
ICANN83 | PF – Joint Session: ASO and ISPCP
Tuesday, June 10, 2025 – 13:45 to 15:00 CEST

OZAN SAHIN

Hello and welcome to the joint session between the Address Supporting Organization and Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers constituency. 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 ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During this 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 this 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 ASO Chair Hervé Clément and ISPCP Chair Philippe Fouquart. Thank you.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

I don't know, Philippe, if you want to... Thank you, Philippe. Hervé Clément, Chair of the ASOAC, for the record. Good day, hello to everyone. It's always a pleasure to be within the ISPCP, by definition. We are here and I will just make a short introduction to present and for you to have the opportunity to discuss the ICP2 document and draft.

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.

There was the ICANN consultation. One more time, thank you very much to have made the effort to answer and to make a good answer to that, to the document. It's another timeline. There will be other possibilities to discuss also regarding this document.

During this meeting, we are very dedicated in integrating all the comments we received and from the ICANN and from the regions as well. And with that, with my thanks and with this introduction, I will leave the floor to Kevin. We will have the pleasure to present the document and I will join the rest of the ASOAC to constructively, I hope, work on the comment and probably the new draft. And thank you for that.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. Thanks, Kevin. This is Philippe Fouquart, ISPCP Chair. Just to say that we, even if it's more than paying lip service, we do appreciate your presence. It was, as you could tell, really important for ISPs, not even on the overall review of the policy, but also you know the importance of the specific case at hand of the AFRINIC, that it's not the primary objective of the framework.

But we really do appreciate the spirit, you would have understood, of our last response to the consultation. It was very much not to relitigate and not repeat our comments. We appreciate that it's in the review. It's all a matter of trying to find out what the common denominator is.

But thanks again. We're looking forward to that. And it's good to know that there's going to be yet other iterations down the road. Thanks again. Over to you.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Thank you, Kevin Blumberg from the ASOAC. The ISPCP is one of the closest organizations within ICANN in that you actually use Internet numbers. And so I think as a whole, I believe your group has a very good understanding of the little n, we call it, or I call it, the little n at the end of ICANN, the numbers side of it. Because day job involves Internet numbers consistently.

So the presentation that we have for you here is to continue to socialize the work that we're doing, to continue to talk about it. And I can go as fast or as slow, depending as you want, in the sections. We've included the basics of who the ASOAC is, a little bit of a timeline on the ICP2 work, and then at the end sort of talking about the current place that we're at and where we're going.

So I'll go a little bit fast on who we are. I think everybody hopefully on the call and in the room has a decent sense of the ASO at this point. I'll go very briefly through that and try to give more time at the end towards questions and hopefully free up some time for you as well.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Okay. Just procedure-wise. Thank you. This is Philippe Fouquart. Do you mind if we interrupt as we move along just to make it as --

I'm not sure we're going to use the whole set. Well, I don't know. We never know. But since it's not that --

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Absolutely. The level of formality is not a key concern for me. The key concern for me is discussion. So happy to, if there's any questions anywhere through this, just let me know. Not a problem. We did a RSSAC as an example yesterday where we thought it would be 10, 20 minutes, and in the end it worked out to an hour, and it was a good sort of just discussion, and that's what we're looking for here. Okay? Okay. So if we can go to the next slide. Next slide.

So who we are. We're 15 volunteers that are -- two are elected and one is appointed by each of the RIRs. It's very important, especially in this process, to emphasize that we are volunteers, we are not staff, as an example, of any of the RIRs, and we are here on behalf and with and for the community in terms of the work that we do.

What do we do? We advise the ICANN board on numbers policy. We oversee global policy development process, which is in relation to numbers. We appoint two members to the board, and we have somebody that we appoint to the ICANN NomCom. So the ASO -- okay. Next.

We like to put this up here for two reasons. One, we're missing three faces. Unfortunately, right now, without a board with AFRINIC, they're unable to appoint or elect members to the ASOAC. We're

hoping that that gets resolved shortly and three more faces can be presented. But the real reason we put this up here is we are all at the ICANN meeting. We will be at more meetings as it comes by, and if you see any of us in the hall and you do have any questions, we are happy to direct you in the right place at a minimum, if not be able to sort of help you along with things. Next slide.

So a little bit of a backgrounder on the ICP2 review. Next.

ICP2 is one of the older documents in the ICANN fora. There were three Internet coordination policies that were developed, at which point I believe the whole concept of these documents sort of got negated and they moved into more formal processes. But this is one of the original processes. It was to recognize new RIRs, and the examples in ICP2 was that it be a sufficiently large proposed region, it support the local numbering community, and that that organization be technically capable. Next.

So ICP2 was adopted in 2001. It's a long time. And ICP2 was used. It's an active document. It was used for the formation of LACNIC and AFRINIC in 2002 and 2005. RIPE, APNIC, and ARIN predate the formation of ICANN. They weren't formed using ICP2, but LACNIC and AFRINIC was. Next. Yeah, go ahead.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thanks, Kevin. It's anecdotal, but bear with me. In terms of institutional memory, if you see what I mean, how many—I've got

insider knowledge that there was one, possibly one member of the ASOAC who was involved in the first vote?

KEVIN BLUMBERG

No. There was no members of the ASOAC that were involved in ICP2. However, ASO—We are two houses inside of the ASO as a whole. We are the ASOAC, which is the volunteer group that does the things we described, and then there's the NROEC, which is five executives or the executives from the RIRs. One of those executives was the chair of the ASOAC back when that was ratified. And I was clarified yesterday their responsibility was to take the document that the RIRs made and put it through a review process, and Hans Petter was the chair of the ASOAC back then. So that's the basic formulation of it.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Maybe a follow-up, which is probably not as anecdotal. But in terms of the policy, which we'll come on to in a moment, so to your distinction between the NROEC and the ASOAC, I understand, which we'll come on to in a moment, so to your distinction between the NROEC and the ASOAC, I understand, which we'll come on to in a moment, So, the ASOAC revises or proposes a revision of ICP2, but in terms of how ICP2 is implemented in GNSO terms, the role of the ASOAC in this is very limited, if any. It's more the NROEC who will be, among other things, recognizing or de- you see what I mean, in terms of distinction in roles.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Right, so I'm actually going to get to that. There's a bunch of stuff on that one, so let's move ahead. So, ICP2, as we said, is nearly 25 years old. The internet has changed. Is anybody here still doing dial-up? No. So, that's the age of when it was. The relationships between the RIRs and ICANN have changed over that time as well. You know, I don't think that ICP2 ever thought of that there would be an IANA transition, as an example. There's a lot of things that have changed in our world. Cloud providers, hyperscalers, didn't exist back then. You know, there's a lot of things that have changed. That doesn't mean it needs to be in the document, but in internet years, it's been a thousand years since this document was written.

So, we need to be more explicit. A lot of the things were implicit, not explicitly defined. And that involves more of a life-cycle approach to the ongoing responsibilities and potential de-recognition of an RIR. Those things were left out. They were not explicitly put into the document. It wasn't a full life-cycle document. It was about the formation only. And, again, we believe that a lot of it is implicitly there, but it wasn't explicitly there. Next slide.

So, in '23, the NROEC asked the ASOAC to do two things. One was to review an implementation procedures related to the existing ICP2, which we completed in about February of 2024. And the reason we're here today, the second request, was to strengthen ICP2 and to revise it and to work through all of our processes and

procedures the way we wanted to do it as a community to strengthen ICP2. Next slide.

So, we published, as you may be aware, in October last year, the core principles. And this is where I said we did it the way our group wanted to do it. We felt that just throwing out a document with hundreds of changes and not really speaking to the principles would be very difficult. People would be focused on individual words rather than the concepts that we wanted to do. So we put out the principles document. We did a consultation on that. And we got a lot of really helpful feedback on the principles that then allowed us to draft the revised document.

Just as an FYI, we call it the RIR governance document right now. That is a placeholder name until somebody gives us a better name for it. So we didn't want to call it ICP2.biz or anything like that. And this is as generic as you can be. If anybody has a better name for it, we'd love to hear it, but that's the going name. So we went through every single piece of feedback, put a lot of time into it in relation to the principles, and did a consultation report. As well, ICANN did their own. So this was done both at the RIR level individually as well as ICANN did their own. That completed in February. In April, we published the draft. All good? Next slide. And we get to, just so you can see...

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Probably not critical, but when you say ICANN, it's the community or including legal within org or not?

KEVIN BLUMBERG

No, there was an ICANN public comment period. The next slide shows the number of responses, which was 298 responses on the RIR side, 14 that were received. We analyzed them all in our response. Next slide.

And the full report is available here. So we just wanted to include it and let you know it's available. We can keep going.

So then we introduced the RIR governance document, which now included recognition, maintenance, so ongoing, and derecognition for regional Internet registries. We published the document. It's there and available. And it's a comprehensive update to ICP2. The main part is it clarifies the scope and lifecycle, formalizes structures, strengthens operational requirements. And more importantly, clarifies a lot of the roles and responsibilities and procedures that go into it. Next.

So this is an example. In the original ICP2, it mostly handled just the establishment. That was the main focus of it, whereas the new governance document talks about the recognition, operation, and derecognition of an RIR. Next. Next.

It formalizes governance structures. Again, in the original, it outlined principles, neutrality, impartiality, bottom-up policy. And in the RIR governance document, we expanded it to include

member-controlled governance, corporate governance, empty camp term measures. Again, many things that are being done today that would have been implicitly sort of expected but that are now explicitly called out inside of the document. Next. We've strengthened operational.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

I was going to say it's not critical. I don't know. But on the anti-capture measure, you may remember that in our comments, that's one of the aspects that we insisted on sort of – even just in terms of methodology, how you approach this. There was a term that we liked, which was like stress testing this thing against scenarios, hypothetical or not, to see whether it is robust as a procedure. How did you approach that particular issue?

KEVIN BLUMBERG

It's an important scope part of this document. So this document is not going to be the implementation document. This is the high-level document that directs the RIRs and ICANN to do a number of things. We stress tested the anti-capture, and what we realized was there was no way to come up with a global uniform anti-capture description that would cover every single regional scenario there is. The key point to it is that once this is in here, all of the RIRs will need to have implementation and procedures around it, formalize it with their membership communities in relation to how they are addressing it.

Just a simple thing of they may have it today in their bylaws, right? They may have something that's mostly in there today in their bylaws, which would then put them out of compliance, and they would need to resolve that. But to put the specificity around it would then create an issue of we don't know how the bylaws could be changed, if the members would support the change, or anything around it. We can't force it on them. What we can do is tell them they need to, and I don't want to use the term best practices, because there's no such thing as best practices, but they have to have robust anti-capture measures. What those are, we cannot actually implement in this document. That needs to be done by them through their consultations. Does that sort of?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Yeah. Thank you. Just to follow up to this, I think it covers at least a great deal of what we had in mind. The one thing that still, I wouldn't say unclear, but maybe that's just an academic sort of question. But on the question of recognizing a new, I understand that with the existing RIRs, especially in your life cycle, what was the middle one? Operations? Operational. Yeah. I understand that. It has to be anti-capture. It depends on the sort of regional context. But on that very question of recognition where, say, just for argument's sake, there's a group who would like to have some recognition and would not, well, they would probably geographically fit in a region. They would have to. But whether the notion of them using this as a potentially new RIR to be recognized, are there sort of overarching anti-capture elements that would be

relevant for this rather than under the existing regional or you just saw that it was so unlikely that that was not relevant?

KEVIN BLUMBERG

It's not about whether it was likely or unlikely. There are a number of other checks and balances in place. The RIRs are going to, and we're working, again, this is still now, there's a lot of feedback. I'm going to start with a little bit of background on the RIR. We've had a lot of feedback in terms of how a new RIR gets formed. We received a lot of feedback on that. Ultimately, it's going to have to go through a process. That process is all of the RIRs are going to have to support it. If they don't, then there's a whole bunch of things that have to go on and back and forth. The community of the affected region needs to support it. It needs to match some of the complexities of making sure that there aren't funny things going on in that region. The members could potentially say, no, we don't want to have a new RIR. We don't support this. There's the scenario of the other regional registries may say, we have concerns about the structure and formation of this. Please come back and fix that. Things like that. There's all sorts of checks and balances in place. It's not a guarantee that you can just become a new RIR. This is a global collaborative community that has to function together. I used this term to my colleagues earlier. This is not an I want. This is a we want. We need. We are working together. It's less about the I and more about the we when it comes to these kinds of things. There's a lot of specificity. There's a lot of requirements to have

specificity. The specificity is not in this document. Every region needs to match those aspects.

The next was under the original, we emphasized technical capabilities and the provision of registration. We've added in audit obligations, transparency, continuity planning. Again, things that are on top of mind for many organizations today are now implicitly put into the or explicitly put into the document. We've clarified the roles and responsibilities. ICP2 just provided general guidelines. We're clearly delineating the responsibilities between the RIRs, ICANN, and procedures. Next slide.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

I would hate to do the question part, but again, when you say ICANN there, in this particular case it's the Board. It's actually in the document.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

I think it is up to each of the organizations to define the processes and procedures, and that's going to be a large part of this. The ICANN board, the organization, has its set of bylaws that it follows. It has many procedures that it uses day in and day out. It's very possible for this, they will generate a new set of procedures and requirements. Ultimately, when something like this would happen, eventually it would go to the board. It would go to the board for approval. It may go to the board for discussion. It may go to the board for reconsideration. All of those are sort of examples of

things that are done today that they could use an existing process or procedure. They could create something new. They have to go through this. ICANN Org is helping us provide the public comments and all of that.

We haven't reached the point yet, because we haven't handed this document to ICANN and the RIRs to say, okay, now how would you make this work? That's another step in this process. Ultimately, it comes down to all of the organizations that are involved in this are bottom-up organizations. All of them are going to have their own procedures, transparencies, member requirements, etc. This document leaves it to those organizations to generate that operational implementation guidelines and continue that. Even once this is done, this is just the framework to then allow all of those things to happen, to be contractualized, to be MOUed, whatever the case may be.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON

If we're going to up-level things, we are interested in this, in the updating of the ICP, too, because we want to ensure more stability and security moving forward in the RIR process, and we want to learn from the things that we have encountered in our recent history, or that we are currently going through. I think what you're saying, I'm just saying it out loud to see if I'm interpreting it right, is that you're actually going to preserve that level of, you're going to increase that resiliency more by allowing each individual organization to frame new requirements in their own terms

without having hard requirements that are top-down. And if so, I think that's something that we can fully support and get behind.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

There will be a lowest common denominator. There is going to be some key examples, like audit, I'll use that one. Every organization will be responsible for audit. The issue is that they will need to present that audit example to their members, who will then support it. The question will become, what happens if they approve an audit level, which is a checkbox, once a year somebody's going to come along and check it off, and there is then a complaint that they're no longer in compliance, because that's not actually an audit. So that is possible. The key is that because this is all bottom-up, each region will have to set what those audit requirements are, because it's going to be unique to them.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON

So would you agree with the framing then that the revised ICP2 will set what you would call a floor and not a ceiling for those types of requirements?

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Yes, that's a good way to look at it. There's a lot more that is being specified here than what was in the original ICP2, which was just that. The complexity is, and it was the joke I made this morning and I kind of like it, to some people in this room, you know what SOC-2 is, to other people in this room it's two pairs of socks. Every region

is really radically different in that regard. And we need to appreciate that. Audit is going to be a hard requirement in here. What audit looks like is up to the RIRs to work together and their communities. Next slide.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Probably not specific to the clarification of rules, but the way we've got this framework, which will lead to implementation. When we talk about implementation in a PDP, in a GNSO environment, that has a very specific meaning. I was wondering whether at this point we had a sense of what, so you referred to best practices or the fact that as far as the second bullet is concerned, it might take a variety of forms in terms of implementing this in the ICANN environment. Could that lead to concretely, could that lead to amendments to the bylaws, instructions to the PTI? I'm thinking aloud, but I guess the question is have there been some thoughts about how that can

KEVIN BLUMBERG

I think a better way to say this is it's way out of scope of what I am able to talk about. We are here to deliver this document. The point is for me that we are giving as much flexibility as we can to the implementation way because we A, want to have something done in this generation. And one of the concerns with doing a 400 page ICP2 document is it's never going to see the light of day. And B, we absolutely, the more we go into this, the more we realize that there are such differences between things that all of the organizations that are involved in this are going to need to do their own

coordinated implementation procedures. So I can't really speak to what they will be or what they'll look like. The NROEC did an implementation procedure to sort of start this off already. You can sort of see that as a guideline, but I think there's a lot more because we're asking a lot more of the organizations through this document.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER

On that particular point, it is a situation where there is an expectation that each RIR will document at some stage ahead how they comply and cover off these roles and responsibilities.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

They have to. Because there will need to be procedures or things for all of these, because how can you be in compliance or out of compliance of your ongoing operational if you don't have what it is, what the norm is? So they're going to have to have something related to all of these. And hopefully most of it's already there because it's part of their day-to-day business governance, but we're sort of specifying it now as these are our, our needs. Okay, next slide.

So the consultation closed very recently, on May 27th. Thank you for the submission. And next. Okay, so yeah, we're closed. There's the link to it. Keep going.

The ICANN, just as an FYI, the ICANN report is already out on the public comment. The ASO has spent a lot of time, and that's where

Hervé was running off to, digesting every single piece of feedback received through every single medium, including the ICANN as well. And we're going through it line by line by line to extract out core concerns, textual changes that is possible, not possible, and in some cases, iterative, where they may have suggested one thing and we discussed it, and we go three steps ahead to something else that has now come out because of it. So we're going through every single piece, and we will generate out a report, just like we did with the principles. We'll generate our report when that's done. But we are absolutely using it towards working on the next draft. Next slide.

So this is where the questions come in, and I read your response, and I thank you for that. It was even saying we support the work you're doing is as important as sometimes commenting on a specific aspect. Recognition of this and the work that's being done by the communities is an important role, I think, for everybody. We've asked other groups these questions, and I'll just work through them quickly, and then we'll see if there's a discussion.

Any part of the draft text require further clarification? Is there a topic that your group did not reach consensus on when submitting your comment that you'd like to talk about? And more importantly, how can we improve the next round? Did this round, the way we did it, work for you as a body? Is there anything we could do to improve the next round, whether that be webinars, additional information,

education, you know, scope discussions, whatever that may be? And I'll leave those questions up there and pass it to all of you.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON

I'm not certain that we had a problem reaching rough consensus on anything. There is, however, a little bit of, like, presupposing outcomes when you read a bunch of questions, and, you know, all of us are certainly concerned around, for instance, you know, the AFRINIC situation, and I think that there were a lot of questions of, like, is this work going to get us to a point where we're not going to ever get into a situation like that again? Right? Is this going to be enough? Are they thinking it the right way? Can we think of ways that we can encourage them to, like, look at this differently in a way that will button things up a little more? And there's a certain extent to which I think that this conversation has led me to, okay, I can trust the process. I think that you guys know what you're doing, and it's very important that you're doing this and having undertaken this will put us in a much better position than we were before. But I would say that there's no lack of consensus, but there was a lot of talking through worry, if that makes sense.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Game theory is really what you're talking about. We've done some of that, and I'm sure that ICANN and the RIRs, when they go through their process, is going to do a lot of that. Writing a document that has got the best intentions is always the issue, because ultimately you want to look for when somebody doesn't have the best

intentions and make sure that your document cannot be used in a way you did not expect it to be used. We've done some of that work as laypeople, as best we can. Ultimately, yes, if there is a concern from your, as an example, that would be a great example. If you have a concern that a particular section may be used incorrectly, please bring it up. Even if it's in the next round and you don't touch this round now, that is a great piece of feedback. I expect that, again, the RIRs and ICANN will have to do that due diligence at a much higher level than we have done. Ultimately as the general community, the ASO numbering community and all of that, I think we are a little bit more positive about things. I think ICP2 was an aspirational positive document. It really didn't foresee negativity. Yes, that is absolutely, we're trying, but we are not by and large lawyers. Your own feedback from your own experiences would definitely help inform us. If there are things that you see that are wrong.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON

I will say that a number of us in this table have gone through the process of redoing the ISPCP's charter in the past few years. It took a few years to work with it. Work within our community, and then we brought it to ICANN, and ICANN made a number of recommendations. I believe that Org has developed a number of insights that come from dealing with the ramifications of captured communities that they can probably provide along that process and probably should be listened to in that process, because I think

it was valuable to us to receive the feedback that we got from ORG when we turned in our work product.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Yes, and this is my personal feeling. ICANN has been very supportive of this process. At the same time, they've given us the room to let us write something. They haven't been making, you know, comment here, comment here, concern here, concern here, do it this way, do it that way. They've really let us work through this document, and staff, the RIR staff are very similar. They've guided where they could and helped us when we've asked questions, but they're really leaving it to us to sort of formulate with the community what it may be. We absolutely expect that the next round, rounds, will have a lot more of that in it.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

And just to this point, and coming back to the parallel that I made with the way we understand the PDP versus the implementation, what you're saying in terms of when the input of legal among others may come to you, it's very much consistent with how we approach with the interplay between the policy development, the sometimes what we call the ODA, operational design phase or assessments, where at that point precisely, there may be inputs relative to the costs or anything else, legal, et cetera. But generally, unless it has a huge impact on the policy itself, the input comes at

a later stage, if I'm making sense, which is very much consistent with what you seem to understand of what you're saying.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Exactly. And the next round we're targeting for the September, October, November timeframe, the next ICANN, the comment period, our goal is to have the comment period open during the next ICANN, close it shortly thereafter. We want to give all the RIR communities the ability as well during their meetings in September, October. So we're going to have an extended timeline. It will be in person as well as remote for that. And then we've got to take all of the feedback in the next round. Again, this was the first round where everybody got to see all of the things that were there. And so I'm hoping there's a little less changes in the next round, but you never know. We could go the right direction or we could steer a little off. So there's a lot more coming in this regard. This is a long-term project. It's taken us two years. We originally formulated it to be two years. It may take a bit more. This isn't addressing one specific current issue, unfortunately, fortunately. It's not, was never designed for that. We were asked to work on this document for the long-term, keep working on it, you know, and have reviews of it, not touch it once every 25 years.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Just again, to provide you some feedback with your three questions, and just maybe to start with our last input, it was very much in the spirit of what you said, just expressing some support

for the work and for the principal, but also mindful of we've provided inputs to other things, and we're very much aware of how the dynamics work, and we don't want to, as I said, come back to points that may have been dealt with on a consensus-based approach. But it's good that we know that this is not the last iteration, so maybe we may come back onto some of these aspects. But to be specific on your question, was there anything that, from our perspective, would require further clarification? On the principle, at a principle level, even as a chair, I don't think we've got this. I think we were quite happy with the way this was going. In terms of consensus, is there a topic that, or aspects that were not – no, we had questions, as Christian said, on the practicalities of assessing, of making a decision, for example. I don't have a specific example, but there are cases where you want – the only case I've got off the top of my head is the recognition itself, but it's unanimity, so it wouldn't apply to what I'm going to be saying. But just the practicalities of making a decision. How do you do this? Who does that? How do you assess the consensus within the community? What you said is that when implementation comes, then it may vary from one RIR versus another. So I don't think we'll – the question was valid, but it was not the right time to ask it. So I think we'd be happy with that approach. So I guess the answer to bullet point two is certainly not something that would be worthwhile raising again, but we'll definitely review the next – the new version.

And as to – so that's for the substance. On the formula, your last bullet, I don't think we've got any improvement to suggest in the way you reach out to the community. But we certainly appreciate what we're doing here. We would hope that it's – it would be possible to do something similar in the future, because we've got a – not only people here, but also a community which is very – understandably so – very interested in how this is developed. So I guess on three is please keep going.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Thank you. And I'll just add one thing. We've had a couple of companies who have commented in the ICANN side of things and commented in the RIR side of things. There's nothing wrong with that. They are two different areas. You may have two different hats on when it comes to this type of thing. I believe everybody in this room is involved with the RIR communities as well. I'm just saying don't limit yourselves to one or the other. By all means, all feedback is helpful in this process. We're trying to digest as much as we can and take in as much as we can. And we realize what the ISPCP does is consensus-based and may be different than what company A does inside of their RIR, et cetera. So we're saying that absolutely you are free to contribute wherever you feel is appropriate to contribute.

And if having a clarification call before the next ICANN, if you have any things related to that, we're happy to do that. You can just schedule it with the secretariat. And we're happy to go through the

next draft and if there's clarifications, because we realized that scoping is hard because we're spending a lot of time, we see it, not necessarily everybody else. So we're working on that. But if you have a question that may be answered by just going through it and walking through it in how we see it versus how you see it, that may help and we're happy to do that.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Just on this point and with my Orange hat, the only reason why we would not do this would be if we were to reiterate what we'd be saying as an ISPCP in our capacity as a constituency. And certainly, we're a member of two of the existing areas, so we would do that, yeah.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Thank you. Next. So, as you can see, we've got a lot of bilaterals going on this week. I just wanted everybody to see it. We're going to continue sort of at this pace as we get closer and closer. Next slide.

This is where we are now. I talked about this already. I don't want to spend too much time on it. Around August, September, we're hoping to get the next round of consultations open and that's going to go through into the fourth quarter. And then, yeah. So that's everything. I've sort of gone over this stuff already. Next.

We're working through that right now. This is ongoing. We're going to probably do more and more and more and continue the

outreach. And we just talked about how we are happy to do that.
Next.

And we've answered, I hope, the questions. But if there's anything left, happy to do it.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON

Just one really generic one, which is, in what ways can you foresee us, once you're past your timeline and you've handed this off to the RIRs and to the community, what ways can you see us continuing to support you towards good outcomes?

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Because I think, ultimately, some of the implementations, roles, procedures, et cetera, may have to go through their own procedures, again, within the ICANN for us, specifically. So I think this is now going to be a long, long term. And then it becomes the review of every X number of years and things like that. It always is.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON

Yes.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

So for the ISPCP, this is not the end of when this document gets done because, ultimately, I suspect there will be procedures and policies, et cetera, that come out of that, that are ICANN focused, that we'll need community consultation and feedback on.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

If I may, and beyond the timeline, I'm just being curious. I'll just personally skim through some of the inputs, which, by and large, seem to be quite supportive, with a couple of exceptions, which may have been difficult to accommodate because they were very much principle-oriented. And things like having unanimity among RIRs, for example, that principle was questioned. And just by the way, at least speaking, we haven't discussed it within the constituency, but speaking with my employer's hat, I definitely support unanimity. We didn't comment to that during our response, but I think that's important. Just in terms of the inputs that you've received, I don't know if you can answer that, but do you have a sense that there are things that you definitely cannot accommodate and that may be stumbling blocks down the road that you've just described?

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Stumbling blocks, no. I think there are absolutely things we cannot accommodate. There are things that are completely out of scope. There are aspirational requests that are out of scope of the document. There are things that conflict with the document in other areas where they may want to add something here, but it unfortunately conflicts with some of the key principles of it. We still go through all of those, and we still look at that. Unanimity, we've gotten a lot of feedback on. All of the comments are public, so you can see that. It's an area that we're actively working on to see if

there are other ways we can formulate around it and at least help assist in some of the concerns.

You have people who have very different, extreme polar opposite views on things, and a lot of it is looking through this lens of, is it in scope? Does it strengthen ICP2? Sort of putting it through this filter. Can we accommodate it? How would we accommodate it? Does it then create a problem elsewhere? And ultimately, it's a balancing act and a judgment call, but that's how you work through these. You have to do them one by one, and you don't discount and throw away something because it may lead to a good idea. You don't, at the same time, put everything in because it's been asked of. So thank you very much, and look forward to the next time we get to meet.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

So are we. Thank you. Thanks.

OZAN SAHIN

Session is adjourned. Please stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]