
ICANN84 | Prep Week – RIR Governance Document Update
Wednesday, October 15, 2025 – 16:00 to 17:00 IST

OZAN SAHIN

Hello, and welcome to this ICANN 84 Prep Week webinar, presenting the second draft of the RIR governance document. 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 the session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted in the Q&A pod. Interpretation for this session will include English, French, and Spanish. Please select the relevant language from the Zoom toolbar. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, unmute your microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record, the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English, and speak at a reasonable pace. I will now hand the floor over to the ASO Address Council Chair, Hervé Clément.

HERVÉ CLEMENT

Thank you, Ozan. As you say, I am Hervé Clément, initially from Orange and France, and I am the chair of the Address Supporting Organization, Address Council, but we will have a few words about that. But before that, I can give temporarily the floor to Nick for him to present himself.

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.

NICK NUGENT

Hello, everyone. My name is Nick Nugent. I am a vice chair of the ASO AC, and I will be co-presenting with Hervé today.

HERVÉ CLEMENT

Thank you, Nick. So today is the presentation of the second version of the Regional Internet Registry Governance document. It's a document some of you probably know, which is under public consultation. I will start to present our global work, the global task of the Address Supporting Organization and the main changes we provided regarding the last document. And after that, Nick will come further into the details of the change we provided. You can go to the next slide. Nick, about this Addressing Supporting Organization, Address Council, ASO Addressing Supporting Organization, everybody know, and Address Council. It's a supporting organization established by ICANN to advise on internet number resource policy, internet number, IP numbers, and autonomous system numbers as well.

It is normally comprised of 15 members, three from each regional internet region. And in each region, two members are elected by the community and one is appointed by the executive board of the Regional Internet Registry. We have currently only 12 members because of the issues that AFRINIC has made. It was not possible to recruit members from this region, but we hope, as AFRINIC has now

an executive board, we hope to have pretty soon members from AFRINIC as well.

What do we do? We advise the ICANN board on this topic. We oversee the global policy development process. A global policy regarding the internet number resources is a policy common to all regions describing the relationship between the IANA, which is a function of ICANN, dealing with internet number resources management. And we see if, to accept a global policy, if the process has been conducted in a good way. We appoint two members to the ICANN board, specifically seats 9 and 10, and we appoint one member to the ICANN meeting committee. And importantly, in terms of transparency, we meet every month, at the beginning of the month, every Wednesday, and the meetings are public. And we try to meet in person once a year, generally during the first ICANN meeting. The work we conducted recently was to conduct the election for Seat 10, and it was Christian Kaufmann who was elected for that. We monitor and support the global policy development process. And of course, it's a topic of this session today, we also conduct the ICP2 review process. You can go to the next slide.

And it's better to see the faces of the people who compose the council, so you can see the 12 current councillors. You can go to the next slide. A piece of history. In 1992, the RIPE NCC, the Regional Internet Registry for Europe, Russia and the Middle East was established first, then APNIC for Australia, India, China, Japan, etc., in 1993. In 1997, it was ARIN established for the US and Canada. And

then ICANN was established in 1998. In 2001, ICANN adopted the Internet Coordination Policy 2, which describes the list of criteria for a Regional Internet Registry to be established. And via this document, the ICP2, LACNIC for the Middle and South America was established in 2002, and AFRINIC for Africa in 2005.

The ICP2, as you can calculate very easily, is nearly 25 years old now. Of course, the Internet has changed over this last quarter century, and also the relationship between the Regional Internet Registries and ICANN, and between each of them, of course, has changed significantly. And we will talk about that later. As I say, the ICP2 2001 version just describes the criteria to establish a Regional Internet Registry, but we have to be more explicit about the ongoing responsibilities of a Regional Internet Registry and to think about the potential derecognition of a Regional Internet Registry. You can go to the next slide. For this reason, it was requested to the Council, to us, to review this project. In October 2023, the NRO-EC, the NRO-EC is part of the ASO and is comprised of the CEOs of the different Regional Internet Registries. The NRO-EC asked us with two tasks: to first review and advise this committee, this NRO-EC, on a procedure for validating and addressing ongoing Regional Internet Registry compliance with ICP2, which is called the implementation procedures first, and then it's a core part of our work to strengthen the ICP2, which is to revise ICP2 to make the system more accountable to the Internet community. You can go to the next slide.

And after the piece of history I have described, this is a timeline describing our work. In October 2024, after one year of work, we published a set of 24 core principles to be included in the next version of ICP2, which was called the principle document. And there was the first consultation about this document between October and December 2024. Then, between December and February 2025, we reviewed the community feedback that was given during the consultation. And then, on 24 February 2025, we published an ICP2 questionnaire summary report, taking into account the different feedback. On 14 April 2025, we published a Regional Internet Registry governance document, and from that, we launched a regional ICANN consultation for the ICANN community and the regional communities as well. And after that, after analyzing the different results, we published another document at the end of August 2025. And now, we are on the ongoing consultation regarding this document. You can go to the next slide.

That's a QR code. We belong to a numeric world where you can go to the principle consultation report document I have talked about. You can go to the next slide. And to have an overview of where we are regarding the timeline and the different tasks we had, we are now in the dark blue square, which is called the Second Public Comment on Draft. So we will go after that, we hope to the final review of the outputs of the consultation, and we hope after that to the approval and adoption of the document. You can go to the next slide. So you have another QR code, which is a QR code to reach the

current document you can read under the current consultation.
Next slide, please.

And to help the community not to understand but to read the document and to see clearly the differences compared to the previous document, we have elaborated supporting documents. The first one is a redline of changes. So you have the link. And there will be an extract of this document just after so you can see the differences regarding the last document. And you also have a rationale document which explains the reason why we added or not added specific changes. And we have a frequently asked question document also. You can go to the next slide. And as I said, so it's an extract of the redline document. So you can see what this document is exactly. You can see for example, in the first line that we deleted "policies adopted for its policy development process" and replaced it with "number resource policy applicable to it". Very easy to read, I think. You can go to the next one.

Rational. So it explains why we added or not added specific changes. So you have, for instance, regarding the recognition topic, you have the background of why we decided to change that, you have the specific change and the relevant section where you can find the specific change of that. Next slide, please. The consultation, there is another QR code to go to the specific consultation. And of course, we will be very happy to read your remarks and your feedback. And as it is said in the document on the slide, your feedback is vital. So there is also the link. So you have

everything in this document to help you to answer the consultation. Next slide.

So I will briefly, I have only two slides left and then Nick will go further into the details. We are talking about the revised Regional Internet Registry governance document. This document represents a detailed update to the original draft with the overarching goal of strengthening the Regional Internet Registry system that is primarily our goal. And that was the goal of the request from the NRO-EC in October 2023. The key changes you will read and find in the document are for the title. You will see that we have operated a small change to the title of the document, but Nick will explain. There is a preamble at the beginning of the document. It is expanded, and it really explains the goals of the document. You also have implementation procedures. Just to explain that you have a general principle in the document, which is under consultation, and there will be a separate implementation procedure document that may provide further implementation detail on any obligation. It's an easy, I would say, comfortable way to work. Next slide.

You will also read a recognition and de-recognition part with additional protection in recognition and de-recognition procedures for the affected Regional Internet Registry. And it includes a possibility for a candidate RIR to be recognized on less than the unanimous approval of the existing Regional Internet Registries. Unanimous was a topic which was largely discussed during the last consultation. Another topic is audits and proposals.

We added new criteria for Regional Internet Registry members or ICANN to request an ad hoc audit or propose de-recognition. And then lastly, there is ad hoc emergency continuity, which is a procedure to temporarily transfer a Regional Internet Registry's responsibility to an emergency operator in case of impossibility for a specific region to fulfill its responsibility. And if you go to the next slide, I think it's the one when I give you the floor, Nick.

NICK NUGENT

Great, thank you very much, Hervé. And as Hervé mentioned, he has gone over a very high level summary of the changes made. I'll now go into more detail about what those changes are. And I guess at the beginning, I neglected to mention Hervé mentioned that he is an employee of Orange. I should also mention my affiliation as a professor at the University of Tennessee, but we're all volunteers on the council. So, let's go into a little bit more detail about these changes that were made. And these are again, the purpose of this is not to go through the entire document or even the most important parts of the document. The purpose is to go over the changes between version one, which we published and conducted a consultation on, and version two, which we've just published and are now in the middle of a consultation on. So I'm going to describe some of those main differences. Starting with the title. This isn't terribly interesting, but we note it just to be comprehensive. We've made a small tweak to the title. Previously, the document was called the Governance Document for the Recognition, Maintenance and De-recognition of Regional Internet Registries. We've simply

changed that to Governance Document for the Recognition Operation and De-recognition of Regional Internet Registries.

Preamble. We included a preamble in the first version of the document, we've expanded it here, that was based on feedback that we received. And this is something that is worth emphasizing as well, that we got a lot of feedback during the first consultation on the first draft. The consultation is being conducted in parallel in each of the five RIR regions, and in ICANN's community. That was how it was done for the first version. That's also how it is being done for the second version. So one of the links that you saw was a link to the NRO website, where you could see where all the discussions are taking place. Obviously, this is an ICANN consultation, so you'll want to participate using the ICANN consultation link. And as I mentioned, we got a lot of great feedback. And one of the pieces of feedback that we got was that we needed to provide more context for the document. What are the goals? Why is this being revised, etc. So we expanded the preamble a bit to define more of the document's purposes. So far, nothing very interesting. We're going to get into some more substantial topics now.

One of the things that was a constant topic of conversation and feedback from the community was that some of the obligations set forth in the document were vague or broad. For example, in the document, there's a requirement that each RIR must practice good corporate governance practices. So some people understandably said, what does that mean? That can mean different things in

different jurisdictions. Can you provide more detail? Or, for example, when it comes to the obligation that RIRs share information with each other and provide backup data so that there could be assistance in the event of an emergency, there were obviously a lot of questions. Well, how would that work? What database, what protocol would you use? And as we explained when we delivered various presentations, the governance document is meant to be broad. We think that it would be unnecessary and would bog the document down to get into too much detail. Rather, it's only the high-level obligations that really need to be spelled out in the document. As for how those obligations are fulfilled at a more detailed tactical level, that can be sorted out later. And we mentioned that the RIRs would probably get together and collaborate on another document, which we've been calling the implementation procedures. So, for example, what protocols are we going to use to share information? How is an audit going to work? What are the dates? Who are the vendors? Things of that sort. Those details can be sorted out later by the RIRs.

And we mentioned that in our previous discussions, but we rightly got the comment, "Well, you should reference the fact that a separate document will be created. You should reference that in the document itself." So, that's what we did. We added a new section 1.3 that says that the RIRs and ICANN may jointly develop this additional document, these implementation procedures. And now, that's not going to be as heavy of a process where there's going to be consultations and detailed feedback sessions and

things like that. The implementation procedures document is meant to be agile and flexible and fast, because this is just low-level tactical details. But to allay any concerns that the implementation procedures document could be used to override the RIR governance document or operate as an end run around community-based engagement, we noted in section 1.3 that the implementation procedures cannot contradict or override any terms of the RIR governance document. So, that is one of the changes that you will see in version 2. Recognition and de-recognition.

Now, as we've noted before, and as Hervé talked about, the three potential states or main events that can happen with respect to an RIR are recognition, the entity is recognized as a new RIR and given responsibility for a particular region. Operation, which is okay, you're a recognized RIR. Now, here are your obligations going forward. This is what you have to do to fulfill your role and to maintain the stability of the internet numbers system. However, if an RIR continually and materially failed to comply with its ongoing operation obligations... Sorry, can folks still hear me? I think I accidentally hit a button. Great. If an RIR materially and continually failed to comply with its obligations, then there is the possibility of de-recognition, that its responsibility to serve as the RIR for that region would be revoked or removed. So, obviously, a lot of procedures around how recognition and de-recognition would work. So, let's start with recognition. How does a new entity, a candidate RIR, become a recognized RIR?

Well, the version one of the document provided the basic procedure. It's necessary that the RIRs, the existing RIRs, first approve of that or vote in recommending that RIR, that candidate RIR. And then, as a second step, if those RIRs approve, then ICANN also has to approve, and then the candidate can be recognized as a new RIR. Well, how many of the existing RIRs have to recommend recognition for the new candidate? The first version said it has to be unanimous. And there was concern. There were comments from the community that, "Well, unanimity can be hard to achieve, and goodness, what if a particular RIR is acting in a self-interested way or doesn't have a good reason for objecting? What then?" So, we modified this in version two to provide a mechanism for, I don't know if appeal is the right word, but a type of independent review, where if less than all the RIRs agree or recommend recognizing the RIR, the new RIR, pardon, then the candidate RIR can go to ICANN and say, "Can you review this?" And then ICANN can take a look at this or an independent party appointed by ICANN can take a look at this and ask the RIRs to take another look. And then on that second look, if an RIR continues to object, continues to dissent to recognition without a valid reason, then there is the possibility of recognition, even if there is a dissenting RIR. So, it's not quite unanimous. It's not quite less than unanimous. It's a hybrid of the two. There's a possibility of recognition on less than unanimity among the RIRs. So, that's a big change between version one and version two.

How about on de-recognition? Well, that's very similar to version one in this second version, but we provided some additional protections for an affected RIR. That is an RIR that is subject to de-recognition or for which de-recognition is being considered. We have minimum requirements for who can submit a proposal to de-recognize and what that proposal must look like. We provide an opportunity for the affected RIR to respond in writing and various elements of transparency in terms of publishing the reasons for decisions. So, again, this is to protect the rights of each RIR to make sure that any de-recognition decision is not taken lightly and there are adequate protections. Let's talk a little bit about the de-recognition proposal. Who can propose it? Well, the previous version, I think, said that it was either all the RIRs or 25% of all the RIRs, that is, minus the affected RIR, or 25% of the members of the affected RIR. So, you could have an RIR that's failing to meet its members' needs and those members can get together and if 25% of them say we would like this RIR to be de-recognized or at least to submit a proposal to de-recognize the RIR. Now, because different RIRs can have different numbers of members and members can be defined in different ways and have different thresholds, we now revise this to provide a threshold of 2,000 members or 25% of the members of an RIR, whichever is lower. It also allows ICANN to submit a proposal for de-recognition, but note that ICANN cannot act unilaterally. The process still requires the other RIRs to agree to de-recognize that RIR.

Audits are very important. Again, and I can't really emphasize this enough, the point of revising ICP-2 to provide explicitly for the possibility of de-recognition does not mean that there's any great enthusiasm or eagerness or quickness to de-recognize an RIR. That is certainly a last resort when other options have been exhausted. There are provisions in the document that say that there should be a bias in favor of rehabilitating an RIR. Well, likewise, audits are instrumental to catching problems early before they become big problems that could potentially result in de-recognition. So, not a big change here. Version 1 provided for the possibility of ad hoc audits. The changes here simply provide some criteria for who can trigger an ad hoc audit. Previously, the other RIRs had to unanimously agree to request the ad hoc audit of another RIR. Now, it's by majority decision. Likewise, we have the 2,000 members or 25% of the members of the affected RIR, whichever is lower, and now we have the ability of ICANN to trigger an ad hoc audit. And again, the purpose of this is to catch problems early on, so there's no need to think about de-recognition.

There are also periodic audits, and we specified a general obligation to undergo periodic audits in the first version. Well, we added a periodicity. We added a time horizon. Each RIR must be audited at least once every three years. This is something that's definitely quite new between version one and version two. What happens if an RIR cannot fulfill its obligations through no fault of its own? Let's say that there is a natural disaster, a hurricane, an earthquake, or political turmoil in the RIR's jurisdiction. Well, we

don't want it to simply be, "Well, that's too bad. I guess we're just going to have to de-recognize the RIR because that's the only way to ensure that its members can continue to receive the services they need." So we've added something different or something in between here, which we call emergency continuity. And what it does is it's a mechanism that can temporarily transfer an RIR's responsibilities to another entity, which we call an emergency operator, in urgent situations. It's a lighter weight process. It doesn't require a two-step approval. It's just unanimous agreement of the other RIRs and ICANN.

So if they agree to do so, then there can be a temporary transfer of that RIR's responsibilities to another party or it could be that other party, of course, could be one of the existing RIRs, but it's time limited. It's limited to 90 days and it must be quickly followed by a community consultation. Now, it can be renewed for additional 90-day periods, but again, each time will trigger a subsequent consultation. So this is meant to be lightweight and accountable, but not a substitute for de-recognition. Just some details here around how I've already mentioned these, but I'll briefly recount them. ICANN has to publish the rationale and scope of the emergency continuity and initiate a community engagement process quickly thereafter. Again, the continuity cannot exceed 90 days, although that can be renewed, but each time it's renewed, there are additional consultation obligations. And after the event ends, there's a post-mortem. RIRs and ICANN have to conduct a

post-event review, publish a report, provide a community feedback process, etc.

Those are the main ones. Then just a few miscellaneous changes that I'll mention here. Rectification. What is rectification? It's a fancy word for something very simple. The governance document can be amended. It can be amended and it can be amended in such a way that puts an existing RIR out of compliance. So I'll just be silly here for a second. If this said all RIRs must have orange buildings, and one of the RIRs does not have an orange building, we don't want to create a situation where the moment the document is amended, an RIR is out of compliance and potentially vulnerable or at risk of being de-recognized. So there is rectification, which is a grace period, a timeline for that RIR to change its policies if necessary, its bylaws if necessary, other aspects to become compliant with the revised document. We previously said if the document is amended and there's an RIR that will be put out of compliance, that RIR must be given a specific grace period. We have clarified to say that the grace period must be specified in the amendment. And we've also said, "Well, what about when this document itself is ratified for the first time?" Let's be clear about what the grace period is for that. And the grace period for that is three years.

That doesn't mean that the existing RIRs can be out of compliance for three years. It just means if there are any new obligations in this document that were not already contained in or implicit in the current version of ICP-2, then the RIR has three years to become

compliant. We added a section on dispute resolution that requires RIRs to provide effective adjudication mechanisms for members to enforce their rights against RIRs. Again, we can't emphasize this enough. There is no desire to create tools or mechanisms in this document to disadvantage RIRs or to quickly put them out of compliance or to arbitrarily reject proposals to recognize RIRs or to de-recognize RIRs. Rather, there's a good faith expectation, and we've made that clear, that all the RIRs and ICANN will act in good faith and fair dealing under the RIR governance document, and that if there are any actions to be taken, they'll be prompt, but reasonable time frames will be given for the affected parties. So that is a fast tour, but a slightly more detailed tour of some of the major differences between version 1 and version 2. That concludes the summary of changes. We'll just close by reminding everyone to please provide their feedback by November 7th. That is coming up, and once again, we provided a link to the ICANN consultation webpage. I think that's it then. I think we're ready for questions if anyone has any. I don't see any on the Zoom Q&A, the question and answer one, but I do see some things in the chat, so I'll take a look at that and others can as well.

HERVÉ CLEMENT

Yeah, perhaps, so we tried to answer the two or three questions. So, there was the one about the 25% threshold regarding the decision to be able to launch a decision. So there was the question if this 25% was too small or not. So I recall that during, for example, a General Assembly, we can have no more than 10% deciding or

voting during a session, and it was 25%, it was just for starting the process, not for deciding, of course. So I don't know if you want to add something about that, Nick?

NICK NUGENT

Yeah, just agreed. I'll be completely transparent. We've debated a lot internally as a group what the threshold should be for triggering a proposal. Some of us were worried about a threshold that is too low, and that this could result in trivial, frivolous proposals. Others have worried that it's very difficult to coordinate different bodies, especially different companies, to get them all involved, and that 25% could be too high. 25% was the compromise that we struck, and I should say that we developed this document at all times in consultation with and with the participation of the NRO and the RIR Legal folks. So that was the compromise we settled on, and as was noted, that's simply for submitting a proposal. The community itself does not vote, does not make the final call on whether a proposal succeeds. It is simply for initiating a proposal. And I guess I'll say one other thing that if there were a situation where, let's say, there were a major problem with an RIR, and just to be silly here, only 24% of the members could coordinate to submit the proposal. Obviously, that would be insufficient, but those members could absolutely reach out to the other RIRs, could absolutely reach out to ICANN and say, "Hey, this is a major problem," and there are provisions in the document for the other RIRs to kick off a proposal, or for ICANN to do so. So, hopefully that answers the question.

Again, reasonable minds can disagree about what is the best threshold.

HERVÉ CLEMENT

Thank you. So there is another question on the chat. After that there is Pari, raising her hand, there is Peter after that, and I see that in the Q&A, there is another something. Coming back to the chat, there was Anil Jain, hello Anil, who said that he thinks that 90 plus potentially 90 days period for the emergency operator can be too short. So I just started to say that, of course, it's something we can discuss. There can be different reasons for the regional internet registry to not be able to fulfill its responsibilities. For example, it can be not a governance something, but a natural disaster something, for example. So there are a lot of reasons, and that's the reason why we decided to first start with 90, with the potential to add 90 more, etc.

NICK NUGENT

Yeah, just to piggyback on that, the 90 days is meant to protect the RIR. We don't want any concern that the emergency operator mechanism could be used to essentially de-recognize an RIR without going through the full process, without getting the necessary community consultations done, things of that sort. So, 90 days is meant to be short. The period can be renewed. It isn't simply that it can be renewed once; theoretically it could be renewed five times, six times, but the 90-day period is meant to ensure that each time a renewal happens, there's a community

consultation, there's accountability, that it's not, again, just an end run around the de-recognition process. 90 days might be actually perfectly fine for handling a natural disaster, as Hervé mentioned. 120 days, again, that's almost half a year could also be sufficient. We're not sure, but think about it also from the RIR's perspective. For an RIR to be essentially sidelined for 90 days is a major disruptive event. And if we had a period longer than 90 days, let's say 180 days or 365 days, that's putting an RIR out of commission for quite a long time before there's the adequate evaluation, community consultation, publication of reasons, things of that sort. So again, it can be renewed, but it's meant to be short to protect the RIR. Of course, my opinion on this, and our opinion doesn't have to prevail. If others still think that's not the right timeframe, then we welcome those comments, and we will very seriously consider them.

HERVÉ CLEMENT

Thank you. Pari, you have your hand up, so we are happy to listen to your question.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much. Firstly, I want to thank you for the great work that has been done, both this presentation and the improvement in the document. There are two points that I'm not sure if it's going to be on the document that you mentioned that it will be added to this, or is it something that you will discuss here? But I thought that I would mention it anyway. So, one is that the current draft leaves

full discretion to RIRs in creating and managing sub-regional registries, but doesn't include any minimum requirement for transparency or community oversight. So, while sub-regional entities are accountable to their RIRs through a bottom-up process, practices may vary widely across regions. So are we perceiving any kind of, are we introducing any kind of baseline safeguards in these regards? Is it going to be included in the additional document? The second point I would like to make is about regional continuity. Again, this is introduced, and you described how it will work, but I wonder that in the event of failure, I want to stress that continuity of service is not the same as continuity of trust. So, the current draft does not address how the RIR community will be involved during such a transition, nor does it prioritize regional expertise or legitimacy in the successor interim arrangement. So, how are we going to safeguard this? These are the two points I have. Thank you.

HERVÉ CLEMENT

Thank you, Pari. Very interesting question. Perhaps I can start briefly, and I will give the floor to Nick to complete as well. Regarding, I would say, the sub-region or the national internet registries, it is agreed that it is not discussed per se in the document, but the Regional Internet Registry has the liberty to sub-allocate resources to sub-organizations. I would say that the thing is that the creation of this NIR or sub-organization cannot impinge on the Regional Internet Registry's ability to fulfill the criteria described in the document. That's a fact. And the other one, regarding the continuity, that's a legitimate question. What I could

say is that in this document, we describe the possibility to have this, and again, being sure that all aspects of the document are safeguarded as well as having a kind of community legitimacy, but perhaps it's something which has to be described further. I don't know specifically. Nick, if you want to complete?

NICK NUGENT

Yeah, thanks. I understand the concern, definitely. Just to shed some light on our concern, if the governance document were to prescribe how each RIR should create sub-regional registries, so National Internet Registries, for example, NIRs, and then provided parameters around how that were to work and community engagement and involvement, the document would become far more complex. I think that it would be more difficult to get community buy-in across all the different regions. Also, there's a constant background issue in this, and that is to what degree should each RIR have independence or, for lack of a better term, sovereignty? Or to what degree should other RIRs be able to curtail that or impinge on that sovereignty, or to what degree should ICANN? And that's a balance. The RIRs, to some degree, have operated a little bit more independently historically, and one of the purposes of this document is to provide more accountability, both between RIRs to each other and with ICANN as a neutral third party. So this question about NIRs really speaks to to what degree should RIRs have independence and autonomy in terms of how they conduct affairs within their region. And our current position on this, and again, we welcome feedback challenging us if we're not

thinking about this appropriately, is that as long as the RIR is complying with its obligations under the document, then it's okay for it to sub-delegate out to sub-regional registries. It's kind of like if you hire someone under a contract, they can outsource their obligations as long as they remain responsible for what their NIRs do, for what their sub-regional registries do. So we think that there's enough accountability, in the sense that if an NIR did something that violated the document, or didn't provide enough engagement or opportunity for the community, then that would cause the RIR to become non-compliant. So that's how we've tried to address it.

HERVÉ CLEMENT

Thank you. So, I tried to address all the questions and remarks. Perhaps, I don't know, so Akinori, I see your hand up. Akinori is another councillor for the ASO AC. Hello, Akinori. So, I don't know if your hand is related to the current questions we are dealing.

AKINORI MAEMURA

Yeah. Thank you very much for the patience, but I'd like to make some comment for the Pari question. It's actually very well covered by Nick that this ICP2 provides the operational criteria for the RIRs. That provides that only the RIR needs to comply with this policy. And then if the one RIR has a sub-regional registry, then the entire RIR internet numbers registry system needs to comply with that. That's actually bringing us in the Asia-Pacific region, the national internet registry people, a lot of additional burden to craft the

appropriate mechanism to assure the compliance of the ICP2 as the entire APNIC RIR system with all the NIRs. But it is all about the implementation process, and for improving the implementation process, we will have some appropriate mechanism to get a comment from the regional community members, and then we will have a good effort to make it happen for us to comply with the revised RIRs governance document. So that's from my side. Thanks.

NICK NUGENT

Thanks. If I could just jump in here, Hervé. Pari provided another comment. I think she said, "That is not what I suggest, but a baseline." So, if I think what I hear you saying, Pari, is I may have misrepresented your position. You're not saying we should specify in detail how each RIR is to manage its NIRs, its sub-regional registries, but you want some type of baseline, just some basic procedural protections or requirements. And so, I understand that is a valid distinction. And, I would just say, we welcome suggestions if you have any recommendations as to what that looks like, whether you want to submit that through the consultation or other mechanism, we're, of course, always happy to hear suggestions. And to be honest, the more concrete, the more specific, the better, but we'll take it in any form.

HERVÉ CLEMENT

Thank you. Before coming to Adiya's question, just for the record, there was a question from Peter Koch. "Do I understand correctly

that for the second round, there will be a single feedback process?"

And Carlos, thank you, Carlos, for answering. So you said, "Hi, Peter, each Regional Internet Registry and ICANN have their own feedback process." So I don't know if that answered correctly and completely your question. And Hadia, you have your hand up, so please ask a question.

HADIA ELMINIAMI

Oh, thank you so much. And this is actually not a question. This is going back to the ask about having some kind of safeguards to protect policies related to sub-regional entities. And I have a view which is similar to the answers you have provided. So, Regional Internet Registries are independent, member-based organizations accountable to their own communities. And Regional Internet Registries' policy follows community-based policy models. And thus, policies developed by the community do govern or apply to sub-regional entities. And those policies are developed by the Regional Internet Registry's community. So applying ICANN's CIP to sub-regional entities would conflict with the bottom-up, consensus-driven Regional Internet Registry processes. So, in my opinion, extending ICANN compliance policies downward to sub-regional entities would blur accountability and duplicate oversight. So, I think that ICP2 as it is now, not delving into policies related to sub-regional entities is fine. And thank you so much.

NICK NUGENT

Thank you, Hadia.

HERVÉ CLEMENT

And I see that Pari, you want to react?

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much. Yes, I think accountability is both upwards and downwards. And right now, as we have seen with the crisis, there is a governance crisis. Therefore, the aim of this whole ICP2 is to strengthen the governance and prevent vulnerabilities. As a result, I don't see that providing a baseline is undermining the bottom-up process. It's actually accountability is both ways, and we need to strengthen it. So, I do like to emphasize the need for some degree of baseline here. Thank you.

NICK NUGENT

Yeah, and again, we will take that, certainly, under consideration, regardless of what happens next, but you said that you'll submit a comment via ALAC, and that's great. Again, the more detail, the better for us. So, we would appreciate that.

HERVÉ CLEMENT

Yeah. Thank you. And for information, Akinori, you added on the chat that you will be happy to talk about this question. So you said that to Hadia. And for information, Nick, Akinori and I, inter alia, will be present in Dublin. So for people from the ICANN community who can be in Dublin, but Dublin is not the only place, of course, we can

discuss ICP2, but we can have the opportunity to discuss on-site, for people who can.

NICK NUGENT

Great, effective use of a legal term there, Hervé. Inter Alia. I'm impressed, by the way.

HERVÉ CLEMENT

I try to improve. Well, we have three minutes left. I guess we have time if there are any other questions. Of course, I don't see additional questions, but feel free to ask.

NICK NUGENT

Okay. Questions or comments, because I see also.

HERVÉ CLEMENT

People from the region, so legal, communication, etc. So it's not an obligation, of course, but everybody is free to intervene. Anil, so you submitted a question in the Q&A, that's right, but I see that your question was answered, and it was a question regarding universal acceptance. And so you wanted to be sure that there should be a process, that we should pay attention that our processes are, can be, universally accepted, or something like that. If you can re-ask your question?

ANIL JAIN

In the draft of ICP2, I can see that there is a line saying that communication between RIRs and between RIRs and ICANN can be multilingual. But my question is that there is software which is being used within RIRs to communicate with NIRs, LIRs, and members. Now, whether this software is mandated to be universal acceptance software, or it is left to our RIRs to decide? Thank you.

NICK NUGENT

You want me to tackle that real quick, Hervé?

HERVÉ CLEMENT

My answer will be in two parts. So, it can be seen as an implementation procedure, something like that. So it can be in a separate document, to be sure that this software or functionality can be used. It's something we can understand, but it can be seen also as a principle, so for everybody to be able to communicate and to be understood, and for the community at large to be able to reach every organization also. So it can be part of the principle as well. We are not against universal acceptance, of course, but it can be seen as part of the operational procedures. Nick?

NICK NUGENT

Yeah, and the document speaks to that issue also in that the inter-RIR, the way that RIRs communicate with each other, and with ICANN, English is the language of the RIR system, so that must be available in English. It doesn't mean that there can't be additional languages, but in terms of how the RIRs conduct intra-RIR business,

including with respect to its members, can be in whatever appropriate language. But then beyond that, as Hervé mentioned, that would probably be an implementation detail that would live in the implementation procedures, although that's a good piece of feedback that the NRO and ICANN would probably want to hear.

ANIL JAIN

Thank you, Nick. I hope that this comment can be taken during implementation guidelines. Thank you.

HERVÉ CLEMENT

Thank you. Okay, I see for me in Paris time it's 06:00 PM, so 16:00 UTC. I don't know, Ozan, will you take the floor now?

OZAN SAHIN

Thank you, Hervé and Nick, and everyone who participated. This session is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]