
ICANN84 | AGM – At-Large Plenary 1: RIRs at a Crossroads-Governance Gaps Reg Challenges and ICANN's Role
Tuesday, October 28, 2025 – 10:30 to 12:00 IST

MICHELLE DESMYTER

Thank you. Hello and welcome everyone to the At-Large Plenary 1, RIRs at a Crossroads, Governance, Gaps, Regional Challenges, and ICANN's Role. My name is Michelle DeSmyter, and I am the remote 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 will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod.

Interpretation for today's session will include English, French, and Spanish. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record, the language you will speak, if speaking a language other than English, and please speak at a reasonable pace. I will now hand the floor over to Pari Esfandiari.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much, and a very warm welcome to everyone joining us here in Dublin and to those participating online from around the world. My name is Pari Esfandiari and it's a pleasure to moderate together with Hadia Elminiawi this ALAC plenary titled

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.

RIRs at a Crossroads: What AFRINIC Reveals About Regional and Global Governance.

The AFRINIC experience has prompted important reflection across the internet community on how the regional internet registry governance model must evolve to rebuild trust, strengthen accountability, and ensure effective coordination in a rapidly changing environment. These events have not only exposed areas of vulnerability but also opened the door for renewal, a chance to strengthen transparency, reinforce collaboration, and ensure that the system remains resilient and fair for all regions.

Our goal today is to foster a constructive forward-looking dialogue within the ICANN community, not to revisit existing processes such as the ongoing ICP-2 update, but to complement them. We aim to explore how the culture and practice of RIR governance can evolve to restore confidence, reinforce clarity of roles, and foster greater equity and balance among stakeholders. This conversation is particularly timely for end users, those who feel the most direct impact when systems are tested. Issues of trust, continuity, and coordination ultimately affect everyone who relies on a stable and inclusive internet.

Today's session will unfold in several parts. First, I will briefly outline the recent developments that have brought us here. Then, we will hear from our distinguished panelists. We will move from panel discussion to open Q&A, allowing for both in-room and online participation, and conclude with closing reflections.

To frame today's discussion, let's recall the basics. RIRs are not-for-profit, member-driven organizations that allocate and manage IP addresses and autonomous system numbers under ICANN's coordination. Their accountability operates on two levels, globally to uphold technical stability and coordination, and regionally to ensure open bottom-up decision making. This dual structure is what gives the system its balance and credibility.

AFRINIC, the youngest of the five RIRs, encountered a convergence of governance and institutional challenges that escalated into a crisis. Disputes over financial management, elections, and transparency strained community trust. By 2021, an extended legal battle in Mauritius disrupted its operations. At one point, AFRINIC's ability to perform its essential functions was severely limited, a first in the RIR system's history.

It's important to note that this was not a failure of the RIR model itself, but rather a stress test revealing gaps in oversight, accountability, and crisis management that can inform stronger governance across all regions. When one RIR faces difficulty, the ripple effect reaches the entire internet ecosystem.

The AFRINIC case reminds us that the RIR framework relies on mutual trust, transparency, and coordination, both within region and globally. As the internet becomes more politically and economically contested, strengthening that trust requires reflection and renewal. The question before us is not whether the

governance model works, but how we ensure it continues to work effectively, fairly, and inclusively as new pressures emerge.

AFRINIC has since resumed operation, and the community has responded proactively. The ongoing update of internet coordination policy, which defines how RIRs are recognized, reviewed, and, if necessary, de-recognized, is introducing valuable reforms such as regular audits, clear accountability criteria, and continuity mechanisms. Yet these necessary procedural updates also surface broader governance concerns, namely whether there is sufficient shared understanding of the principles that sustain accountability and trust, and whether procedural reforms alone can succeed without a stronger community culture of inclusivity, transparency, and shared responsibility.

That is what we will explore today, not by revisiting the mechanics of ICP-2, but by reflecting on the governance values and practices that give it meaning and long-term resilience. We have a distinguished panel representing diverse perspectives from across the ICANN community. They are familiar faces who need no introduction, so to save time, I will forgo introduction. Next slide.

Our discussion will be guided by three overarching questions. They are displayed on the screen. I will begin with the first question and invite each of you to share your perspective. The question is, how can strengthening ICP-2 help ensure that RIR governance remains fit for purpose, and what additional measures might enhance its credibility and effectiveness? Aziz, as the new vice president of the

AFRINIC board, you have had first-hand experience with governance challenges in your region. From that perspective, how would you respond?

AZIZ HILALI

Thank you, Pari. I am a member and also the vice chair of the new board of the AFRINIC board. From AFRINIC experience, as you said, we learned that the RIR model is still strong in principle, but too fragile in practice when legal and institutional protections are weak. AFRINIC crisis showed us how a regional internet registry can become legally vulnerable when it is registered as a local association or a private company subject to national laws. This exposes it to abusive litigation, external pressure, and private actors trying to capture common internet resources for their own gain.

That's why the update of ICP-2, in my point of view, is so important. It brings lessons from AFRINIC to make the whole RIR system more transparent, accountable, and resilient. It should also not only define the criteria for recognition and derecognition, but also ensure that RIRs enjoy a clear international statute that protects them from political or commercial interference.

We also need to go further by adding periodic reviews, stronger audit requirements, and clear communication with the resource members. One decay of the problem of AFRINIC is many AFRINIC members are still inactive. Very few vote or participate in PDP. Rebuilding confidence requires to engage in the community, not

just rewriting the rules. So ICP-2 is a solid foundation, but the community participation and legal safeguards are the two real case to long-term trust in the RIR system. Thank you.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much. And with that, I would go to Hervé. In your role as chair of the address support organization, you oversee coordination across all RIRs. From that vantage point, how would you approach this?

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you, Pari, and thank you, Aziz, for your first answer regarding ICP-2 and the work we are performing about that. First, I am the chair of the ASO AC, who is a part of the ASO, and just beside me, Hans Peter, is the chair of the NRO NC, which is the other part of the ASO, so we try to be as simple as possible.

The ICP-2, it was an old document adopted in 2001, and it listed the criteria for the establishment of original inter-territory history, and with that, as it is a 25-year-old document, it has to be updated. And when updating the criteria for the establishment of original inter-territory history, in a certain way, you consolidate the system and consolidate the trust, so the members of the community can have regarding this document.

And there is another aspect of the work of updating ICP-2, which is important, is that this criteria can be used also for the ongoing life of original inter-territory history, and can be used, and you say,

Aziz, that to enforce the trust, audits. And something like that can be useful. And this updated ICP-2 can be used for audits, and it will be in the future, a plan that audits can be performed as well.

So this aspect of having strong criteria, and the strong criteria are here with the precise definition to give, finally, a consolidation in this task, and the possibility of audits, so driving in a certain sense a step further to consolidate one more time the system. Thank you.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much. And with that, I go to Hans. You're leading one of the most established RIRs. You bring valuable operational knowledge. What insight can you share from your experience?

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Thank you very much. And first, I would like to welcome Aziz to the table. It's really great to see that we have an AFRINIC board back, so to you and your colleagues on the board, it's really great to see you taking seats and taking charge of AFRINIC now.

Yeah, the RIPE NCC is the first RIR to get established in the '92. APNIC came soon after, and then a while later, ARIN. The governance of the RIRs goes back to documents being written in the beginning of the 90s, and then ICP-2 came, and now we're reviewing that. So we have a long period of time where the governance of the system has actually been evolving. It's not static, and I think that's very important for the organizations, but also for the community, because the RIPE NCC do not do this for

our own sake. We do it for our members and for our community at large.

I had a discussion last week at the RIPE meeting when we discussed the future strategy, and there was a call for more involvement or outreach to government, and I think my response to that has been that, well, governments are part of the community. They need to participate because of the multi-stakeholder nature here. So just sitting and waiting until something goes wrong is a bit passive approach, either for the community or for government.

So taking active part and coming with improvement suggestions where needed, and I think Aziz made an excellent point in us being a non-for-profit membership organization in one country under the protection of that country, and of course, we have duties under the legislation, but the country is also supposed to protect its citizens and its organizations.

What I really would need as the RIPE NCC is protection from all the 70-plus countries in my region, and how do we create that? Because it's not that I want the governments to come in and take over, but I need their support and protection from exactly the threats that was described here.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much, Hans. With that, we go to John. From ICANN's technical coordination perspective, what is your opinion?

JOHN CRAIN

So as you can hear by the previous speakers, this is quite a complex area, but I'll stick to the ICP-2 question. So when these issues started to emerge as ICANN, the first thing we look to is what are the documentations we have, what are the processes we have in place what is our expected responsibility and roles? And that, for the greatest part, in the addressing world, the IP addressing world, is ICP-2.

So the first thing we do is we take that out and we look at it and we say, well what does this give us? And it became clear fairly quickly that ICP-2 was written at a time, 25 years ago, as people have already said, when the problem space we had was how do you have a predictable mechanism for recognizing a regional Internet registry? It's written for a very specific problem in a specific time. And because of ICANN, and this might be one of my pet peeves, I think people know that I do come from the regional Internet registry world, is that we spend a lot of time focusing on the issues around the namespace and very little time looking at the other identifiers that are important.

So ICP-2 hadn't really had a refresh or a good look because we'd had no real problems for almost 25 years. So ICP-2biz, the new version of ICP-2, is attempting to solve some of those questions. And what you'll see is it goes beyond recognition, obviously all the way to derecognition, but the most important part in my mind is the middle piece, which is about the continuity of RIRs and what

are the expectations from them and what are the expectations from ICANN.

So we've heard talks about having checks along the way that services are being delivered, etc., which all seem extremely obvious, but when you wrote a document 25 years ago, that was not the mindset. So I think ICP-2 is a fantastic move forward. We should not see it as one and done because what we don't want to do is develop something now that is good for this particular point in time and then forget that the world evolves around us. So ICP-2 coming back, we have another document called the ICP-2 implementation document, which is how ICANN and the IANA will take ICP-2 and actually implement it.

I suspect after ICP-2 biz, I'm not quite sure what we're calling it yet, we will have an ICP-2 implementation biz that will look at that, and I suspect we will continue to learn lessons, and I suspect we will continue to see change going forward, and that will provide stronger, better, more predictable governance.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much, John. And what I hear is legal vulnerabilities, need for protection, proactive participation, and of course, living document, ICP-2 as a living document. With that, I'd like to come to you, Wolfgang, with your broad experience in Internet governance and multi-stakeholder process. How do you view this question?

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER Yeah, thank you very much. And we should not forget that the critical Internet resources, as IP addresses, domain names, protocols, and on, are public resources, and which has to be managed in the public interest, as neutral as possible. So we are, in this community, a service provider for the whole world. And this is based on trust, so that means in the supply chain, everybody expects that everybody understands its role. And this is an interrelationship based on trust. And what we have learned from the AFRINIC case is, we do not have enough instruments to react if somebody misuses the trust.

So this is, the whole AFRINIC case started with this misuse of trust, because we trusted that delegated address blocks are used in the region, and then somebody came and misused this trusted system. I think this is what we have to learn. But, what I have also seen, and I think this is an important encouragement, is, and I would call it digital solidarity, that as soon as the conflict appeared, the whole community was, came together, and made clear that AFRINIC is not alone.

So the NRO, the RIPE NCC, which was active in the region for many years before AFRINIC was established, so understood that that's the common responsibility. And so we have to work together to fix this problem. I think this is a very great encouragement to see that the system works, even if we have some problems. But there are

enough instruments available, even if it takes some time, and not everything is perfect, but we can settle these problems on our own.

I think this is an important message to, and another element, it's a message to governments. I think Hans Peter mentioned that the role of governments in the IP address should be not only accepted, but it's important, because governments are a stakeholder, they are part of the community.

So in the IANA transition, more or less the understanding was that governments will not step in as an oversight body, but they will remain in an advisory capacity, because they expected that the system will work. So if the system doesn't work, this could be seen as an invitation for governments to step in and to control it. But if we make clear that governments are part of the system and not oversight of the mechanism, I think this is important.

And insofar we can use this, what we call crisis or problems, to move forward and to enhance the multi-stakeholder system by making clear that all stakeholders have special responsibilities, and governments are part of this. They are not above the communities, they are part of this community. And insofar to move forward now with the ICP-2 and the implementation plan, so this signals the strengths of the community and not the weakness. Thank you.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much, and with that we go to our second question. What improvement in accountability, transparency, and inclusivity can reinforce RIR resilience and promote fairness for end users? With that, I would go to Hervé. Let's begin with you. You have a unique overview of coordination across all RIRs. From that system-wide vantage point, how can greater transparency and inclusivity be embedded across the RIR framework to ensure fairness for end users?

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you, Pari, one more time for this very important question. So just know that before the discussion on the work on ICP-2, so there's three words, accountability, transparency, inclusivity, are words that were still very important and very focused in the work of all the regions and all the regional and international histories. You say that, so you have the view and the coordination, so between the different regions, which is very important, so I can see that there is a common set that is the foundation of that.

On what I wanted to underline also, so we speak about AFRINIC, but when working on ICP-2, so the AFRINIC is not only the focus of the work, of course, but so the work we are doing is to strengthen the system at large, and of course cooperation is key about that. Saying that, so what improvement you say about that?

One more time, we were requested by the NRO NC to work on the update on the ICP-2. And if you read the current version, which is called the draft document, we have a certain number of function of

IDs that have been part of the global functioning and the ongoing functioning of regional and international histories and with its relationship with the membership and the community also.

For instance, if I can give example, we have the notion of impartiality, and if I read in the document, is a regional history must operate and apply its number resource policies in a manner that is impartial and consistent. So I think it can answer part of the question. Another word which is included in the document is transparency, and regional and international history must maintain and publish comprehensive records of its governance, activity, and finances in a timely and accessible manner.

The regional and international histories governance body must provide mechanism for its member to ask questions, provide input, receive timely and meaningful responses to legitimate questions. I think it's part of the question, and with that I am happy to give the floor to my colleagues. Thank you, Pari.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much. And I go to Hans. From an operational standpoint, what practical measures or practices have proven effective in enhancing accountability and community engagement?

HANS PETTER HOLEN

So thank you for that. I was reflecting a bit on the first part that you didn't ask me on how can I improve transparency, because we're

doing so much. We're providing annual reports, we're now doing security audits and we're sharing the results and so on and so on. We're doing reports from law enforcement interaction and sanctions reports and whatever. So if anyone has ideas on more transparency, we're all ears, but it also comes with the cost. And involving the community in this is something that's close to our heart.

We do, as part of our accountability to our members, we hold general meetings that elect the board and report, but parts of those general meetings for the RIPE NCC are actually open to the community in a services working group where we hold the presentations that would normally be in the general meeting, so you can actually participate in a discussion regarding there.

Inclusivity is important to us, and we have just improved our Fellows program in order to get new people not only invited, but also help them to stay. So constantly working on this to make sure that it's not only those that's been there for 30 years. My first RIPE meeting was 30 years ago as a community member, but we need the next generation in, and we need their ideas, and we need to continue, and this is a never-ending game.

We will never get perfect in transparency and inclusivity, but this is what hopefully makes us seem accountable not only to our members or to the Dutch government that has the legal oversight because we're incorporated in the Netherlands, but to all

governments of the whole world and all stakeholders in the whole world. Thank you.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much. And Aziz, with AFRINIC's recent governance challenges, from your point of view, what steps do you think are most important now to strengthen accountability and rebuild trust in your region?

AZIZ HILALI

Thank you, Pari. AFRINIC's recovery shows that governance culture matters as much as structure. I think good bailouts alone cannot ensure stability. What really matters is a culture of transparency, accountability, and cooperation. Rules are important, but they must be supported by open communication, honest reporting, as my friend Harvey said, and a sense of shared responsibility within the community. When decisions are made openly and everyone can see how and why they are taken, trust grows, and that is what keeps RIR strong in difficult times.

For governance, I think ICANN should support, coordinate and accompany RIRs in their mission. We don't need more centralization. We need solidarity between region and shared framework of good practices. A practical idea would be crisis support mechanism between ICANN, the NRO and the RIR to assist any registry facing legal or operational difficulty which was happened in AFRINIC.

We must continue investing in capacity building so that Africa can fully participate and bring balance to global Internet governance. At AFRINIC, we already started. The new board is working hard to rebuild trust. We already started the reactivation of governance committees, launch of external audits for 2022 and 2024, relaunch the policy development PDB, and preparation for full review of the bailouts to increase participation and accountability.

This step, I think, proves that we can reform deeply while staying true to the RIR model, as long as transparency, inclusion, and accountability remain. That's the heart of our culture. Thank you.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much, Aziz. You have a very hard task ahead of you. With that, I move to John. From ICANN's technical and institutional perspective, what improvement in accountability, transparency, and inclusivity can reinforce RIR resilience and promote fairness for end users?

JOHN CRAIN

I'll try and take the three words separately. So I think the improvements in expectations that will come with ICP-2, hopefully with the implementation thereof coming also with measurable expectations, will increase some of the accountability to the more global community. All of the RIRs, I think, have mechanisms to be accountable to their members, and those will differ by RIR, but they all have them.

So on accountability, I think ICP-2 will come a long way. You can't have accountability to a global community without the second word, which is transparency. Now, as you know here at ICANN, we sometimes get accused of being overly transparent, but I don't think you can ever be transparent enough around such things. So transparency is something you do. It's something you live. It's not just a word.

So you have to have a lot of trust to be transparent as well. It's hard being transparent. We can all throw that word around as though it's the easiest thing in the world, but it's not. It takes an active, sort of, almost, it has to be in your geist. It has to be what you do. It has to be what you live every day to increase that transparency, and I think there is a lot of transparency in the RIR systems.

I think, unfortunately, in the crisis that was happening, and people use that word, but whether you call it crisis or challenges or whatever, the situation AFRINIC was in, the legal system was the issue that created a lack of transparency. I don't think for a second that those that were at AFRINIC didn't want to be more transparent. It's just the way the legal system, and trust me, I spent a lot of time on the island in legal offices and with lawyers and talking to people in the jurisprudence. Not all legal systems are equally transparent, and it was one of the problems.

I had personally worked with, for example, the receivers, and I don't blame them for this. It was a cultural thing. When I went to them and said, well, we should just publish all of this, and we

should be transparent, and you should get on calls with the community, they just didn't understand. They weren't living that culture. And we have to realize that when we interact with people outside of our bubbles, not everybody has that culture, so we just need to live it ourselves and promote it. I believe that's happening.

On inclusivity, yes, we can all do more. I mean, we're constantly improving our Fellows program and our next-gen program, and we're always trying to bring people in. Do we get it right? Probably not all the time, but we're always trying. I know the RIRs have similar things. The RIPE NCC person working on their fellowship program has been talking to the people working on our fellowship program, so there are lessons we can learn from each other because we can learn from them, too.

The thing that I found most encouraging, because no crisis comes without an opportunity, is the thing that Wolfgang was talking about, the way the community came together. The RIRs and ICANN staff and CEOs and lawyers talk constantly. Before this crisis, it was, we'd reach out sometimes, they'd reach out sometimes, we'd have NRO discussions, ASO discussions, but now we've built a much closer working relationship and a much better understanding of each other. So I think the future looks bright, or at least a lot brighter. And we have Aziz, we have a part of the governance solution solved. So I think as long as we all live by those words and what those words mean, I think we'll be in a better place.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much, John. Allow me to ask you a further question. I'm all for bottom-up, but during the crisis, what role ICANN could play?

JOHN CRAIN

So during the actual crisis, we had the challenge of ensuring that we played our role and did not overstep our bounds, right? So as a neutral interested party, so not completely neutral because we were interested party, we interacted heavily with people on the island. When the receiver was appointed, I believe on the Friday, the first question was, can ICANN help? And I was on the island on Monday. And it's a good 32 hours flight, so I don't quite know how I did that. And regular conversations with the RIRs, with people on the legal system, but remembering that we have to be neutral.

So we could not overstep our bounds. You know, a lot of people would have liked ICANN to have stepped in and just solved this problem. That is not our role in this case, or was not our role. So we were happy to be helpful. We were happy to do everything we could, and we did that in coordination with other parties through discussions to make sure that we fulfilled our role and understood it. Remember, we had an ICP-2 that was not clear so that we put bounds around our role and that we work within that. So, absolutely, we were there and we will be there going forward, but

we need to set these expectations, if you like, which is what ICP-2 once again is about.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much. With that, we go to Wolfgang. During your long engagement in Internet governance, how do you view the balance between autonomy and accountability in achieving fairness for end users?

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER

Thank you. This is a very broad question. And I would start in saying transparency is the key to rebuild trust, which will promote fairness for end users. So this is a chain which has different elements, and you cannot take just one element out of it because one is dependent from the other side.

And as John has said we are in this community, we have reached a high level of transparency, but we live not alone in the world. We are surrounded by other communities which do not like transparency, some hate transparency, prefer to negotiate behind closed doors. And so this makes life difficult because we provide a service to communities which are disconnected from ICANN, using the service, but have their own bubbles and their own communities which are rather different from our community. So this is a mismatch. And we have to live with this and to say what we can do. So the best thing is to produce good examples so that we try to

convince others to follow our example because it works and it's successful.

And insofar, the question is for ourselves, for this community, do we have met our homework or are there areas where we have to enhance the level of transparency? I'm not an expert in the IP4 and IP6 addresses, but my understanding or my observation is while the allocation of IP6 is rather transparent, so that it's very clear, so there are some open questions about what happens with the unused blocks for IP4.

So we know there's huge imbalances for historical reasons. So, when this started 20, 30 years ago, everybody could get the IP4 address blocks because at this time, nobody could imagine we need more than four billion IP4 addresses. But then already in the middle of the 90s, we realized we went to IP version 6. But now we have this imbalance between the allocation of IPv4 and IPv6, or the imbalance is more with IPv4. And this triggered also the AFRINIC problem because they got the rest of the blocks and then the misuse started.

So that means if we want to bring good examples for transparency, we have to produce good examples and to be clear as much as we can. Thank you.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much. And we move now to third question. In an era of digital interdependence, how should responsibility for

managing internet resources be shared and what form of accountability and openness best support the global public interest? With that, I go to John. And I'd like you to think about from ICANN point of view, how should responsibility for managing internet resources be shared, and what form of accountability and openness best support the global public interest? I know you touched on it, but let's go deeper.

JOHN CRAIN

I think we should do it the way ICANN does it with its community. I mean, that's the easy answer. I mean, I'm in my bubble, right? So I come from this multi-stakeholder environment. So I've been doing this for 30 plus years, probably I'd argue longer than ICANN has existed. And it's always seems obvious to me that this is the model, but I think one of the things we need to do is we need to question ourselves and our model on a regular basis and see how we bring in other players and understand their perspective.

Just what Wolfgang was just talking about, right? It's not only that there are people out there that do not necessarily believe or understand this model, there are also people who have a different opinion. And I think going back to transparency, etc., it's good for us to bring those people in. I still believe that this model where we bring the governments into the room, we bring the users in through at large into the room, we bring in the operators into the room, and we bring everybody who is affected by this, because let's face it, it

is a global resource and there are lots of different cuts of this pie, different views of how things should work, and we bring them in.

So I still truly believe in this model. There is a if you come to ICANN, I'm not sure if it's them we can hear or it's the room further over, but we have a government advisory committee, so we bring in governments, we have an ISP group, we have the root server operators are all here at RSAC, we have ALAC. So I think I like this model, but we have to understand that not everybody does, and we have to learn to not only bring them into our atmosphere and bring them to where, say, come discuss with us, we also need to go to them and learn to speak in their language, too.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much, John. With that, I go to Hervé. Building on that, as an ASO chair, how can the RIR system strike the right balance between regional autonomy and collective accountability to the global Internet community?

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

So I can speak, so as you say, my role of chair of the ASO is here regarding this model. And I think I can join in this position, saying that, so we are based in a multistakeholder model which is, from my point of view, is a pretty good one for this question of managing resources. When I go note my role in part of Orange on the end user of resources, what I say, being part of Orange, to the different affiliates, to the end user, is that, so the model we have, the

governance model, is a good one because it aims to be allocated resources, I would say, in a good quality, and finally, at a price, the tariff, which is very interesting compared to other models we could have.

If you talk about accountability, and so there is a system where it's up to the community to build policies and to have a consensus-based something, to have policies to be adopted, and for the regional internet registries to use these policies to manage these resources, finally.

So finally, you have still this accountability, and you have the openness, because all the policy discussions and all the way the regional internet registries manage the resources with a database, with reliable databases, which are called OEs. Finally, you have this notion of accountability, of openness, and you also know the possibility of transferring resources, so the end user, finally, has a lot of tools in their hands to have, I won't say a control, but see that those resources are managed, from my point of view, in a good way, finally. So that's the first point.

And so, regarding the issue of interdependence of the association of the different regions, the cooperation, coming back to ASO AC and ICP-2, we added what is called a concept of emergency continuity in case of specific disasters, issues, a lot of things that can help in specific situations for the different regions to support themselves in the case of the management of their resources, but I won't go into details about that. Thank you.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much. Important points made. With that, I go to Hans. From RIPE NCC's experience in collaborative governance, what approaches have worked best in promoting shared responsibility and openness?

HANS PETTER HOLEN

So thank you for that question. Our starting point that our meetings are open to anyone that's interested in governance. We don't create constituencies, but we bring everybody together around topics. So we have working groups on address policy, or on IPv6, or on routing, so everybody, whether they're end users, civil society, internet engineers, or governments, can actually chip in and discuss. You don't even have to be present at the meetings, you can participate remotely, and discussions happen on mailing lists. So that's been our thinking in bringing things together.

Now, over the years, realizing that governments may not speak as freely as others in open forums, we also organize government roundtables. So we have a long tradition on bringing governments in the EU together. In Brussels, we also have roundtables for quite some years in the Middle East. We have it in Southeastern Europe, and we're working on establishing good relations with governments also in Central Asia. So it's not a one-size-fits-all approach here, but bringing everybody around the table on topics is what we see as the important thing here.

And looking at the words you put on the screen here, digital independence, it's important to realize that the internet has no national borders. On the other hand, we have governments that want to have control within their national borders. And on the third dimension, we have global players, platforms, that centralize services here, while you as the end user, to sort of take the ALAC perspective in here, you really want to own your own content.

And how do you do that? You put it on a huge platform, owned by a company in a completely different country on the other side of the world, or do you put it in your own living room, which today still creates or needs a quite different level of technical expertise to do?

And how do we find the right balance there? So in the numbers governance, we have a tiered system. There is responsibility for managing the global pool with IANA through global policy processes, set by the community through the RIRs, and then the regional internet registries, like RIPE NCC, also have local internet registries, the members, that manage the resources to their customers.

So it's at least three-layer structure here, where we try to do this as distributed as possible. And I think that's an important thing to think here, that it's not the RIRs that manage the resources, it's their community, it's their members collectively, and we collectively come together in the address reporting organization with ICANN in a bottom-up fashion. So I still believe in that.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much for those very insightful comments. And with that, I go to Aziz. From the perspective of the AFRINIC community, how do you see regional responsibilities aligning with global expectations in managing internet resources? Over to you, Aziz.

AZIZ HILALI

Thank you, Pari. I think this question is very related to the previous question, and goes to the heart of internet governance, not only in AFRINIC, but in the global point of view. No single actor, not ICANN, not RIR, not government or private sector, should have full control of internet resources. As the professor said, it's a good for the global users in the world. And this global public goods and their management must reflect shared responsibility.

The RIR must continue their operational role, driven by the system of bottom-up and community-based model. ICANN should ensure the role of ICANN is to ensure global coordination and coherence. And the role of government is mainly to have a role to protect institutions, offer legal stability, and defend the public interests without interfering in technical issues. If any one actor dominates the balance that makes this system work, it will collapse. We must therefore keep this balance alive through openness, dialogue, and trust between all parts of the ecosystem.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much, Aziz. And with that, I go to Wolfgang. You heard from technical community and problems they're facing. You know about a specific problem that AFRINIC is facing. With your broad perspective on internet governance, how do you see global interdependence reshaping the principles of responsibility and transparency in internet resource management?

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER

I think the best way to promote, to support the global public interest is the further enhancement and development of the multi-stakeholder approach, because this is such a broad complex with so many aspects, and no single party can manage all this on their own. So that means it needs the various groups within the various stakeholder groups. You have already many constituencies.

ICANN is seen as part of the technical community, but ICANN has a lot of various constituencies, and so the business, the civil society, and governments are very diverse, and only if everybody works hand in hand, we can best support the global public interest. But saying this, we should be aware that this is not shared by a lot of other constituencies, in particular some governments.

So I see year by year that some governments, in particular Russia, in the ITU Council Working Group on Internet, tries to question the role of this multi-stakeholder model, and says we need an intergovernmental body or a governmental oversight committee instead of a governmental advisory committee for ICANN. Just recently in September, it was six weeks ago, Russia introduced a

questionnaire in the Council Working Group asking four questions, and one question was, do you believe that a public resource can be managed by a private corporation?

So this was indirect an attack against ICANN. So the Working Group could not decide on the questionnaire, so the plan of Russia was to distribute this questionnaire to all 193 member states of the ITU, and then to collect munition for challenging the system.

But the chair of the Council Working Group said, okay, we cannot discuss it here, this goes beyond the mandate of the Council Working Group on Internet, but we have next year the Plenipotentiary ITU in Doha, and this could be a place where we can continue the discussion on this. So this will not go away. So we will have some governments which will challenge the system, and the best way to counter this is to produce, without any noise, excellent services.

So that means as long as ICANN delivers domain names, IP addresses, if the root server system works, and if this is happening without big noise, because it's the machinery room which has to work and to provide the services to everybody, then we are on the safe side.

If we fail to deliver the service to the global community, without any exception, and so far also the decision not to remove the .ru domain from the root server as it was called for by the Ukrainian minister, so certainly Ukraine has all the support from ICANN community. But ICANN managed this in a neutral way, the IP

addresses, the domain names, the zone files. So, as long as we can deliver this, we are on the safe side. But if we fail, then we have probably a problem.

And while I do not see any chance that the proposals from Russia will get a majority in the next ITU conference, but the arguments are on the table and we have to recognize this. Thank you.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much. Thank you, all. That was a truly rich discussion. We have explored accountability, trust, and the evolving balance between regional and global responsibility. Now let's bring the voices of the community. The floor is open for your questions, reactions, and reflections, both in person and online. Participants are welcome. And there is a mic going around, so anybody has a question, please raise your hand. I am going to pass the floor to Hadia, because I know there are questions online.

HADIA ELMINIAMI

Thank you, Pari, and thank you to our panelists for this discussion. We have a question from John McCormack. It says, some of the assumptions about IP allocations on a country or regional Internet registry basis may have been made in a time when Internet infrastructure was at an earlier stage of development.

The AFRINIC situation may have been caused by a shortage of IP addresses in some countries served by regional Internet registries like AFRINIC to be targeted and an IP address secondary market to

emerge. Can the situation with AFRINIC, much of the allocations ending up being used in Hong Kong, rather than Africa as a region, be resolved? So, I don't know who wants to take this question.

AZIZ HILALI

I will switch in French, if you like. Take your headphones, please. I will be more comfortable. So, as regards the Internet resources, we need to come back to our history. I saw the birth of AFRINIC in 2005 in Mar del Plata. I don't remember the meeting it was, but we were very happy. We were the last RIR to have been created. But the problem is that given that Africa was late compared to the others, we had less than 2% of all of IPv4 addresses allocated to us, amongst all which existed. And one end user from North America had the ability to have 10 IP addresses, IPv4 addresses, while in Africa there was one address for 10 people.

So, as long as there's a lack of IP addresses, well, this lack of IP addresses motivated some people who wanted to generate profit, and they went to Africa, and they tried and grabbed some of these addresses. I will not go into the details of this because it lasted for some years, and it ended up with what we have today. That's why we are fighting to get IPv6 addresses in our continent. We want for these addresses to be better used amongst our members.

Earlier I said that we have a problem with our members. I personally have worked with someone from AFRINIC, and we went literally door to door to see our members. And some of those who are considered as big customers of AFRINIC did not even know that

they could vote. This is a problem. that weakens the regional registries, and specifically in Africa.

Another problem we have is a lack of involvement. And here I'm also referring to the telecom operators because they are the ones who have the biggest demand for IP addresses. But we need to encourage them, motivate them, raise awareness. The crisis AFRINIC went through ended up with positive results because now the community believes that these issues when managing Internet resources need to be solved and we hope to do better in the future. Thank you.

PARI ESFANDIARI

We go to John. John has a comment.

JOHN CRAIN

It's not precisely on what Aziz was saying, but there is a lot of historical context here that often gets missed. So you will hear about disparity in the division of IP addresses all the time. And it's true. There is disparity. But even in the more developed places like the U.S. and Europe, there is also disparity, right? So originally, so around the early 1990s, we realized as a community that we were going to run out of IPv4 addresses at some point if we continued going further. And we did something called classless inter-domain routing, which is the way we do IPv4 today. But before that, we didn't, right?

So you will see somebody have a large network, but not massive network, have what we would call today a slash 8 of address space, which is, I think the incorrect word is ginormous. It's really big. But back then, it wasn't, right? That was just the way routing was done. It was called a class A back in the day. So that's the classful routing system, and we went into the classless routing system. And at that point, and I remember it well, we had a lot of discussions about disparity. Why did the guy six months ago get what we would have called a slash 16? Why did they get a B address and we get a slash 24 or we get a slash 23 to basically the equivalent of 2C addresses?

So there has been disparity throughout, but it's not always caused by policy. Sometimes it's also caused by technological changes. So we need to remember that and at least have it as a context in the back of our head. It's not like somebody just decided one day that we would do things differently. There were actual technological changes throughout the history of the Internet that have caused some of these, and hopefully the one that we'll take off is IPv6. That's a new technological change caused by some of the same problems. At a certain point, we realized we were going to run out of IP addresses. So we've been here before, and it caused disparity the last time. It's causing disparity this time.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

So I will take a question from the floor, and then we go back to the chat. So Bachar, yes, you can go ahead. Please introduce yourself first.

ABDELDJALIL BACHAR BONG

Hello, everyone, and thank you very much for this very enriching session. I'm Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong. I'm the incoming vice chair of AFRALO. And as a member of the community, we would like to thank all of the RIRs, because it's thanks to your efforts and the efforts of Smart Africa, specifically, that AFRINIC could exit this crisis that I even call a war.

So according to your experience, based on your experience, what would you give? What advice, what recommendations would you give to the African community so that we do not end up with such of a same crisis? Is the ICP who has to give us recommendations? I don't know. What are your recommendations from the perspective of RIRs? During this crisis, we spoke with local communities, for example, in Chad. We worked with ICT operators, and we realized that the members were not very involved. They used the resources of AFRINIC, but they did not want to vote on anything. They paid their bills, but they did not want to involve themselves.

And the government, well, of course, we will never accept for the government to take control over all of this. So we need to strike a balance with the involvement of the government and the community, the role of the community. We don't want governments to have a total role here, total control.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you very much. I'm going to be answering in French. And here I'm going to take my hat of Orange, a telecom operator. I'm a member of Orange. We work in countries in Europe and in Africa. So I was involved in the African elections. The good thing with the African elections is that it allowed us to mobilize a lot of the members in Africa on these issues. And this is the benefit to some of the problems we have in Africa.

Many members, CEOs, operational managers, well, they realized how important AFRINIC was. They understood the role of AFRINIC. And they realized that they not only have bills to pay, but they also had a lot of responsibilities. And within Orange, we have a lot of employees, and the CEOs most of the time don't know the operational managers. So this allowed us also to meet each other and to get acquainted with one another.

Now, you were asking for advice, for recommendations. Well, we are interested in the management system at Orange, but I'm also interested in the discussions that take place within the community. And the community is a key actor of our system. So what can we do?

Well, each member of the community as an individual needs to take an interest in what's happening and realize that I have my own interests, but I also have interests as a member of the community. And so they have to ask themselves what can they do in the service of all the others. For example, they can suggest management rules, management policies, which are constructive. And when we

discuss these policy suggestions, these proposals, well, the idea is to be constructive when discussing these issues. That's one first recommendation. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

Thank you. I guess we have another comment from the floor. Please introduce yourself first.

PIERRE BONIS

Thank you very much. My name is Pierre Bonise. I'm the CEO of AFNIC, the French Internet Registry. So I will speak in English because I just wanted to make a comment, especially on Wolfgang Kleinwaechter's approach. And after having welcomed Aziz, and that's so nice to have an AFNIC board member at this table, and what an AFNIC board member. I just wanted to come back, and I will end with a question, about the trust issue. You said that the rules have been made between people who trust each other.

And I wonder if it's not the original float, because, I mean, rules are not made for that. Rules are made for people who don't need to trust each other, but just need to trust the signature of the people who say that they are going to follow the rules. And maybe if we continue saying, oh, this is just a trust issue, if we are between people of good faith, there will be no problem. Bylaws are done for days where you have to face a problem. So maybe these bylaws were a little bit naive in a way, and maybe it's not only the AFNIC bylaws that were naive.

So this is a question that is hard to put on the table, but is there something, maybe in ICP-2, that is a lesson learned about all this crisis, and the fact that we need to recognize that the rules are stronger than the trust that we have with each other. And the second thing I just wanted to note is that, and that's a question, because we are talking about problems that have been brought on the table not by governments, but by private entities. So this thing of saying, is it fair that a private entity, I mean the Russian way saying the public goods must be ruled by the governments and everything that you said, okay, but private entities can be evil too. I think we have the example there.

So I'm not very sure, and I don't know if this opposition between government and private entities is fruitful. I think, and in Africa, as has been said, the governments have been involved because there were a crisis. And the real question there is, if ever there is a problem that is not a problem of distrust, but maybe a problem of operational problem, I don't know, there is a bomb or there is something, and one of the RIR disappears, is there an EBERO? Is there something we can build on from and put the operational things somewhere else? We have that in the domain name world. Not very sure that we have that in the IP world. And this is a question I want to ask you. Thank you very much, and sorry to have been a little bit long.

JOHN CRAIN

So good questions. I think rules gets read one way, and I think some of what you're talking about is predictable processes rather than rules. And they are important. ICP-2 is part of that. I don't know that we were naive when we did ICP-2 because our worldview was, and the world itself was very different.

I think the lesson I took away from it is you cannot let your processes and your policies sit in a box somewhere and not look at them in a regular basis. So the way we do it in operations, and obviously you're going from an operations background, is when we have a process or a policy, we dust it off every year or so or every six months, depending on how important it is, and we test it, right, and then we update it. And we didn't do that with these policies.

On the last question, that is a question that has been discussed, and I think Hans Peter will probably talk to this as well, that we've discussed with the RIRs about what does this look like. Now, probably not EBERO. EBERO was designed for a specific scenario, but the concept of ensuring that there is good resilience in your infrastructure and in your process and your people, et cetera, is something that every business needs to look like. The difference between somewhere like an RIR or ICANN is that we are in the public realm, so people expect a little bit more. What was that word we were using? Transparency around some of these things.

So absolutely, these are discussions that need to take place and will take place and I think will be in very good partnership, and I think some of it may come through ICP-2, and that will increase

transparency. So I think we're on a good path to that, but I'm going to let an actual RIR CEO talk a little bit to what they're doing. I think that's what he's going to do, or maybe not.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Thank you. Thank you, John. You jumped the queue here right now. I hear your questions as to take the RIPE NCC when that was set up as a legal entity in 1997 where those bylaws, those articles of association fit for today's world, and no, they were not. We have updated the articles of association frequently, and some say that, oh, it's too frequent that we update them. They should be stable over a long time.

But we have, for instance, learned from the AFRINIC situation that if the RIPE NCC board loses quorum, they still have the right to call for a general meeting. We don't have to go to the court for that. If I lose the whole board, the CEO, me, have the right to call for a general meeting so we can elect a new board.

So we kind of put that in proactively. We don't have to wait for a governance document to do that. We can learn from what's happening. And then what if there is neither a board nor me? Well, actually, there was a provision in there so 200 members can call for a general meeting. It's just a hassle to get 200 members. So the right thing in this situation is for the members to come together and elect a board.

And you could also even say in the AFRINIC situation, if everybody would be acting in good faith, there would have been a general meeting a long time ago, and nobody would bother about whether this is legally exactly within the board because electing a new board by the membership, if everybody gets appropriate notice and everybody does this in good faith, is the right thing.

The problem is, as you said, when people do not act in good faith anymore, then we need more detailed rules. So that's where the community grows up. And from when I started 30 years ago, it was very much focused on, but we don't need rules and procedures for everything. And I even hear today that, yeah, but can't the right people just do the right thing rather than following all these rules and procedures? And no, we can't today. We have to follow the processes and procedures in place in order to provide equal treatment and then transparency, the procedures are there so everybody can see how we do things.

So I think that's the one aspect that we need to evolve constantly. And, yeah, the other thing that you mentioned is what any democracy struggles with is voter turnout. How do you engage the people to actually vote? And we have a job to do there to educate and make sure that people understand that they have to get engaged. I think we, in the RIPE NCC region, we have 20,000 members. At best, we have 2,000 votes at the GM, depending on the topics.

Now that kind of increased by tenfold when we went to electronic voting, so that has developed over time as well. But when it comes to the policy process, there are even less people participating in that, and that is an issue that we're working with to see how can we improve that process.

And to your last point on escrow, I discussed this with data. The RIRs have copies of the WHOIS data between themselves, so that exists, but we have realized in the AFRINIC situation that for a domain name, you kind of need the email address and the credit card number and that identifies the domain name holder. It's a bit more complicated to establish holdership or the right to registration because that's the contractual relationship in the RIR system. So we figured out that now we realize that we may need to store more data and then in a proper escrow system. So at the last RIPE NCC board meeting, the board put an action on me to explore that and put in place a system for that.

And you can say that having the data there is the first step, but then there needs to be copies of systems and so on, so it's the first step of a long journey. And this is something that will be requirements in the new RIR governance document, but I don't see the need to wait for that to come in place to put this in place. So proactivity from the community, from the RIRs and from governments to at least give us advice before starting to discuss taking over. Feel free to share your thoughts and ideas on the governance document or on things that we can improve. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

Wolfgang?

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER

Yeah, I think everybody knows this slogan, trust is good, control is better. So it goes back, by the way, to Vladimir Ilyich Lenin 80 years ago. So that's not a new problem, how to find the right balance between trust, a trusted-based system and a rules-based system.

So my experience is that if you overrule, you end up with a bureaucracy that is counterproductive. So that means you have to find the right balance, and this is an iterative process. So that means you have to learn from your mistakes, and then you see where rules are needed.

I think what ICANN started also to be against a lot of rules, and then discovered some people called ICANN in the early days, it's a regulator, and they rejected it. ICANN is not a regulator. And then we realized that it's regulation by contracting, because you have to contract, so thousands of contracts, and the contracts create the regulatory framework. And this is unavoidable, leads to more bureaucracy.

So that's the dilemma you have, and you have to find the right way how to avoid an overregulation and keep a trust-based system. But as Hans Peter has said, this is based on good behavior. So if you have bad behavior, you have to have the rules in place. So I would

not call it a dilemma. That's the reality. And we have to face this and to be aware about this.

And let me make a final comment. When you said, okay, the governments are not the worst stakeholders now. Big tech companies are even worse. So I remember 20 years ago in the WSIS when Google was still the small company which doesn't do evil. So let's question this how evil is done today by Google and other tech companies.

But my understanding from the multi-stakeholder model is that governments are not the enemies, they are the partners. And they have to be part of this community, not in an oversight capacity. You know, under special circumstances in an advisory capacity as in ICANN. But in other Internet-related spheres like cybersecurity, for instance, they have the lead. And then the technical community and the business are in an advisory capacity.

So there is no one multi-stakeholder model as we know, but there are different models according to the specific issue. And management of critical resources is different from management cybersecurity. And so far, you have to be flexible. But I agree, and probably the WSIS+20 review is a good opportunity to check more directly what is the role of the private sector of the big tech companies.

And I'm a member of this sounding board now. And what I have repeated there again and again is if we discuss the future of the IGF and funding of the IGF. So 20 years ago, these tech companies did

not exist in the way it exists today. They are the beneficiaries from this development which was promoted by the WSIS process and the IGF. And they have a duty to pay back.

So that means if we talk about the financial crisis of the IGF, then the first address should be the big beneficiaries from the Internet development of the last 20 years. I think that is their responsibility to understand themselves as partner in a multi-stakeholder model and not as isolated and protected against any rules. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

Thank you so much, Wolfgang. And now I will read a question from the chat. And I read it exactly as it is. What positions ICANN has taken, reply government and Smart Africa involvements in AFRINIC, and what are the basis of those positions given that there has been no engagement with the community by ICANN on it, advocating particular governance structures?

I would like to understand whether ICANN leadership or staff participated in the development of Smart Africa's proposal to take over AFRINIC. Smart Africa claims a joint effort with ICANN, and this certainly is surprising to us in the Internet numbers registry community. If it is true, how does ICANN justify its participation without any community notice or engagement? If it is not the case, ICANN must make clear its actual involvement to avoid serious misunderstanding in the community, which could have serious consequences.

JOHN CRAIN

So I heard multiple questions in there. There was one about, I'm guessing it's the CAIGI, I think it is, that's coming out of the Coalition for Digital Africa. No, ICANN was not a participant in that. We are not a partner in forming that organization.

Our role, and we've published this in many places, so you can find this, has always been as a neutral player, and what we do, interestingly enough, it's what my group very much does inside this community, etc., is we actually explained to people, not just Smart Africa, lots of people who are asking these questions, what is ICP-2 and what is ICANN's role? So we do that for everybody. That is actually our role, and explaining what we do is part of what we do.

So I think our positions and our communiques into the AFRINIC situation have all been published. I think Amin knows that. I think he knows where to find them. And on the specific question, which I didn't quite understand, but I think that's what he was asking, no, we did not write any of that, etc. And yes, if we need to be clear about that at some point, or ask Smart Africa to be clearer about that, then absolutely, we did mention transparency, right? I think he may have actually sent us a similar email that we're looking at.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

Thank you. And now I move to Aftab. And please limit your intervention to 60 seconds because we are out of time.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI

Thank you, Aftab Siddiqui, incoming ALAC member. I'm not going to masquerade my question into a comment. Just knowing quite well that the accountability of RIR belongs to the members of their respective RIR, then extend it to their respective community. Knowing this structure very well, how do you want and how do you expect At-Large community to engage with the RIR governance document or any other document which comes forward in the future? How do you expect us to work with you? Or you just leave that to your respective community and then we can just have a discussion here every year? It's towards the ASO AC chair and the NRO NC chair.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Very briefly, so we are happy to have all comments of everything, inputs from every organization. You are part of a very strong, very useful organization, so very happy to work together. So I don't know if I say more about that.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Yes, so to add to that, all ALAC members are members of our communities and more than welcome to our regional meetings to participate directly in all the policy work we're doing there. So please welcome. I know that ALAC is actually sending and has sent people to the right meetings and we really appreciate that. But then At-Large, it's also more than welcome to come.

And then for any document that considers global policy or interaction with ICANN, there is also the possibility that will go through ICANN's process of public comments. So then you're more than welcome to submit comments there or ask for meetings with us on specific topics and we're more than happy to join you here at ICANN meetings to discuss matters of mutual interest.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

Thank you, Hans. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Thank you very much. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I just wanted to push on the words of my friend and compatriot Pierre Bonis, telling us we all have to tighten up the ship. And especially in regards to a regional Internet registry of last result, which I think is what you were alluding to. I'm not sure there's anything that's in any bylaws or any document that relates to that.

And talking about bylaws, I think the whole ISTAR community needs to tighten up its ship. We no longer live in the world that John Perry Barlow was speaking about in regards to the Declaration of Independence of the Internet. The world has changed very much, and everything has to be put on paper. And I despair when I then see that the ICANN ship is not really a ship, but is looking at a review of its reviews that looks more like a raft than anything else.

And at the same time, we also see the IETF Trust being transformed into an IETF, Intellectual Property Management Corporation. That required one community from this community to actually point out that the bylaws of the IETF, Intellectual Property Management Corporation, were completely ill-suited for the task that it had to do. Very unfortunate, but thankfully some people are watching. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

Okay, thank you so much. Hans, go ahead.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Yeah, thanks. I just thought I'd read out a comment from my colleague, John Curran, that he wrote in the chat here that regarding lessons learned. It's worth noticing that the Internet numbers community predates ICANN and has operated successfully for decades and has robust governance structures in each region.

AFRINIC experienced a particular set of circumstances that precluded the members from being able to self-correct its governance. As a result of seeing this, the RIRs set forth the ICP-2 update process in November, and this is what we're doing to rectify that. So I just wanted to give John, who is not here, the ability to be heard as well. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

Thank you so much. And I will apologize to those who have their cards up and their hands up because we are already over time. I want to thank you all for participating in this session. Please, if you have questions, email them, and we will try to get your answers back. Thank you, and thank you to all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]