

---

ICANN81 | AGM – ASO Information Session  
Tuesday, November 12, 2024 – 16:30 to 17:30 TRT

**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 Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During the session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. If you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, please unmute in Zoom, state your name for the record, and speak at a reasonable pace. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. I will now hand the floor over to Hervé Clément.

**HERVÉ CLÉMENT:** Thank you, Ozan. This is the ASO information dedicated to the presentation of one of the many works we have performed till today, which is called ICP-2. This ASO information session is, I understood, dedicated to the people we have not presented to. We have a presentation with the GAC, with the SSAC, with the ASPCP. Other people may be interested and there will be other information because information for us is key for this process.

Before that, ASO information. We are a part of the ASO. The Addressing Supporting Organization is first composed of the NRO EC, the chairs of

---

**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.

---

the regions dealing with IP addresses first. And we are the second part, or the other part, the Addressing Supporting Organization, the Address Council, comprises of normally 15 people, three coming from each region, two elected by the community and one by the Executive Board. But with the particularity currently, and because of the current status of the AFRINIC, that there is no AFRINIC representative in the ASO AC. ICP-2, no.

We were requested in October 2023 by the NRO EC to answer to two different but very linked tasks. The first one, the ICP-2 first. Historically, it's a document that was adopted by the ICANN in 2001, drafted by the ASO AC, proposed by the ASO AC. And this document is a list of criteria for the creation of new regional Internet registry. We will go through the principle after. But via this document, the LACNIC in 2003 and the AFRINIC in 2005 have been created. This document has been created in 2000 and 2001, that is 23 or 24 years ago. Since then, a lot of things have changed in terms of ecosystem, technique, governance, some specific events. The regional system is more mature than it was in the past, it's a question of experience. And it was a necessity at one moment to update this criteria.

The first question or the first task we were asked by the NRO EC is an implementation task. Per se, the criteria described in the document has been used for the creation of regional Internet registries. And no, it was a wish to make more clear that these criteria were used to have an evaluation on the ongoing way of regional Internet registry. And in a very extreme way, the possibility of deregister regional Internet

registry. So the idea is to have an entire cycle of the life of a regional Internet registry.

And it's something we are working on, on the proposal of a document from the NRO EC in the beginning of the year. And it was then given to the NRO EC, it was in February. And then in March, it was in ICANN79 Puerto Rico meeting, we started to work on the update. And there's different criteria. We started with numerous pages, we then have to clear to go to a more simple document. And it's that document now, which is under ICANN public consultation. And the different parties, constituencies, community of the ICANN are requested one more time to answer to. And this consultation is open till the 6th of December.

And in parallel, because the legitimacy of this document, at the end, will need the support of the community, on the input of the different communities. The communities of the regions are key as well for the adoption of this one. But the reason why there is also a questionnaire everybody can answer to. And the deadline is the same.

I don't know if the other members of the council want to add something about this presentation on tradition of the ICP-2. And after that, I will give the floor to Kevin for the presentation of this principle per se. I see that no. So, Kevin, the floor is yours.

KEVIN BLUMBERG:

Thank you, Hervé. And I'm sure if there's any extra time, we can talk about all the other things that the ASO normally would be doing. Things like appointments to the NomCom, our board of directors, things like

---

that. But for right now, let's dive into, I think, what has been of keen interest to other community members. Next slide, please. Next slide. Okay.

So, the first thing to mention is that ICP-2 is not a new document, as Hervé mentioned. It was last ratified in 2001. And there are key components to the principles document and the principles that we have out for questionnaire right now that are embodied in the existing ICP-2. Those principles include the region of coverage should meet the scale to be defined by ICANN.

The new RIR must demonstrate that it has broad support in the proposed region, that it needs to be a bottom-up self-governance structure, that neutrality and impartiality are there, and that it has technical expertise. These are all things that are embodied in ICP-2 today. So, what we're going to go through is some of the new principles.

Next slide, please. Well, continue on. Adherence to global policies, activity plans, funding models, record-keeping, and confidentiality are all parts.

So, next slide. As Hervé mentioned, on October 2023, we were asked to do two things. And I'm going to focus now on number two, which is the strengthening of the ICP-2, which was to establish and manage a process to update ICP-2 in 2024 and 2025 to provide the RIR system with better accountability to the Internet community. So, one of the things that we realized was that when we started this process, rewriting a document and handing the document to the community, maybe a 20, 30, 40 page document, would create an issue where people were

---

focused on individual words or concepts, and that this iterative process may take years rather than months or a year and a half, because we'd almost given a final document and then asked people to comment on a final document.

So, what we looked at doing was distilling it down into two distinct phases. We're in the key portion of phase one, which is we have gone through what the key principles, as we believe them to be, and I need to stress this, as we believe them to be. Because we are seeking feedback from the community, whether they agree, disagree, strongly agree, strongly disagree, and more importantly, comment. Comment on nuances of the principles that they may want to make recommendations on, concerns they may have with any of the principles, as we outlined.

It's the feedback from the community that is incredibly important to us and that we will then take and use towards building a draft that, again, will go to community feedback. But we felt that by doing it this way, we could work on things that were, A, important to the community, there may be some principles that the community does not feel is important, or, B, where they feel very strongly that it needs more in it than what we had potentially put into the principle. All of those pieces of feedback are important and valuable to us.

Lastly, I've said lots of important feedback is great, but so is just the feedback of we appreciate the work that's being done and we support the work that is being done. That in itself is of help. Any community input, small or big, is helpful to this process.

---

Next slide, please. Let's talk about some of the proposed principles. Next slide. Yellow is just the key catchy ones. We've divided it into a number of different areas. Governance is the first area. I'm not going to read verbatim. We'll leave it on the screen for a minute, but I want to go through it. We will give time through this if there are questions related to it. We can explain a little bit around the principle, but the key is there's a difference between a question and a statement. If you have a statement that you'd like to do, by all means, please put it into the questionnaire. It's really difficult, unfortunately, for the individual ASO AC members to comment on statements, but if you have a question to help clarify, we're happy to do that.

The first is authority. A proposal to recognize a candidate RIR or derecognize an RIR must originate from the NRO EC after a majority vote. This lays out, and again, while some of the principles were explicitly mentioned in ICP-2 originally, many of them are implicitly expected. We have erred on the side of moving things from implicit, where it's not specifically mentioned in the document, but it is understood, to explicit and mentioning it in this document. Authority between the NRO EC and ICANN to recognize or derecognize an RIR. We'll speak more about derecognition because there's some very important curing expectations that we have put in here. While derecognition is there, there are a lot of steps that we have also included with these principles.

The next thing was that ICP-2 may be amended among agreements. Again, we want to make it a little easier down the road if there's changes that need to be made. It's explicitly now mentioned. And another

---

important one is rectification. The idea is that if a new principle or a new part of ICP-2 is included, that an RIR has an opportunity over time to fix rather than to grandfather in the provision. So rather than just say, oh, we've got a new provision and you don't have to worry about it, the idea is that an RIR would work towards something that was new in terms of future additions. Or potentially even this document in its finality may have some areas that require an RIR to rectify, and this gives them time and patience to do that.

Next key area is the RIR ecosystem. Again, the yellow is more of a newer or has more content in it. Coverage pretty much follows the existing that RIR should only ensure that all areas in the globe continue to receive the services. Service region shall cover a large multinational geographic area and shall not overlap. Again, very similar. What we are trying to do is also clarify some of the wording that was used in 2001 that may not be appropriate in 2025 and onwards. So some of the terminology that we used, while service region may be slightly different, we're trying to improve some of the terminology. Next slide.

Next is the RIR lifecycle. Recognition was and is in ICP-2 today. That does not change. But what we've added into the principles are two key areas, which is the operation that once an RIR is recognized, it must continually meet all the requirements. So that's the ongoing operation.

And the last is derecognition. Again, while it is implicit, this would make it explicitly mentioned now inside of the new document. And an RIR that does not continue to meet all the requirements specified may, and

---

the important word is may, may be derecognized as an RIR. So if you have any comments on these, by all means, please include them. Next.

Recognition. Again, these are areas that already exist. The community support. We have changed some of the terminology. We're using the word resource holder in this, and we've sort of helped clarify. If there's questions about what a resource holder is, happy to answer that later. But the main point is, again, we're using more consistent terminology across the regions that are used today. But community support is very important for recognition, and community commitment. A candidate RIR must demonstrate that its community is willing to support the RIR, both financially and by actively participating. Next slide.

Operation. So these, again, are all things that exist inside of the current ICP-2, that the RIR is independent, it's a not-for-profit, that it has good corporate governance, that it's member-controlled, that it's community-driven, and that it's neutral. Next slide.

So let's talk about some of the new things we've added in. Transparency. An RIR must maintain and publish comprehensive records of its governance, activities, and finances, that it must participate in regular audits by an external and independent auditor to ensure that it's continuing to comply with ICP-2. The service is an existing. It provides stable, reliable, accurate, accountable allocation and registrations.

The next is continuity. It must maintain continuity procedures and redundancies and participate in record-sharing. That's an additional. Anti-capture, which is different. We've talked about this a couple times.

---

It's a little different between each of the regions. There's no specific text around this principle. The idea is that each region should look at this, investigate it, and be able to understand it. Again, this applies more to a not-for-profit, member-driven organization. Anti-capture is good for those kinds of organizations.

And lastly, the catch-all, Ecosystem stability. Each RIR must cooperate to ensure the ongoing operation and stability of the global Internet number registry system and must not operate or fail to operate in any manner that threatens such stability. We felt that the catch-all was important to include. And while we can foresee a number of things, we are not necessarily all technical and all knowing. So that was why that catch-all was there. Next.

Derecognition. So this principle here is probably the most important. It's not the right word, but it's the most important for me to call out, because what it does is it says that ICANN and the other RIRs must provide all reasonable support if requested to assist an RIR to cure any failure to comply with ICP-2 before being derecognized. Everything should be done, is the key part to this. This is not, we don't like what's going on, we're going to derecognize you. The goal is that, by design, want remedial work to be done so that the communities can continue to have a bottom-up process in them and that whatever reasonable it can take is done.

Lastly, a handoff. A derecognized RIR must cooperate with ICANN and the other RIRs to ensure the smooth transfers of its operations to a successor. So we've tried to put together a number of principles here.

---

We believe we've covered both the existing principles as well as new principles that would create a much fuller lifecycle document. But in order to do that, we really, again, do need your input. And while I may say something I feel is important, again, that is my personal view, and you, your community, your organization, etc., may have a different perspective, and that is why we're seeking input on this. Next slide.

So that's the end of the policies. Do we want to open it up, or first to the ASO, if there's anything they want to add? Because this was not my scheduled discussion, and I hope I got everything. But if I did miss anything, please, by all means.

ESTEBAN LESCANO:

Just to add that the consultation is open until the 6th of December and is in the ICANN webpage. And, well, it's important that everyone can contribute. And the answers will be analyzed and validated by the ASO AC.

KEVIN BLUMBERG:

So there's a microphone up here if anybody wants to come up. Yay, nay. Go ahead.

OZAN SAHIN:

Hi, this is Ozan. I'm doing the remote participation today. We have a few questions that were submitted remotely. I think three questions. Would you like me to read them out loud?

---

KEVIN BLUMBERG: Yeah, if you could do them one at a time and just let us, attribution is important, but please, one at a time would be great.

OZAN SAHIN: So the question comes from Mohibul Hasib Mahmoud [ph] and says, Hi, Kevin, I'm interested in learning more about how the updated ICP-2 specifically enhances accountability for RIRs. Could you elaborate on which new principles or procedures will have the most impact on ensuring transparency and responsibility across the RIR system?

KEVIN BLUMBERG: So there's a transparency. If you want to go back a couple slides into governance. So there's a transparency is new. Audit is new. Continuity is new. Anti-capture is new. All of them have significant benefits. While, again, many of these things may be done, may be implied in ICP-2 today, they're now going to be explicitly called out. But the transparency and the auditing, continuity, all of those things will, I think, have the biggest impact to the question.

OZAN SAHIN: So I'm going to the second question. Thank you, Kevin. What role will the Internet community have in monitoring RIR accountability under the new ICP-2 principles? And are there mechanisms for public reporting or feedback?

---

KEVIN BLUMBERG: I believe that comes under the transparency. Again, an RIR must maintain and publish comprehensive records of its governance activities and finances. There is a level of transparency that, as a member-driven organization, is already in place today. I think this enhances those requirements and codifies those requirements. Again, if there is more that a community member is looking for, as far as that, it would be recommended that they fill out the questionnaire. And that type of question may fall under the transparency or audit principles.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you. And I'm reading the third question. Mohibul Hasib Mahmood submitted. If an RIR fails to meet the requirements outlined in ICP-2, what specific support will ICANN or other RIRs provide to help restore compliance before derecognition is considered?

KEVIN BLUMBERG: So the ASO AC is here to write a document. We're here to get community feedback on the document. We're not here to implement the document. So while I would love to answer the question, Mr. Hans Petter here may be better for that.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: So thank you, Hans Petter Holen, chair of the NRO EC. I don't have much of a voice left, so I thought I'd avoid speaking, but anyway. The RIRs have established a support fund where we have pledged money to help each other, both monetary and other. So that is in place. I also know that ICANN is willing to offer reasonable support given the

---

circumstances. This has not been formalized yet. What we're working on now is principles. There are no detailed procedures or implementation written yet.

We will focus on getting the principles in place. And then we will have to answer all those questions that comes up, which are very clear and need to be worked on in more detail. But just to say, both the RIRs and ICANN, as I understand them, I can't speak on behalf of them, are very committed to support the RIR system and AFRINIC specifically, since that's the underlying question. Now we're actively working to support them to get them back on their feet and have good governance again.

OZAN SAHIN:

Thank you, Hans-Petter and Kevin. And that's it for the remote questions that we have. So back to you, Kevin and Herve.

DANIEL MIGAUL:

Right. So I might be completely out of -- I'm not sure what I'm going to say is going to make sense, but I had the impression that RIRs were completely independent. And now that I see ICANN, I mean, my reading of the text is that ICANN can decommission one RIR. I mean, we cannot capture one, but we can capture all. So it's like a little bit of a Dan Kaminsky attack.

OZAN SAHIN:

Could you, for the record, state your name and affiliation so we have that?

DANIEL MIGAUL:

Daniel Migault, I'm the liaison from IETF to RSSAC. Thank you.

HANS PETTER HOLEN:

I knew that, but it's good for everybody. Hans-Petter Holen, NRO EC again. Thank you, Kevin. You know, everybody is equal, but some are more equal. My answer is yes and no. So all the RIRs are independent legal entities. They're membership organizations in some shape or form under their local jurisdiction. The boards are elected by their members, and they hire a CEO, and they have separate governance.

The RIRs have signed an MOU with each other, which is the NRO MOU. That gives us some mutual obligations. We have some inter-regional transfer policies. We have some global policies. We have an MOU with ICANN, and two of the RIRs have been recognized explicitly by ICANN under ICP-2. So there has been a recognition process. AFRINIC and LACNIC would not have come into existence without the ratification of the ICANN board. Therefore, it follows, somebody may say, and we believe, that ICANN also has the power to derecognize.

Now, what would happen for the RIPE NCC in such a case? Well, if the RIPE NCC gets completely dysfunctional, if the membership is not able to elect a board, and I'm not able to call for a new GM because the members have given me that power, even so that we have mitigated for the AFRINIC case, and it all falls apart, I would find it reasonable that the other RIRs and ICANN step in and resurrect the RIPE NCC in one shape or another. Now, that's a very political, dramatical statement that

---

you've never, ever heard me say again. Oops, am I in a public forum now?

But you think, from the 30 years since the RIPE NCC has been established, we need some oversight and we need legitimacy. Now, does that mean that you can capture the whole system by capturing ICANN? Yes, but there has been put in 20, I don't know how many years, of checks and balances in ICANN to prevent capture of ICANN. So we need to stop the trust somewhere. And I think that's what we're trying to build now. If you go to the first principle on the first slide there. The authority. It is clearly expressed there as the proposed principle that ICANN has that authority after having consulted with and given substantial consideration to the input of each RIR. So, if that wasn't clear before, at least it gets very clear now, right? Yeah.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT:

But there's no bad question to that. If we give the opportunity to the communities to answer questionnaire, it's because from our side we will be very interested of all the opinion, considering that we wish not to have so separated and different ways to have opinion because it will be quite impossible to analyze them. But it will feed definitely the way the second document, because it will be a second document after this draft. It's the first consultation and it will be a phase we will analyze the different question and the other region and via the ICANN, we will decide. Kevin?

---

KEVIN BLUMBERG:

Kevin Bloomberg. We had originally intended to not present the principles this way. And the reason for that is we did not want to introduce bias, our own bias, into this process. But a consistent piece of feedback from a number of different groups was we really need you to give us at least a walkthrough as much as possible. And we've realized that we've spent a lot of time on this. We added it up and it was in the thousands of hours as a group. And I think we know this material very well. And we have a good idea of what this material is meant to hopefully achieve in a draft. But to put that on the community without giving some of this ability to have questions like this answered.

So your question was not out of line. It was actually extremely important. It's important for the questions to get asked. We'll focus more on, we'd love to hear your feedback once we've clarified, but we don't want the clarity, especially if language is an issue. We don't want clarity to stop somebody being able to produce a feedback.

OZAN SAHIN:

Hello, this is Ozan again, managing the remote participation today. Mohibul Hasib Mahmood submitted another question, which I'm going to read. Is there anything important that was not included in the ICP-2 update, but could still help improve RIR accountability or transparency? Could these ideas be added in the future?

HANS PETTER HOLEN:

That's why we're asking for feedback now.

---

KEVIN BLUMBERG:

The point of the feedback was the high-level principles. There were a couple of iterations that included sub-bullet points and things like that, but ultimately, they just detracted from what the key principles were. So are there principles that we have potentially forgotten or not included, or-- Yes. Absolutely, please fill out the questionnaire if you believe there is a core principle that we should be taking into account. This is the perfect time to provide that.

We are 15 potential volunteers on this group. We are not paid, we're not staff. We are the community. Two are elected, one is appointed from each region. So yes, it is possible, but there are a lot of eyes hopefully looking at this, and we're hoping that if you do see something that you believe is important, to submit that.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT:

I don't see any additional question or in the room, and Ozan, you confirm you are known remotely. So thank you, Kevin, for having provided this presentation of the principles. So one more time, it's really principle, really general. And there's a reason why, because we wanted to have something flexible enough not to change this document every six months, for example.

Thank you for that. It's an SO/AC presentation, perhaps two additional information. One of our missions is to appoint somebody to the NomCom, to the Nomination Commission of the ICANN. And so it was late appointment, but an appointment. It was Louis Lee from the region, and who was part of the SO/AC for a long time before, was appointed to the NomCom for this year.

---

And the second information we have, because one of our missions is to appoint two directors of the Board of the directors of the ICANN, seat 9 and seat 10. Seat nine is filled by Alan Barrett, who was CEO of the AFRINIC at one moment. And there is currently the open candidature for seat 10 until December. I don't remember the date exactly. It must be around 15th of December, something. So just to say that we are waiting for appointment candidature for this seat, knowing that nobody from the AFRINIC can candidate as there is Alan Barrett to the other seat, who is from the AFRINIC as well.

And after that, I don't think I had any more to say about the SO/AC information today. Our point information is that we are here. We have an intense meeting with a lot of working session and a lot of meeting with the other organization, with the ICANN, which is good. And that's the reason why it was a pleasure to see you and Kevin.

KEVIN BLUMBERG:

Thank you. [aso.icann.org](https://aso.icann.org). We have monthly teleconferences that are open. We have a number of open mailing lists, a number of documents, both historical as well as new on it. We try to keep as much as we possibly can open and available to the community. So [aso.icann.org](https://aso.icann.org) has a plethora of information, old and new. It's where we're there, our procedures, our playbook on how we do things, our operational procedures are all there. They were updated fairly recently.

Lastly, we do have a number of things that we do during the year, including a review, which is coming up shortly of how we did this year and what we need to do next year. So we have work plans that are

---

available on the website that lay things out. So there's a lot of interesting things if you're interested in what some of the numbers, community at least within the ASO AC does. And hopefully we will all have voices by tomorrow for the next round of sessions.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Can I just at the very end thank everybody on the address console? They're all volunteers from the community and they're putting in an awful lot of hours in order to improve the governance of the numbering resource system. So thank you very much for your effort, Chair. Thank you.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: And in return, thank you for the regional support, the legal team we put on there, and the communication team as well. It's because of the communication team of the ICANN also that the questionnaire and the consultation have been put in place. And with that, I give you the floor Ozan.

OZAN SAHIN: Please stop the recording, the meeting is adjourned.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**