

---

KOBE - Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and ASO  
Tuesday, March 12, 2019 - 09:45 to 10:45 JST  
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

>> Good morning, everybody. We'll be getting started here in just a moment.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Good morning. Good morning, everyone. It's already time for start. Please take your seat. This is a joint ASO and the Board, ICANN Board meeting. Thank you very much for coming.

Okay. Shall we start? Good morning, everyone. This is Address Supporting Organization and ICANN Board of Directors joint meeting. ICANN64, community forum, here in Kobe.

Thank you very much for joining us. So let's start with introducing ourselves from Kevin.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: Hi, Kevin Blumberg, vice chair of the ASO AC.

PAUL WILSON: Good morning, everyone. I'm Paul Wilson. I'm the head of APNIC which is the Regional Address Registry for the Asia Pacific.

---

*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.*

---

JOHN CURRAN: John Curran, president and CEO of the American Registry for Internet Numbers which is known as ARIN.

JORGE VILLA: Jorge Villa, ASO AC vice chair.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Good morning, everyone. Aftab Siddiqui, ASO AC chair.

RON DA SILVA: Ron da Silva, ASO appointed member to the ICANN Board.

ALAN BARRETT: Good morning. My name is Alan Barrett. I'm the CEO of AfrinIC, and this year I'm also the chair of the NRO.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Good morning. Nurani Nimpuno. ASO AC representative for the RIPE region.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Good morning. Chris Disspain, ICANN Board.

CHERINE CHALABY: Cherine Chalaby, good morning, ICANN Board.

---

AKINORI MAEMURA: Akinori Maemura, ASO appointee to the ICANN Board of Directors.

LITO IBARRA: Lito Ibarra, ICANN Board.

HARALD ALVESTRAND: Harald Alvestrand, IETF liaison to the ICANN Board.

TRIPTI SINHA: Tripti Sinha, ICANN Board.

AXEL PAWLIK: Axel Pawlik, managing director of the RIPE NCC. Morning.

FILIZ YILMAZ: Morning, Filiz Yilmaz, ASO AC member for the RIPE region.

AKINORI MAEMURA: I would love to have the microphone being passed to the front-row people for the other councilors and some other people from the ASO. Could you?

Microphone is coming right now.

Go ahead.

---

HERVE CLEMENT: Good morning. Herve Clement, ASO AC representative for the RIPE region.

BRAJESH JAIN: Good morning. Brajesh Jain, ASO AC from APNIC.

ESTEBAN LESCANO: Good morning. Esteban Lescano. SO/AC for LACNIC region.

SIMON SOHEL BAROI: Hi, good morning everyone. Simon Sohel Baroi from APNIC region.

RICARDO PATARA: Morning. Ricardo Patara, ASO AC from LACNIC region.

LOUIS LEE: Good morning, Louis Lee, ASO AC member from the ARIN region.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much, everyone.

And who is the ICANN Board member? Raise your hand.

Yay!

[ Laughter ]

---

Oh, all right.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: This is Chris Disspain. Could I just apologize? The logistics -- We wouldn't normally be up on a stage, you wouldn't normally be in an auditorium. So normally we'd all be kind of be on the same -- round the same table, the same room. So I just want to apologize for the logistics of the fact that we've got some board members up here and some down there and some ASO people down there. Our apologies.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much, Chris. That's right. As my local host hat's on, I'm sorry. This is the biggest room, but it is not the plain room.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So now I have to apologize to Akinori for any implication that he is to blame for anything to do with this.

[ Laughter ]

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much.

Then who is the RIR people, RIR colleagues? Raise your hand.

Thank you very much.

---

Who is the RIR board members? Raise your hand.

Yes, thank you very much.

Pretty much numbers people here. Let's start.

So usually this joint -- joint ASO/Board meeting is an exchange of the recent development. So from the ASO, do you have the update? Who is -- Who is presenting that? AC, please. Aftab.

ALAN BARRETT:

Let me start. This is Alan Barrett. So the first thing I see, there's the scope of ICANN activities in number resources. Essentially the -- the NRO or the ASO would like to ask ICANN that when you -- when ICANN undertakes any activities related to Internet number resources, we request that ICANN should coordinate with the RIRs in advance so that we can firstly not be surprised and, secondly, in case there really is the opportunity that we can work together. And we submitted a request along these lines as a comment to the ICANN strategic plan, and we identified three items in the strategic plan that we thought were related to number resources, and we would like to ask that the strategic plan could expressly state that any work related to those goals should be coordinated with the RIRs.

---

CHERINE CHALABY: To respond to that, I don't know if you were there in the audience yesterday when I -- you were there when I said my opening remarks. I said that to implement our plans, we can't do everything on our own. We're not working in a vacuum, and I think collaborating with the RIRs, and I mentioned the RIRs specifically and as well as other of our partners, is essential, and that we have to have an open and transparent relationship, and that ICANN doesn't need to lead in all instances, particularly in areas that are in your domain and you don't have to lead in areas in our domain. So we have to have this open collaboration.

So is there a particular issue that I'm not aware of? Or this is just a general principle? Because we agreed with the general principle, and we're very happy to move past that point if that's okay with you.

ALAN BARRETT: Related to general principle, I don't know. John, do you want to say anything?

JOHN CURRAN: So I don't think there's a major issue. We've had occasions where -- I think probably a good example would be a few years back ICANN launched an identifier-wide initiative for health metrics, the Internet Technology Health Identifier metrics. This is a set of

---

measurements about the accuracy and completeness of the registries, the domain registry, the protocol parameter registries, and the number registries.

When that initiative launched, it required the RIRs to do a little bit of work to collect this data and report those metrics. And we've been doing that, so it's -- so ICANN can have a complete view of all of it. But when it was launched, we actually weren't aware of it until it was, I guess, happening, announced to the community. So our participation was sort of required even though we didn't have a chance to discuss resources or timing. And we looked and said it made sense to participate, we'll do so. But when we're doing a collaborative initiative, it's good to collaborate before announcement. And that's just the example. I mean, we overcame that, and the ITHI initiative is under way, and all the RIRs are review feeding metrics to it. We helped define the metrics. We kicked off work to do that.

We just need to make sure that ICANN's mission, which involves an overall coordination role, actually involves coordination.

CHERINE CHALABY:

I hope that's not an issue going forward. I think the idea is to be transparent, collaborate, and work together; right? We have to trust each other, respect each other's remit and work together because there are bigger -- bigger issues in securities, in



---

deployment of IPv6, in the identifiers, things that we really need to work hand in hand, each one within his own remit. So understood. Thank you very much.

ALAN BARRETT:

Okay. Thank you, Cherine, for that clarification.

Indeed, we do have to work together, and we have been. It's just we don't want to be surprised in the future.

Shall we move on --

CHERINE CHALABY:

And me, too.

[ Laughter ]

Okay.

ALAN BARRETT:

Shall we move on to the next topic, the ASO organizational review?

So every five years the ASO has to be reviewed, same as the other SOs, and a review was conducted in 2017. There were 17 -- 18 recommendations came out of there, and some of them were fairly simple. Some of them have already been done. And the

---

three points that I'd like to speak about here are recommendation recommendations 3, 6, and 18.

Recommendation 3 said that the NRO should adopt a procedure for conducting periodic reviews of the ASO in line with processes used by the ICANN organization or the effective committee. And so we've accepted that, and we've developed a procedure, and a short while ago the NRO EC actually approved a new process for that for conducting periodic reviews. And it's published on the NRO website. I think I sent the URL in email to somebody in the ICANN side. Probably Carlos. And I'm happy to share that with anybody else as well. But I think you could easily find it. If you just go to the nro.net website and look in the recent news or recent documents, you should be able to find that procedure.

So really, this is just to report to you that we have been working on the recommendations and we have adopted a procedure for conducting periodic reviews.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much, Alan.

Yes, I got to look at the update of the organizational review, and I'm really impressed that other -- other supporting organizations have taken this seriously and to -- to, you know, review the ASO MOU and the ICANN bylaws to accurately reflect the result of the

---

review seriously, then. Thank you, members, for that effort. That's really great.

Any other comments or questions from -- for this part?

Thank you very much.

ALAN BARRETT:

Okay. Thank you. Let me move on, then, to recommendation 6. That's one of the others that requires coordination with ICANN.

The -- There's a global policy development process which is set out in Annexure A -- sorry; Attachment A of the ASO MOU. That's the MOU between the RIRs and ICANN about the global policy development process. And in that Attachment A, there are several steps which require coordination or agreement with ICANN, and it seems that in the past we haven't developed those procedures, but recently we have.

So recommendation 6 says that steps 12, 15 and 16, we should ensure that procedures are developed. And we've done that, but we need ICANN's agreement to complete the process.

So for step 12 -- I don't have the text in front of me here. I'm sorry. What was step -- ah, there it is. Thank you.

So step 12, there needs to be a procedure for -- yeah. Sorry, that text on there doesn't give me quite enough detail.

---

Where is the text of 12? I don't have that.

Sorry.

So step 12, really, we need a process for -- I think step 12 was when the Board disagrees with the global policy proposal --

>>

That's right.

ALAN BARRETT:

-- and they want to send it back to the ASO AC and send it back to the RIRs for further development. Step 12 of Attachment A says there should be an agreed procedure for that.

And now, we think that we've got a procedure in paragraph 6.6.2.3 of the ASO operating procedures. We think that would satisfy the requirements. The only missing part is ICANN would have to agree that it satisfies the requirement. So we're asking you to do that, please. And I've sent a more detailed message to the MSSI group with the text and references to the documents. So I don't think this is quite something for the Board right now. I think MSSI will shepherd it.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Just it will be helpful in the language to specify which part of ICANN we mean. Do you mean ICANN org or the Board? It's very

---

specific in 16 which says it's the ICANN Board, and then there's ICANN. So it would help us. Because if there is an operational thing, it would be the -- more ICANN org, the relationship. If it's a policy issue, then it's more on the board side.

So only being pedantic a little bit so we follow up adequately your request.

Take step 12. Contact ICANN. Do you mean the Board or ICANN org?

ALAN BARRETT:

Right. I'm not sure. What you see there is, I think, an extract from the minutes or action items from an NRO EC meeting. I think step 12 just says there has to be an agreed process, agreed between the RIRs and ICANN. It doesn't say which part of ICANN.

AKINORI MAEMURA:

My understanding is that's -- that's point to the board. But as usual, the procedure is quite -- little helped by the organizations. So that's what we -- it reads.

So not -- I don't think there is -- ICANN organization appear in this kind of process. Okay. Make sense, Cherine?

CHERINE CHALABY:

So are you suggesting this is ICANN org?

---

JOHN CURRAN:

These three steps are things that came up in the ASO review where it was felt it wasn't -- that there may not have been processes that needed to be put in place that weren't there.

In one case, step 16 refers to an initiation of a policy, that there should be a way for the ICANN board, if it wishes to initiate a number policy, a global number policy, to have a process to do that. So in step 16, we said, well, we have a process that's open to any entity to do that, and ICANN board is welcome to do.

So that one's -- we think is unnecessary. I don't think you need an ICANN board-specific process.

The others, we need to go back and look. One of them is regarding whether or not we can use the arbitration clause that exists in the MOU. I imagine that would be triggered by ICANN, the organization, aka, ICANN's board.

I would need to go reference what step 12 is.

But each one of these is a separate and distinct matter that we've been told we need procedures for.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Okay. Thank you.

---

ALAN BARRETT: Okay. So, then, on step 15 of the global policy development process, it says that there should be an agreed procedure for mediation in case of some sort of dispute about global policy.

We'd like to point out that there's already a procedure for arbitration specified in the MOU. And so our suggestion is that the agreed procedure for mediation could simply be that we agree to skip mediation and go straight to arbitration because there's already a procedure for that. So that's our suggestion. And, obviously, we would need the ICANN board's agreement to do that.

CHERINE CHALABY: So what do our board liaison -- I mean, I don't think I can answer on behalf of the board right now. But need to -- Is this the first time you've seen this? Or is this something that --

ALAN BARRETT: Thanks, Cherine. No, we're certainly not looking for answers right now.

I'm just really informing you of the status of these things. And I've sent a message to MSSI, and I think they will take it up and -- through whatever internal ICANN processes are necessary.

---

CHERINE CHALABY: And just for my -- just my education there, what's the purpose and the reason for skipping mediation and going straight to arbitration?

ALAN BARRETT: We already have an agreed process for arbitration. And so it would save us the trouble of writing a process for mediation. I think that's one of the drivers here.

We don't -- we don't have a need to skip mediation. If somebody wants to spend the effort on writing a process for that, I think it would be fine. But it seems unlikely we would ever really need it. The only issue is there's a document that says we have to have a process.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you. And we're talking about binding arbitration here; is that right?

AKINORI MAEMURA: I would think that some other (indiscernible) from the legal team will help from the NRO side.

For example, Craig, do you have any -- Thomas?

Sorry. Just -- put you in this regard. Can you?



---

CRAIG NG: Thanks, Akinori. Craig Ng from APNIC, general counsel.

The legal team from the NRO has been tasked to start doing some work on these recommendations and start to implement -- make a proposal to the NRO EC as to the sort of legal steps that are necessary to implement these recommendations. So I think, really, what Alan is trying to do here is just to identify and give you a heads-up as to what's coming. I think the next step would be for the legal team to come up with the recommendations to the NRO EC. And then the following step would be some sort of communication from us to you, with our suggestion that the changes to the MOU and possibly changes to the ICANN bylaws to accommodate the recommendations.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay. Understood. Thanks.

I think you don't need to go beyond that. Thank you.

AKINORI MAEMURA: And this is update, as Alan said.

CHERINE CHALABY: Yes.

---

ALAN BARRETT:

Okay. Thank you.

So the next part of this recommendation was to develop a procedure for step 16 of attachment A. And step 16 says there has to be an agreed procedure for the ICANN board to initiate a global policy development process. And as John mentioned a few minutes ago, there's already a process for any member of the public to initiate a global policy development process. And so our suggestion there is the ICANN board could just follow that public process, and there might have to be agreement, that you would agree to do that. And, again, I don't think we need to hash that out in this meeting. This is just a -- for your information that these steps we're thinking of.

HERINE CHALABY:

And we don't need to hash out, but, again, what's the objective behind that? Is that there isn't a process by now -- now in place for the board to initiate a policy process? Is that what you're saying? And you want to put more restriction and more control on the process? Or....

ALAN BARRETT:

Attachment A of the MOU, in step 16, says that there must be an agreed process for the ICANN board to be able to initiate global policy development in the -- in the number registry space. There's

---

another part in -- is it step 1 or something? -- where any member of the public can go to any RIR to initiate global policy development. And so we think there does not need to be a special process for the board. We think that the ICANN board could just use the same process that any member of the public could use.

JOHN CURRAN:

Yeah, we have a -- the MOU specifies there should be a procedure here for you to initiate a policy -- global number policy.

In the years since we've been doing this together, you haven't done that. But we've worked to make clear to the community how public policy should be submitted. There's a process for that that involves the ASO AC. We just didn't realize we need a distinct process for the board. And we're asking you, do we need a distinct process for the board, or can the process that everyone uses suffice for the board? If you want a different process, tell us you want a different process, and....

CHERINE CHALABY:

Okay. Understood. Thank you.

I'm just trying to again a little bit to get a little bit of life behind each one of these, understand the purpose of it.

All right. Thank you.

---

AKINORI MAEMURA: That's actually appreciated, Cherine. Thank you.

ALAN BARRETT: Yes. I think the purpose of it is simply that the review turned up the fact that we have not developed processes for some of these things. So we're trying to develop the simplest process possible.

Okay. Can I move on to recommendation 18?

Recommendation 18, from the ASO review, said that the NRO should initiate a public consultation involving the five RIR communities to determine the future structure of the ASO.

And we've done that. And some regions did not see any need for changes, but some did see some need for changes. We expect any changes to be fairly lightweight. All regions agreed that the relationship between the RIRs and ICANN is useful and should continue. All regions agreed that ICANN is doing a good job as the IANA numbering services operator and that should continue.

But there were some concerns about workload imposed on volunteers. And there were suggestions that the ASO or the NRO should consider saying no to some of the invitations we get from ICANN to serve on committees or to comment on documents or to appoint people to committees and so on.

---

And also, there was a concern about confusion in naming, where we use the names "NRO" and "ASO" in different contexts, and that's confusing. It would be nice if we could reduce the confusion.

And so that's, essentially, what came out of the public consultation process.

The next step is that the NRO will develop a proposal for changes that we think we could make to address some of these issues. And, eventually, there would be a public consultation process in the RIR community, and eventually, it would come to ICANN as well.

CHERINE CHALABY:

I think that's -- that's a very good idea. And I don't know if you're following, on our side, we are beginning a consultation with our community also on improving the effectiveness and efficiency of our governance model. And I -- one of the examples I give is the level of participation of the RIRs in there. And I mention the concerns that you just mentioned now.

So we will consult with our community also on this. But if you are -- are you around on Thursday? Are you around?

There is a session on that from our side. It would be good if you participated and expressed your view so that it's logged there,

---

and the community hears your view. But it's not necessary. We made the point anyway. So thanks.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you. Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Akinori.

Just to say that changes that come back to the structure in respect to the way that the ASO participates in any of the enhanced community aspects of the new bylaws, there's -- there are challenges there in balancing. So I'm just flagging that when this was done in work -- in the cross-community working group, the number of -- the number of organizations involved was taken into account and the numbers were come to at a -- in a community -- whole of community consensus way. So if you were to come back and say -- and I'm just using this as an example. If you were to come back and say, "We want to withdraw from this piece and this piece," then the consequences of that would be that the community would have to rebalance what it does. And that's not to say you can't do it, but it is to say that it will take time, because the community's going to have to go through a process of saying, "Well, if we lose these people, then what do we do?" Thanks.

---

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much.

ALAN BARRETT: Okay. Thank you. I think that's understood.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Okay. That's all from the executive council? You have something more?

ALAN BARRETT: I have one more point that I'd like to update you on. And that is that the -- as part of the IANA transition, we set up an IANA Numbering Function Review Committee whose task is to review the performance of the IANA numbers function every year and to advise the NRO EC. And their report for the 2018 year was published just a few days ago. And it found absolutely no cause for concern. It found that all the IANA numbering requests during the 2018 year were handled on time and accurately. So that -- that's good news. I just wanted to inform you of that.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much. Any comments or questions at this stage?  
  
Ron.

---

RON DA SILVA: Thank you for the update on the recommendation status for the ASO review. The other, whatever, 13 or 14 that Warren talked about, are they all closed?

And then second question, has -- the implementation planning for these specific recommendations that you brought to our attention this morning, timing for when we'll see sort of another update on this and it will get in front of the board again?

ALAN BARRETT: No. They're not all closed. We do have a tracking page on our Web site. If you go to the NRO.net Web site and look under "accountability." You should be able to find the ASO review 2017. And under there, you will find a tracking page. And several of the recommendations are still in progress. We don't have a specific time line for when it will all be done, but we are gradually working on all of them.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Okay. Any other?

All right. Then going to the Address Council. Thank you.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Thank you, Akinori. May I have my slides, please.

That's not my slides.



---

So meanwhile the slides are coming, I'm responding to Ron, as part of the recommendation, there were some recommendations slated to ASO/AC internally. So we have actioned on most of them. Some of them are in the implementation phase, because some require some extra task to be done. So if you follow -- and I would request the board to follow the tracking page. We will be updating it on a timely basis so that it is clear to the community and the board what's happening in that area.

All right. So just a quick update about who we are as the NRO Number Council or the Address Supporting Organization Address Council.

We are 15 people. You have seen 11 here. Three from each region, two elected and one appointed by the respective RIR board members.

Its term of office is different for every region. What we do is very clearly defined. We meet every month on a telephonic conference. And once a year face to face. This is our face-to-face meeting. We had our open face-to-face meeting. It was part of the recommendation that the ASO AC should open up their meetings. We did it last year anyway. So you are all welcome to join. So if you are not aware of that, we conduct face-to-face open meeting, and we will be opening up our monthly meeting as soon

---

as possible. It is part of our recommendation, again, to follow the tracking page, again, you can join that meeting as well.

Next slide, please.

So these are the names from each region and their terms. You have -- they have identified themselves here. So if you'd like to meet all of us, you are more than welcome --

Next slide, please.

-- so the global policy development process, we have -- every region has their own PDP. They follow their own PDP. It happens in their own region. But to support the global policy development, we have formed a team called PPFT. It is the policy proposal facilitator team. We have one member from each region, Wafa Dahmani from AfriNIC, Brajesh Jain from APNIC, Jason Schiller from ARIN, (saying name) from LACNIC, and Herve Clement from RIPE NCC.

Next slide, please.

ASO-AC activities. We appoint one member to the NomCom. For 2019, we have appointed Brajesh Jain, who is serving on the NomCom from the ASO AC side.

This is the most important task we have to do as part of the ASO AC. We appoint two board members, one for seat 9 and another

---

for seat 10. So on seat 9, Ron Da Silva is serving from the ASO AC side, from the ASO side. And we have -- we have started the process for the seat 10 appointment. The election process started last year on 15th of September. And seat 10 is currently served by Maemura Akinori-San. So nomination calls are published in all regions in September. And you can find the details.

Next slide, please.

So we got three nominations. One nomination was withdrawn last month. And so here are the names of them. This is all public information available on our Web site. So if you need more information, please refer to the ASO Web site.

Next slide, please.

These are the time lines, again, published on our Web site. So we are in the selection phase at the moment. Deliberation is happening. It will be updated around 22nd of March. So that will be updated as soon as possible. It is available.

Next.

Just a quick overview on what is happening in the regional policy updates so that you are all aware.

Next.

---

So we had in the last six months five RIR meetings, RIPE, APNIC, AfrINIC, LACNIC, and ARIN. So the last RIPE meeting was just before the ICANN Barcelona.

And these are the next six meetings which are coming up. And it's there, so it's an open invitation to the ICANN board members so that you can join our meetings and see what's happening in the policy development -- in the policy arena in the numbers space.

Next.

So in the last six months, I just created a small chart just to show what's happening in the policy side. We had policies on IPv4, on IPv6, on the ASN, some policies to cater IPv4 transfers and ASN transfers, and others, like WHOIS validation, and to update the policy development process. There were multiple policies. So it's a long list. It's available on every RIR's Web site. For the details, you can refer to that one.

Next. And that's it. If you have any questions related to that, please let me know.

AKINORI MAEMURA:

Thank you, Aftab. I have a question. One slide back, please. Okay. The mark represents the dot RIR of the present proposal which is being discussed, is that right?

---

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Yes. Yes. So if it is APNIC cross, then okay, this would be a right sign but yeah, this is just cross is to identify this is a policy proposal either in discussion or being proposed in the APNIC or any others --

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much. Questions or comments, please. Anything from the ICANN side? No? Crystal clear then. Okay. Thank you very much. Oh, Kevin.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: So there's a lot of X's which could be check marks. It's not really that big a deal. The one thing that I want to point out that's important is the nature, the number of policies in our regions has not really changed over the last couple of years. I think that all of the regions are seeing a consistent level of policies. How many happen when they happen, et cetera. But I don't think that it's fundamentally suddenly lowered where we're not doing policy or risen substantially.

While this doesn't have specific counts I just wanted to sort of point out that the policy work going on in the rejoin is consistent.

---

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you, Kevin. Yes, that's interesting too, the work kind of the policy were being discussed there, for example. Now recently we have the APNIC conference in the region, South Korea, and we have -- you may be curious about what is others. The other -- one other in the APNIC was the -- how do I say, improving the process, policy process. That actually had the really active discussion in the region then -- yes. Okay. I'm maybe encouraging the Board members to join the RIR meeting to observe that. Paul.

PAUL WILSON: Thanks, Akinori. Yeah, just to be a bit more concrete, some examples that show that rumors of the demise of the address policy process are definitely premature. In the APNIC meeting we had five policy proposals. Three of them were approved as new policies to be implemented. Two of them were rejected and may come back later. We spent nearly a day, three quarters of a day, on address policy discussions and pretty active discussions, too, of which are archived on the website. This is nothing unique to APNIC. It's the way the other RIRs run.

Maybe one example of an address policy concern with IPv4 was -  
- and this has been an important discussion in our region. It's got to do with our sort of rationing policy for the remaining IPv4 address space which is -- has given us a fairly long life of that remaining space, but we're down to about a quarter of a /8 left.

---

There was a policy that was approved that reduces the size of the ration from a /22 to /23. That means the rations are half the size and possibly the remaining space, therefore, might last us twice as long, but with reduced -- reduced ration sizes.

So that's just an example of something that's very specific to IP addressing. It's just one example of the kind of policy that -- that we're dealing with in the -- in the APNIC region. You probably would consider that that rate of about five policies being conducted in each of our meetings is pretty normal if you extrapolate across the RIRs, and we have reported this in the past. Something like 40 or 50 different policy proposals across the RIR system per year would be -- would be the sort of normal rate. So again, I think that kind of indicates a fairly healthy level of interest and discussion about RIR -- RIR policies. Thanks.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much, Paul. Aftab, and then John.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Yes. So I just want to highlight two points. If you would like to understand more on the policy side and what's happening and work for the policies discussed, please come to our session that is tomorrow at 1:30. That is ASO public session. We will be discussing about the policies, the report from the NRO, and the

---

report from the IANA services team. So it is very comprehensive and it's 90 minutes, so we wanted to give an overview here and so that it's a bait so that you can come tomorrow. And the second thing is, if I can see the second -- the slides back, one slide back. Yes. So these are the meeting invitations to all of you, all the ICANN Board members who are not exactly from the numbers community because people who are from the numbers community, Board members from the numbers community, are very regular in RIR meetings. So I would like to invite all of you to come to these meetings. And it's -- it's good to have you and see that how intensive all these policy development processes are and how active the community is engaged in our regions. And you will find it at times very entertaining as well that how we are developing our policies in the region. And it's very different for every region. So it's not like okay, fine, I'm attending one region so that should be okay. Come to all regions. It will be interesting.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much for sure. 1:30 p.m. tomorrow at Sapphire. ASO open. Okay, thank you. Before you, John.

JOHN CURRAN: Just for -- again to distinguish, if you sit in the ICANN world, you might not see a lot of number policy because the number policy that comes here is global number policy. Yet our local, in each of



---

the RIRs, our policy within each RIRs, is very active discussion. And as Paul said, with some 30 to 50 proposals I'd guess over the course of the year between the five RIRs.

Global number policy, policies that the IANA uses for the issuance of locks to the RIR is remarkably stable, and that's a feature should be celebrated.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much. Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA: So thank you. This is just for my edification. So if you could skip to the next slide, the -- so where -- you said 30 to 40 policies at any given time. So is that -- which space is it most active in terms of the actual columns.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: So I can give you an example. So if you take an example of APNIC, so there were three policy related to IPv4 allocations and -- just last week. So it says mark under the IPv4, but there were three policies referring to that. One policy was actually related to the IPv6 and there was one policy for the ASN and then there was a policy on the policy development process -- to change the policy development process. So how they were -- so sometimes it's --

---

it's close -- you can say they are -- sometimes they are only referring to the v4 in the space and how the allocation is done and how the transfer is done. But sometimes it's available, I would say -- it's a mix. It's v6, v4, ASN. Last year it was very much heavy on the WHOIS validation, but I think every region has accepted that one and now it's very much flat. It's touching all the possible topics.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you, Aftab. Kevin.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: That also was brought up earlier balance. When IPv4 policy is brought up, then there's a natural motivation to look at IPv6 because you've changed one thing and now you're looking, does it impact the other. And there's that balance that goes on. Year-over-year that balance is always happening where IPv4 does that now makes sense for IPv6, IPv6 does that make sense for v4. Transfers, does that impact privacy, things like that. So there's a constant balance of shift year-over-year back to each of these areas. As one changes, the other might change as well.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you.

---

AKINORI MAEMURA: John.

JOHN CURRAN: Yeah. I would say two current trends, I guess, over the last few years has been, as Paul indicated in the APNIC regions, we have it in ARIN region, I know RIPE has proposals, how we deal with the final IPv4 address blocks that each RIR holds is an interesting topic. And it's not just the ones we sign, but it's the ones we reclaim and recover. So that's come up in policy proposals in most of the regions.

The other things are transfers. We have both transfers in each RIR from one body to another. We all have -- there's an active market that works to make sure that there's a -- IP address blocks get to parties that can use them and make sure the resources are effectively used. That has policies around it. And then there's inter-RIR policies for transfer which have similar but slightly different issues as well. And so those are probably the main areas right now. I would say we do see IPv6, we do see ASNs, but it's not as active and heated.

PAUL WILSON: But wait, there's more. WHOIS is the next realm, in my opinion, for more active policy development because the accuracy and the completeness, the correctness of the registries is getting to be

---

more of a focus, particularly in security and law enforcement, public safety environments. So one of the quite costly policy implementations that APNIC is in the middle of is one which is kind of enforcing regular checks, the type of checks that actually happen in the DNS world these days. But regular validation and requirements for validation of contact details in our Internet response contacts and other -- other contacts which are stored in WHOIS. Beyond that, there's also RPKI which is kind of a -- in an experimental realm. Not the focus of very much policy up until this point, but as it goes operational, I'd expect that there's actually quite a lot of policy discussion that will be uncovered and dug out of the -- of the whole realm of RPKI and routing security implementation, (indiscernible), et cetera.

AKINORI MAEMURA:

Thank you very much. That's very good overview and the deep dive at the same time for the regional process. That's how the RIR is (indiscernible). All right. Any other question or comments? Goran, your input? Nothing from the -- nothing from you? Okay. All right. Thank you very much. It's -- I think it's a good discussion to keep up this kind of exchange for the future. Thank you very much. The joint ASO and the ICANN Board meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much.

[ END OF TRANSCRIPT ]