
ICANN83 | PF – Joint Session: ASO and RSSAC
Monday, June 09, 2025 – 13:45 to 15:00 CEST

OZAN SAHIN

The session will now begin. Please start the recording. Hello, and welcome to the joint session between the Address Supporting Organization Address Council and Root Server System Advisory Committee. My name is Ozan, and I'm a participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded, and it's governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and 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. Onsite participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please, state your name for the record, and speak at a reasonable pace again. I will now hand the floor over to RSSAC chair, Jeff Osborn.

JEFF OSBORN

Thank you, Ozan. Not a whole lot for me to say other than welcome, Kevin. We will be hearing from Kevin Blumberg of the ASO for the rest of the session. Thanks, Kevin.

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.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Thank you. It's ASO AC, which is an important delineation because Hans Petter, who joins us, is on the ASO, specifically the NRO EC side of the ASO. But what I want to do is two things. One, thank you for your submission that RRSAC made towards the draft RIR Governance document, first and foremost. Secondly, I am absolutely happy to give you as much time to be able to answer questions and to be able to have dialogue with RRSAC. At the same time, I know everybody here values their time, and I am happy to go as fast or as slow as you would like us to go to free up some time for everybody in the session.

To that end, there are three components to this slide deck. The first component is sort of explaining a little bit about who the ASO AC is. I will go very fast through that. I believe I've given that talk to this group a number of times. I believe everybody here in this room is familiar with the ASO AC. If there are any questions related to the ASO AC, happy to answer those as well. The second is to just sort of go through a little bit of the timeline and where we are at with the work on the ICP-2 revisions. Then we'll get into some of the areas. One of the things, just talking with Jeff preliminarily before, talk a little bit about the scope of the work that we're doing, the things that are in it, the things that are not in it, and the ideas behind that. Because that seems to have been a fairly consistent message from the community. We've started the process of reviewing all of the information. We'll go through that. Hopefully, we'll have some

questions for both sides. Having said that, we can go to the next slide. The next.

Just as a quick reminder, the ASO AC is made up of 15 members. We're all volunteers. We are not staff. We are not consultants. We are volunteers from the RIR communities. Two of us are elected. One is appointed by the Board. There's currently 12 that are sitting. Three from the AFRINIC region, where elections are coming up soon. We're hoping to have those positions refilled. The ASO AC advises the ICANN Board on Internet number policy, overseas global policy development process, appoints two ICANN Board members, and a NomCom representative as well. Next slide.

This is helpful for anybody. If you do see, most of us are actually at this meeting. If you do have any questions or just want to direct something, here are all the people, and we'd be happy in the hall to get you in touch with the right person or the right mailing list, or whatever that case may be. But we find it's always helpful putting names to faces. Next slide.

A little bit of a backgrounder on ICP-2. ICP-2 is the Internet Coordination Policy #2. I believe ICANN retired using ICPs many, many years ago after ICP-3. That was the last one. This will not be ICP-4 or anything like that. It's a completely different document set. We are still looking for a new name for it. The RIR Governance document is really just a placeholder. But to date, we have not gotten a better name. ICP-2 was for the criteria for the formation of new RIRs. Examples of that would be that they were significantly

large proposed service region. They supported the local numbering community and they had the technical capability. Next slide.

ICP-2 came out in 2001. It's 25 years ago. It has remained the same during that time. LACNIC and AFRINIC were both established using the ICP-2 process, and were formed through that by ICANN. Just as an FYI, RIPE, APNIC, ARIN, and ICANN itself predates ICP-2. Next slide.

As I said, it's 25 years old, give or take, and a lot has changed over the years. I think when we go back to that date, we're still in dial-up and ISDN days. There's a lot of technology changes that have occurred. There's a lot of things that didn't exist back then. I don't think the word cloud, other than in the sky, existed back then. Relationships have been modified. We had IANA transitions a number of years ago. There's been a lot of Internet changes over the years. I think somebody called it dog years, where 25 years in dog is 125, and in Internet is 1,000, something like that. I did appreciate that one. And a lot of the things in ICP-2 were about the formation of a new RIR. But they really didn't talk about the lifecycle, the ongoing responsibilities, and the potential derecognition of an RIR. Next slide.

In October of '23, the NRO EC, which are the executive from the RIRs, asked the ASO AC to do two things. One was to review implementation procedures, which they had done up for themselves in relation to their ongoing compliance. That work was completed, I believe, of February of '24. The second was to

strengthen the ICP-2, revise it to make the RIR system more accountable, again, to bring it back into the 2025, not 2001, sort of timeframe. Next slide.

Let's just go through this very quickly. In October, we looked at this as a large multi-year project. In October of '24, we proposed a set of 24 core principles. That was probably scaled down from close to 100 original principles that we then worked what's important, what's more important to this duplicative. And we proposed a set of 24 principles that we had a public consultation on, we reviewed all of that and finalized a draft. The key is a draft that went to the community as the RIR Governance document. We opened the consultation on that in April. Next slide.

That just wrapped up. The proposed principles are done. We got great feedback on the proposed principles. This is here for the record for you. If you ever do want to look at some of the comments, everything is available publicly from a transparency point of view. Every single comment received is publicly available both through the ICANN process that was done as well as the RIR process that was done. As well, we did an extensive report—next slide—which is available at that URL, if you're not comfortable scanning QR codes. Next slide.

I just want to now introduce you to the RIR Governance document. Next. It's available at that location. Next. It represents a comprehensive update to the existing ICP-2, including a full lifecycle management. It clarifies the scope and lifecycle

management, formalizes government structures, strengthens operational requirements, and clarifies roles and responsibilities. We are trying to put everything again into a governance structure that sort of matches what would be expected today. Next slide.

Let's use an example. The original ICP-2 in 2001 focused primarily on the criteria. The beginning of a lifecycle where—that was it. In the new document, you're talking about the recognition so then the new RIR, you're talking about the ongoing obligations, the operation of the RIR, and then finally, derecognition. Derecognition is a last resort in a scenario where an RIR is out of compliance, but it also may be something 25 years from now that it's no longer required in a certain way or whatever. It's just part of the overall lifecycle. Next slide.

Formalizations of governance structures. Again, original ICP-2 outline principles such as neutrality, impartiality, bottom-up policy development, but really didn't go beyond that. The new one talks about member-controlled governance, corporate governance, anti-capture measures, a number of additional things that would be commonplace today to see. Next slide.

Next is operational requirements, audit obligations, transparency, continuity planning. And I think that the last one is something that we've definitely gotten a lot of feedback from the community in terms of if something doesn't work, make sure that you can continue on. Continuity and actually identifying it and

documenting it is an important function of this new document. Next slide.

It clarified the roles and responsibility. Again, ICP-2 provided general guidelines while only implying the roles of various organizations. The new document sort of spells out that RIRs must initially approve a proposal. ICANN will have the final authority and the procedures and the approval thresholds required.

Now, I do want to make one thing on this point out. This is also to be determined. This is part of the drafting process that we are in. We have received significant feedback from the community, which is wonderful, from various stakeholders. And all of the things that we're saying here are still TBD. As in we've written them, we've gotten feedback on them, and now we're working on them to make sure that what the community's feedback is meshes what we had in the draft or if changes are required. Next slide.

The consultation went from the 14th of April to the 27th of May. It just closed. Some of you may still have been on a plane getting here when it closed. It was that soon ago. Next.

The ICANN comment period closed on the 27th. ICANN has already produced their report. They were incredibly quick. It was wonderful to see. They've already produced their report on the submissions that came in through the ICANN public comment period. Next slide.

Clarifications. Can you go next? Jeff, this is where it's the question period. We have three questions and you are welcome to add to this

as well. We'll just go through them. The first is, does any part of the draft text require further clarification? We are all meeting here this week, if there's something that anybody who was working on the document felt could be further discussed here, it's something that we may be able to take back, it would be useful to talk about that. The second one is, is there a topic that your group did not reach consensus on when submitting your comment or felt—comfortable is the wrong word—didn't feel that they had necessarily had the right amount of time to be able to respond to? And lastly, is there anything that we can do to improve the next round? Because there will be a next round of comments. It will probably be in the September timeframe. And we're hoping for a longer comment period than the last time to give people more ability to respond. One example of how we can improve it is to have more webinars or sessions between and during the comment period for people who may have questions or clarifications that they're seeking during that time period. I'll pass it to you and see where you want to start.

JEFF OSBORN

Thank you, Kevin. I didn't know nearly as much of that as I would have thought coming in. This is being really helpful. I hope it's helpful to other people as well. My immediate question is going to sound really trivial, but I suspect it isn't. Where the hell did you come up with derecognition?

KEVIN BLUMBERG

As a term or just the concept?

JEFF OSBORN

I have three dictionaries. Two say it doesn't exist, and the third one says it's an accounting term.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

We're engineers. We don't do confidence alone.

JEFF OSBORN

Okay. Having spent multi-year processes before, I'm aware that there are certain icky things you don't want to have to describe, and one of them is when you 86 someone, and you didn't use the term 86. So you use the term derecognize. It just struck me there's probably a reason behind that, and maybe there isn't. But it's a funny choice.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Right.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Oxford language says that we draw official recognition from and in organizational country that's derecognized, so I don't really see what problem you're pointing at.

JEFF OSBORN

Well, I wasn't as erudite. I picked dictionary.com, and it says there is no such word.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Well, I use reputable sources like the Oxford Dictionary.

JEFF OSBORN

Okay. The funny thing is what ChatGPT came up with.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Okay. I think it's important to point out one thing. First of all, using a term like cremation or death or end of life or anything like that is not the key focus of derecognition. The key focus of derecognition is if there is an issue that is occurring—it's one of the principles. If there's an issue that is occurring that is putting a RIR out of compliance and in a scenario where they may be derecognized, it is incumbent on everybody to get it fixed. To really try their best to fix the problem and not just say, "You failed the check mark, therefore, you're done." The idea of remediating the problem and working with that RIR and all of those things is really the most important part. The derecognition itself is the very last thing in this process. I understand the word may not be ideal in choice. It's the idea of recognizing and non-recognition, or we call it derecognition. Hans Petter is comfortable with what it is in a dictionary.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

In the British one. It's not in the American one.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Right. But that being said, an important part of the lifecycle is we do CPR. We're not doing a DNR at the end of this. Do not resuscitate. We are doing CPR. We're trying to rehabilitate and get the person back in or the RIR back into compliance, back into a stable operational role.

JEFF OSBORN

Thank you. Any other questions from the floor? Wes?

WES HARDAKER

Thanks. I'm, by the way speaking, Wes Hardaker, as an RSSAC member not as a Board member, just for clarity. I'm certainly glad to see this going forward. I think it's an important document. I think the last time we talked about this was roughly a year ago with RRSAC. We told you at the time that RRSAC tends to not have opinions on stuff outside the Root Service System. It's outside of our remit. I'm sure that still holds true. But please do understand, we probably like the fact that this document is going into existence as we define our own governance documents as well. One of the things that occurred to me is it's unclear from the document how much you guys were willing to dive into what happens when particular events occur.

One of the most interesting in my mind is derecognition. If that happened, there's an awful lot of resources and contracts and things associated with an RIR that would need to be appropriately handled. And I noticed in the document it says handed off in the transmission period or something like that. Do the RIRs actually talk about that particular eventuality? I recognize you may have left that intentionally ambiguous and figured out how to deal with that at the time.

JEFF OSBORN

Hans Petter?

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Kevin is a community member volunteer so he cannot possibly speak on behalf of the RIRs. Of course, the RIRs speak of this both within the context of this and outside. I think you should look at this document as a high-level principles or policy document, while there need to be more detailed implementation procedures for a lot of things. Think about annual audits. There is a lot of nitty-gritty details that you need to have in a scope of work to an auditing company. I don't think that belongs in this document, but it needs to be written down.

The process of how to recover an RIR from the ashes, to use a metaphor, there are many ways to do that and technical ways to do that and there are legal implications. While I practically think it can be done, it is going to be a very interesting legal exercise to do that.

We have prior art in setting up two RIRs where LACNIC was split from ARIN. AFRINIC was established out of RIPE NCC and ARIN and APNIC. So this has been done before. Setting up a new RIR when the resources are with is not cooperating, it is not something that has been done before. Not cooperating could be bankrupt, be demolished, be non-cooperative. There are so many scenarios there that can possibly get in this document and it's really painful when you think about it. Have we thought about it? Oh, yes. We have spent considerable time on this.

WES HARDAKER

I have no doubt. We, as the root server operators, have an awful lot of overlap. Though we do not have written down procedures, I am more than confident that my fellow root server operators, if I needed to go away and look at Hans Petter and say, "Please, take my address," then you would do the right thing. I am sure the RIRs fall into that category. The replacement to me was not as interested as if you had to go from five to four, what do you do with the existing resources? But by your point... I can't call on you, he has to. From a messaging point of view, certainly you, the root server operators, have a very long-established history of trying to do the right thing at all times and serving the best interest of the Internet.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

To respond to that, I think taking over root server operator is 99% technical and then 1% legal or political. Maybe it's a bit more

political. Setting up a new RIR is 10% technical and a huge amount of legal and political, so it's a very big difference there.

WES HARDAKER

Agreed.

JEFF OSBORN

Warren?

WARREN KUMARI

The example of taking over root thing, for a lot of this, it's not written down and it relies upon norms and things which have been built up over the years. But that all is assuming that people are not intentionally being malicious. If Wes wanted to hand a root server to someone else, that's fine and reasonable. But if it gets taken away from him and he's out to be difficult, it could be a lot harder. I think there's a reasonable amount in this document which is sort of implicitly assuming that the derecognizing RIR is going to be well behaved isn't going to go out of their way to be difficult. Maybe that is just some of the phrasing, but there seems to be a bit of like I am sure when they go away, they will try and be helpful and not, for example, sulk the field on the way out.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

A lot of this comes down to scope and who owns a particular thing. You are absolutely right. We have no idea as community members what's actually involved and what the steps would be. We can take

some advice, we can put in some generic documentation to it. But ultimately, the RIRs will need to produce that operational and technical and legal documentation to support that. There's a number of areas, unfortunately, and to your submission, points to where we had to be a little vague, because it is out of the scope of what we are able to handle. And I think some of the wording can be tightened up in a way that shows rather than you feeling that it's vague, that you feeling that there will be a document that explains that that comes out of a process that the RIRs or ICANN or whoever it is needs to do. But it speaks directly to the scope of what we are doing. Simple terminologies, we make an assumption that we can define member. We had 10, 20 hours of ASO AC time where we understood we can't define the term member because every RIR has a different definition of it.

We can talk about the general concept, and we leave it up to them. And that is probably the hardest part of this document is not wanting to put in all of the technical things that we as engineers and technical people want to do, but give enough of a pointer to say, "We really need to see this in there. You do it." The communities themselves—we're all bottom-up process communities. We'll get our view on it and our concerns raised at that time, but we need to see more implicit definitions in current ICP-2 than were there. But that doesn't mean we get to carte blanche write legal documents on behalf of at the same time.

ROBERTO CAROLINA

Hi. Rob Carolina, RSSAC. I hope you'll forgive me, because I've been away doing something else for a little while and I haven't had a chance to review the most recent version of the document. But based on the slide that you put up earlier, I just want to ask a question for clarification. You're talking about recognizing and derecognizing the process. It seemed like a two-step process, where first the RIRs would collectively, one assumes by consensus, believe that it was appropriate to recognize, and then ICANN would have what was described on the slide as ultimate authority to make the decision following that, or there was a requirement for the first step and a requirement for a second step. And on derecognition, I wasn't sure. I inferred from the slide that there would be a consensus among all RIRs, except for the one who was in the frame, perhaps, and then again, there was a second step described. So please feel free to correct any of that.

But the core of the question is this. Is this a case where, let's say, both key holders, the RIR community by consensus and ICANN as an organization, where they both have to agree in order for a step to take place. Because your use of the phrase ultimate authority or ultimate decision making authority led me to wonder if, for example, ICANN would, if you're proposing that ICANN would have the ability to override the view of the RIRs or if the RIRs were deadlocked and were not achieving consensus on what they wanted to do. I'm just curious to know how you see that relationship.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Currently, and under the previous ICP-2, all the RIRs agreed, and then the ICANN Board endorsed. And there was elaborate checklists, and it went through the ICANN process with GAC advice and the whole shebang. So it was thorough and checked all the boxes. The current global policy process and global policy for IP addresses means IANA allocating resources to the RIRs. It's got nothing to do with what the RIRs are doing. That is done in each region. The Address Council established that process has been followed, NRO EC checks it, sends it to the ICANN Board, and the ICANN Board endorses the policy. Now, if the ICANN Board disagrees, they can't change the policy. They can send it back and say, "Do your homework." And then if there is disagreement, again, then ICANN Board will have to go along.

That's been the thinking here, and I think that thinking is still the same. But there is something in here, some text in here, for reconsideration, obviously. So if the RIRs don't reach consensus on sending this further on, then the ICANN Board can say, "Please reconsider that for the following reasons." But this thing that you're pointing towards here is where some of the details still need to be discussed, but because here is where we're getting a lot of feedback on how this should work or shouldn't work, right?

So the thinking between the five RIRs, currently are four because AFRINIC is not around the table, since they don't have a governing body right now, is that the NRO is formed by an MOU. So if you want

to set up your RIR and become a signature to that MOU, we can't do that with simple majority because we're actually signing a contract, all of us, so the others can't force me to sign that contract, right? Because my Board may not authorize me, or my community may not authorize me, and there are too many real-life conflicts on the ground that makes it politically impossible for me to go into certain scenarios. But this is some of this where I'm kind of saying, yes, I understand the concerns. Please tell me how to solve them, right? So this is one of the hardest tasks on the Council now, to come up for the next draft, which is then set to be out before the spring season of regional meetings. So then there will be new documents out. So if you haven't studied it in detail now, take vacation and read the next one. But then it's interesting to hear your feedback together with everybody else when we discuss it at all the regional meetings and upcoming ICANN meetings.

ROBERTO CAROLINA

If I could just follow up, I would make an observation that I've made in other fora, but I would encourage you to consider it as you consider your deliberations, and that is any time one creates a single point of control of necessity, you create a single point of failure. From a governance perspective, you create a single point where if that organization faces difficulty, external pressure becomes destabilized for whatever reason, it becomes a single point of potential unpleasantness and disaster.

One of the luxuries we have within the root server community is that, because all of us reflect exactly the same data taken, if any one of us were to cease to exist because of bankruptcy or hostile action or court orders, if we were told to switch off our entire network tomorrow, nobody in the real world would notice. A lot of engineers would notice, some ISPs would notice, there might be a few people who are inconvenient for a few minutes, but there's 11 other organizations who are ready, willing, and able to answer questions from recursive resolvers. And the challenge, of course, that you folks have is that each of you has an exclusive responsibility for the addresses assigned to you, and that makes the balance, I think, much more difficult to draw.

But I would encourage you in the strongest possible way to view ICANN is a wonderful organization and it has a lot of value to the community and to the Internet. I would just urge you not to view it as the natural place to resolve all questions or the natural thing that has ultimate authority to resolve all things, because the more we push authority to the center, the more attractive a target it becomes. And I don't want ICANN to be an attractive target. That's what I'm trying to avoid.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

But part of the discussion here, and yeah, some of this discussion may not be suitable for a public meeting yet. You need somebody to make a call, right? You need somebody to rubber stamp in the end. And then should that be the NRO? It could be, right, but then

we need a bit more formalism around the NRO because today that's just the RIRs acting together. So the NRO does not sign contracts. You sign a contract with the five RIRs. And then having the five RIRs defining, deciding on whether it should be six or not may not be to everybody's liking.

When it comes to the operation of the RIRs, we used to say that if the RIPE NCC took an extended vacation for a couple of months, nobody even noticed. The RIPE NCC would happily continue to function because everybody has their IP addresses and the networks keeps running. What you can't do is to do transfers or get new allocations or change things in the registry. Now, there are copies of that registry database in various places. So the data isn't lost. You can still do your cybersecurity investigations. What gets complicated is RPKI, where you kind of rely on these digital signatures to secure your routing infrastructure. So it's changed a bit. And this is also where it gets very sensitive to put a new system in there.

And why are the RIRs working? Well, because all their members trust them, because I can't enforce you to only use the addresses you have registered in the ARIN database or RIPE database. You could technically do whatever you want there. And in some jurisdictions, you may commit via fraud or whatnot, while in other jurisdictions, they wouldn't even understand what you're up to. So we don't have any enforcement mechanism to say that you need to

respect the uniqueness of the RIR system. That just happens because everybody knows it's the right thing.

That's where if you're trying to derecognize the RIPE NC while there are 20,000 members saying that, "No, we don't agree with this. We want to continue to be registered with RIPE NCC and we do not want to change to this new body," then there would be a huge conflict. Then it's not a conflict with the organization, it's the staff of the organization. It's a conflict with the members, right? And you have a group of 20,000 Internet service providers across 70 countries that has one opinion, and somebody is trying to change that opinion. That's going to be a really difficult thing. Now, if you have a rogue organization because the governance of the organization is difficult and all the members want this fixed by setting up a new organization, that's a completely different scenario. But all of this, it's not possible to make solutions for all of those scenarios. And the worst ones is where you have three fractions to have four different opinions, and what you do then?

KEVIN BLUMBERG

So the good news is recognition. The question you brought up in terms of that was probably the most voluminous of the responses, and we will be working on all of the sections, but that particular section, I think, has garnered the most amount of feedback. Some of it vastly different, but definitely the way we structured it doesn't make a number of people happy on either end of the spectrum, which means maybe it's working, but we need to really spend more

time on that one. So that one is definitely. We will do a fairly comprehensive report after. Maybe don't wait for the next draft, look at the report, because that may go at least into our thinking and our process and how we're doing things.

On top of that, ICANN staff have been wonderful. They've been very supportive. They've listened, but they haven't yet really been involved. That's a to be determined. That's coming down the pipe. So they've watched our process. Because, just like anything else, being transparent, being bottom-up, following a procedure, following things, is very important to how things get done. To date, the feedback from ICANN, the organization, has been very little because they want the communities, they want us to do our work. They don't want to insert themselves in the process. To date, they still have to look at this and make their comments and feedback.

The RIRs, the same thing. They've given us a lot of latitude to do the work as volunteers and provide a lot of support structures for that. But ultimately, we are providing a document that we're then going to hand over to them to then work through. So we want to get it right as much as possible. We know we're not going to get everything right. We know that ultimately there are things that will need to be negotiated, etc. Hopefully that will happen at the operational, procedural level, outside of this document. But there's a lot more eyes that are coming onto this. As we've gone through this, we had a little bit of feedback on the principles, more feedback

on this draft, and I expect to see even more feedback on the next draft as well.

JEFF OSBORN

Any additional questions? I have one or two really stupid, simple questions I want to save to the end because I hope somebody else would ask them. For somebody in here who understands better than I how the ASO AC works and how the RSSAC works, are those similar in the sense that the ASO is an ICANN-funded and staffed organization that basically exists to do some form of... Help me out here.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

So the first thing is the 15 people on the ASO AC are the appointed-elected, or actually in the RIR region are called the NRO NC. And our sole responsibility on the NRO NC, which is within the RIR side of things, is to sit on the ASO AC. So those 15 people come from the RIRs, we sit on the ASO AC. The ASO AC is part of a two-hat system. ASO AC on one side, NRO EC on the other. They make up the ASO as a whole. The EC is the executive. They are the decisional participants, as an example. The ASO is the decisional participant. They are the ones that are the decisional participants when it comes to ICANN. The ASO AC is a very limited volunteer body who has specific roles, the selection of appointment of Board members, global policy development process, making sure it's followed. ICP-2 was what we originally did 25 years ago, and so we were asked to do it again. It was in our remit to do that. But we are just sort of a

group of volunteers that are from the RIR communities, and we are half of it. The executive is one side, where the volunteers on the other side, and that makes up the whole Address Serving Organization. Does that help or make it worse?

JEFF OSBORN

It does. I wish I'd asked at the beginning. That clarified. Thanks.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

So two clarifications to that. The original version of the ICP-2 was drafted by RIR staff, and it was circulated for public comments by then ASO AC chair. It was not drafted by the ASO AC. So just to be very clear on that. And ASO AC chair at the time was me, and I'd forgotten all about it, so I was reminded about that e-mail. Because I did not write it, right?

Anyway, you asked about the financial stuff. The ASO has excellent support staff from ICANN. You know them all because they're also supporting RSSAC. But the NRO has support staff supporting ASO AC, the Drafting Team now is the RIR Legal Team, it's the RIR Comms Team, of course, with help from ICANN staff as well. And all the travel support comes from the RIRs to the volunteers here. And there are two contracts between the RIRs and ICANN. One is the MOU that says that the NRO serves as the ASO, and the roles of the ASO is specified in the Bylaws. And we pay a voluntary contribution to ICANN for the support that we get—meeting rooms here and staff support and so on. And in addition, there is an IANA Services

Agreement. So in the policies we have, IANA does the job of keeping track on which RIR keeps which numbers, and that's under a Service Agreement between the RIRs and ICANN, and ICANN has subcontracted that job to PTI, and the RIRs pay for that. First, the RIRs collectively has a budget in the NRO for one and a half million US dollars-ish, thus my comment earlier on when we talked about funding. Each root operator needs to tip in 100k each, and then we could set up the same thing-ish, just order of magnitude.

So while I hear somebody saying, taking my root server hat on, that we want the same setup for the root servers, I'm not quite sure that all the root servers operator are actually willing to pay for this requirement because none of the root server operators gets any revenue for running the root servers. The RIRs have members paying for this, right? So this coordination with ICANN and IANA contract and so on, that's part of what my 20,000 members and the other IR members are paying service fees to the RIRs. There is a money flow from the bottom to the top, while we have not figured out a way to take credit card payments for root server queries yet. Is this publicly recorded? I hope it's not. Oh shit.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Yeah. We can also talk about the quality of the coffee and budget, but that's probably—

HANS PETTER HOLEN

We did not have a coffee budget this year so you did not get native coffee, and I'm so sorry about that.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

There's a lot of work that goes on when—and it's a big when—global policy development happens. It's very rare. The last policy was many years ago, a decade ago. There was a clarification in terms of autonomous system numbers, whether they were two-byte and four-byte were the same or different. That was something that came to the ASO AC, and we needed to run a process on that. There's a lot of spooling up that can occur because we will go back and take advice and information and have discussions with all of the RIRs, and multiple meetings when it comes to anything we do. And for many things, we don't write the documents. Global Policy is not written by the ASO AC. Global Policy is actually written by the community. It goes through the RIR's entire process. It has to be identical. We're there as a check and balance to make sure processes were followed, that the tech is the same, that all of those things are checked off before it then goes to ICANN for ratification.

So there's a lot of complexities to it. At the end of the day, it's pretty simple. The good news is we're pretty quiet most of the time with—what was it? We call the little N at the end of ICANN? It's because we do all of our work outside of ICANN, all of the policy work that goes on goes on at the RIRs. It's very rare that the ASO is at a policy meeting because we generally don't have policy that goes on. We're here because it's very timely to work on on the ICP-2. We are

happy we do 101 style on the ASO AC and what we do for our own communities because they don't understand what we do half the time either. I'm happy to let you know when we're doing one of those. If it helps inform of the types of things that we do, if you're looking at it for yourselves and how it would be beneficial what you can take and benefit from and leave off to the side because that's not what you want to be doing either, I'm happy to let you know when we're doing a one-on-one type of 30-minute session that sort of delves into this.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Actually, it's a one-hour session and we did it at the last meeting. I did a 30-minute version of that on Sunday for the ICANN Board. So I can share those slides, no problem. But really, the policy part is not that really relevant for RSSAC. RSSAC have excellent procedures for how to make documents, which is in a very different sense of the public policy processes for. So I think the thing that not necessarily RSSAC but RSS GWG is interested in how the NRO is set up and the relationship with ICANN and the funding and so on. But the big difference there, as I understand it, is the question on whether or not the root server operator should get paid from ICANN, and then it's a completely different structure than what the RIR has today.

JEFF OSBORN

Granted. And if you don't mind, I'd love to see the doc. That'd be really interesting. Thanks. Kevin?

KEVIN BLUMBERG

And the good news is that's all on the NRO EC side of the house, not on the ASO AC side of the house. So Hans Petter is definitely a person for that one.

JEFF OSBORN

Good. Is this the part of the message where we say you get time back?

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Absolutely. Unless there's a how can we improve the next round of comments and if you have any comment on how to improve the comments, happy to hear it. Otherwise, you can have your time back. And we thank you for the time you gave us now.

JEFF OSBORN

Thanks for the time. Thanks for the education, Kevin. It's always a pleasure. Is there anything this guy doesn't know? It's kind of scary. The more I know him, the more I realize he knows everything. It's intimidating. With that, we give you your time back. Thanks all very much. Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN

Please stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]