limit the number of renewals that can occur for those 90-day periods, because we are having some more robust procedures around the process to renew them. We were concerned if we put a cap on the number of renewals, that might force someone into a situation where they're thinking about going down the derecognition path when that isn't necessary. And what's really best isn't to go the full-stop process of derecognition, which is very extreme, but to allow them the ability to continue as long as they need to within that process. And also sort of considering the way this process plays in with some of the things we've discussed previously around compliance reviews and the audit process there being a mechanism to discover issues early. Oh, and we also added some text to allow the emergency operator, which is the entity that

will come in and temporarily take over for the affected RIR, to take a staged approach in providing the affected RIR services. The way we have RIR services defined is pretty narrow to allow for a very quick movement in case of a natural-disaster type of thing, where it's just the core services. But if it does need to go on for a longer period of time, there are additional services that the community might need or want, and we wanted to allow the emergency operator to take a staged approach based on what's going on so that the community could continue to receive other additional services as well.

We also got into the derecognition threshold. So once again, like the threshold that we discussed prior, there are three groups that can initiate derecognition: any RIR or group of RIRs, a group of the members, or ICANN. So we received a range of comments around this derecognition process and the threshold for initiating derecognition. We received some recommendations that we lower the threshold for initiating the derecognition process, while also providing some sort of anti-capture mechanisms. So we spent a lot of time thinking about this, and derecognition is really the final recourse, and the threshold is really deliberately high there. We don't want to see this process abused, and because we have this in-between mechanism of an emergency operator, we decided that it's important to keep this threshold high and then lower the threshold for the more temporary options. So we decided to make no change to the number of members that are able to initiate this

process because of how extreme it is, and to separate those thresholds from those two different processes.

For the rehabilitation section, Article 6.2 of version two requires efforts to be made to rehabilitate a non-compliant RIR before derecognition. However, rehabilitation isn't listed as a step under the derecognition process section in version two of the document, and we've changed around some of the section numbers, just to warn you there. So we had received some feedback there that we needed to include rehabilitation as a step in the derecognition process itself to really recognize the importance of how extreme this step is, and also the fact that we're all sort of in this together, right? And the impacted RIR needs to be given the opportunity to rehabilitate and have an opportunity to cure that issue before the very extreme step of being derecognized. So the text is being amended to include the obligation to attempt rehabilitation of an RIR before further steps can be taken there.

And with regard to transition and continuity, smooth transfer of services and operations of a derecognized RIR to an interim or successor entity, as directed by ICANN. Regarding that point, we received some interesting feedback here that the article should address transition in more detail to ensure communities remain engaged during the transition and to protect the communities that are involved there. So we're making some changes to the text there, outlining the requirement that there has to be a transition plan that ensures continuity of services within the text of the

document, just to be very clear that this needs to be done in a thoughtful way with a plan in mind.

So where are we now? As Esteban talked about, the many sessions that we have had during this ICANN, which have been incredibly productive. So thank you so much to the rest of the body for all of their hard work there. This timeline gives you an overview of where we are within 2026. So following this meeting, the ASO AC is going to put together a final version of the document and deliver it to the NRO EC. In Q3, Q4, the RIRs and ICANN are then doing their own complete review of the document, and the document is going to be presented to both of those communities. Right? So toward the end of June, early July, at some point, there's going to be a handoff from the ASO AC to the EC, and then those processes are going to begin for the RIRs and ICANN. So even though the ASO AC is producing their final version, this is not your last opportunity to see what's happening. More processes will occur. And then finally, Q4 and onwards, NRO and ICANN are going to begin their approval and adoption process, including a final call for comments. So you still will have an opportunity here. Nothing's happening behind anyone's back. It's very important to us that there's transparency here.

So with regard to the document handover, the publication of the next version that the ASO AC is putting together will be published so everyone can see that. And then the final draft is handed back to the EC, which is the heads of the RIRs and ICANN, for completion, and they're going to run their own consultation processes there.

And just to note, we have been going through this process for quite a long time now. We really want to thank the community for all of their interest in this and all of the very helpful feedback that they've been providing us since 2023, when all of this started, which seems crazy now. The continued attention that all of you have provided to the work that we're doing here is so appreciated and has been so helpful to us throughout this process, so I cannot thank you enough. We are able to do the work that we're doing here so much better because of all of you. So please understand how much we appreciate that feedback that you've done, and we're really looking to wrapping things up throughout the rest of this year and getting a final document in place that's going to create a more stable ecosystem for all of us, which is really what we all want here. So at this point, I'd like to open up to any questions that anyone in the room or online might have.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Thank you, Amy, for your presentation. I think that's very clear, and just to remark the amount of work that is behind the document and all that process. And as you mentioned, congratulate the community for the input and also the full AC for the work done.

AMY POTTER

Yes. And I think it's important, I would really like to say publicly how much we appreciate also all of the support that we've received from ICANN staff, from RIR staff, from the legal teams that have been very helpful in helping us think through things here, and it's

really been a great collaborative process. We really appreciate all of the work that they put in as well. And again, the community.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

I want to also point out we are the community. It's very important, and I'm hoping that for those that did attend our open working session earlier this week, we are not 15 robots. We have very strong opinions and very strong demands that not just process is followed, but that our own communities, members, constituents, everything, that we always are thinking about them, and I think that's very important. That doesn't mean that that's driving our decisions. There's a lot of factual work that goes into this, but we aren't here acting on behalf of. We are here as community members doing this work, and I think that's very important to remind, because it's sort of easy. I think everybody in the room has seen us up here a number of times, the updates that we've done. This is probably the 25th or 30th ICP-2 update, and this is just volunteer work, folks.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Thank you, Kevin. I don't know if there is any question. If not, I think that we can adjourn the session. Ozan, please.

OZAN SAHIN

Thank you, Esteban. So thanks, everyone, for joining the session. This session is adjourned. Please stop the recording. Recording stopped.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]