

---

SINGAPORE - ASO Information Session  
Wednesday, February 11, 2015 – 15:30 to 16:45  
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This is ASO Information Session, in the Padang Ballroom on February 11, 2015 from 15:30 to 16:45.

ALAN BARRETT: Okay. It's 3:30, it's time to get started. Good afternoon everybody, and welcome to the ASO AC update. I'm Alan Barrett, vice chair of the ASO AC. What we have planned for this session is three presentations. We'll talk about an update from the CRISP team, and the status of the selection of the Board seat that the ASO AC is responsible for.

And the status of the IPv4 depletion. And if time allows, then I have a couple of more topics up my sleeve, but if time is not allowed, then that's all we're going to...

...announced that it was going to, or that it was planning to, or hoping to, get out of the business of stewardship of the IANA functions. And so, the ICG was formed. The ICG put out a call for proposals from the numbers community, the names community, and the protocol parameters community.

Within the numbers community, the RIRs work together and decided to form something called the CRISP team, which was tasked with preparing a proposal from the numbers community. And the CRISP team was appointed around the end of November, last year. And between the end of November and the middle of January, the CRISP team had very

---

*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.*

---

many meetings, exchange lots of email, put out two draft proposals for public comment, and finally, on the 15<sup>th</sup> of January, hours before the deadline, we sent in a proposal to the ICG.

The CRISP team was composed of 15 members, three from each of the RIR regions. And of those three, two were from the community and one was from the staff. So there is a list. I'm not going to read out all of the names, and if the text is too small for you to read it, you can go to the CRISP webpage and look it up there.

So what the CRISP team did was it took input from the five regions, and combined that into an unified proposal, which we were able to send to the ICG. They were some differences in the proposals from the different regions. Some regions had fairly detailed proposals of their own, and other regions only had some eye level requirements that they wanted to see implemented, but they did not have wording for a proposal.

Anyway, the CRISP team took all of that, and combined it. Where there were differences, we worked it out in consultation with the community. So, in our first few weeks, we were able to reconcile the differences between the proposals from the five RIRs, and produce a first draft. We publish the first draft, we called for comments on a mailing list with public participation.

That was around the second or third week of December. Then we published a second draft early in January, and at that point, we were looking mainly for endorsement rather than changes. And we got several comments, and we got quite a lot of support. And then the final draft was submitted to the ICG.



---

So that's the way we worked. If you want more details, there is a webpage you can go into at NRO dot NET slash CRISP hyphen team. If you go to that webpage, you'll find links to the final proposal, or the drafts, or the calls for comments. You'll find archives for the mailing lists. You'll find instructions for how to describe to the mailing list, and you might think that the work is over, but subscribing to the mailing list may still be relevant, because the ICG is still working on combining the number's proposal with proposals from other areas within ICANN, the protocol parameters on the IETF side, and names where the names are CWG is still busy.

So during that process, there could very well be more discussion on the mailing list. So even though the proposal is being submitted, it might still be relevant to subscribe. Okay. You can also find notes from all of the CRISP team teleconferences, and audio recordings from all of those team teleconferences.

So I said earlier that the task of the CRISP team was to combine the proposals from several RIRs, and there were certainly common elements. All of the RIRs said, "We don't want to see big changes. We like the way things are going. We think ICANN is doing a good job. We want to leave ICANN in the position of being the IANA services operator, at least as far as the numbering functions used by the RIRs is concerned."

However, we wanted to be able to change in the future. So if at some future time, we wanted to change from ICANN to other IANA operator, we need the ability to do that. That idea came from all five RIRs, and also the idea of putting in place a service level agreement, came from all



---

five RIRs. Again, there were some aspects that were not common, but only some RIRs wanted.

APNIC and LACNIC, their communities wanted an affirmation of commitment between the RIRs and ICANN, whereas the other three RIRs did not say anything about that. LACNIC proposed something called a multistakeholder oversight numbers council, abbreviated MONC, and the other RIRs did not say anything about that.

The idea of the MONC is that it would be a permanent body within the NRO, with membership from all five regions and multistakeholder and all that good bottom up stuff. And it would have the task of monitoring the performance of the IANA operator. And any decision that it made would be binding on the IANA operator, which is going to be ICANN, at least for the time being.

The way the CRISP team resolved these differences, was to say we have a contract between the RIRs and ICANN as the number services operator, and the contract will incorporate a SLA, and the existence that the contract will make it unnecessary to have an affirmation of commitments, and with regard to agreement from representatives of the RIRs that wanted to see that this resolution would be good enough.

Then the way we resolve the MONC issue, was we said we'll create a review team, which is lighter weight than the MONC proposal. The MONC proposal, several RIRs though it was too complex. The resolution of creating a review team is a lot lighter weight. The review team would be, would consist of members from all five RIRs, very much like the MONC proposal, but a big difference here is that the review team's decision, might be binding.



---

The review team would advise the NRO executive council which is where all of the five RIRs meet, but its advice is not binding. Contrast that to what I said about MONC, where the MONC's decisions would be binding on ICANN.

Okay. So that is how the CRISP team resolved the differences. And putting it all together, the final proposal has these elements. ICANN would remain as the operator of the IANA numbers services, at least for the near future, but the RIRs would have the ability to change their mind later on.

There will be a contract between the five RIRs and the operator, which means ICANN in the first instance. The contract will have a SLA. There would be a review committee, which will be formed by the RIRs with membership from all five RIRs, and its job would be to monitor the performance of the operator against the SLA, and to advise the NRO executive.

Then we also said something about intellectual property rights. What we said was, that the IANA trademark and the IANA dot org domain name, should be associated with the IANA function, not with the particular IANA function services operator. So today ICANN holds that intellectual property, and that's not inappropriate because ICANN is the IANA operator.

But in order to make any potential future transition to a different operator easier, we thought based on community input, that intellectual property would be best transferred to a mutual third party. And it could be transferred immediately, it could be transferred later, which third party it goes to, or which mutual party it goes to, is

---

negotiable but our suggestion was that the IETF trust is an appropriate body to hold that intellectual property trademark, and the domain name associated with IANA.

There is a lot of public information associated with the IANA function. All of the registrations, which IP addresses go to which RIR is public. Any related intellectual property should be in the public domain. There might be some non-public information associated with registrations, and we were not sure how much or what nature of such non-public information it might be, but if there is any, then our proposal says that it should be the property of the RIRs, not the property of the operator.

So that's about it. The next is, we are in consultation with the IETF regarding what to do with the IANA dot org domain and the IANA trademark. If the IETF is willing to go along with our suggestion, of putting it into the IETF trust, then I suppose the next step after that would be to talk to ICANN about it. And we also need to see what the ICG decides about intellectual property. And maybe they want to wait for input from the name side before they make a decision, we don't know.

But in the short term, we are already engaged with the consultation with the IETF. And we're also on standby for any other questions, or requests for clarification that ICG might make.

Right. Thank you. Are there any questions? Yes, please could you use a microphone?



---

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. [Inaudible] from the Center for Communication and Government of the International New Law University in New Delhi. I had a couple of questions on the jurisdiction of the service level agreement. Looking at the preliminary draft to the final one that was submitted to the ICG, I noticed that there was, in the preliminary draft, there was a line that pretty much said that the jurisdiction of the service level agreement would be dependent on the chosen IANA functions operator.

And that line was removed in the final draft. What are the implications of that? And more generally, what would be the jurisdiction of the SO? Thank you.

ALAN BARRETT: So what would be the jurisdiction? We don't know. We're leaving that up to the RIRs to determine, in consultation with IANA, sorry, with ICANN, as they draw up the contract. So we chose not to say anything about the jurisdiction because we did not want to tie the RIRs hands.

We did put some guidance in there that we expect the RIRs to consult the community as they drew up the contract. So, what, in my personal capacity, what I think is likely to happen, is that the RIR's legal teams would come up with something and ask the community whether that's okay.

So I've answered your second question. Your first question, I'm not sure if I understood it. Could you repeat it or does it fall away?



---

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, I was wondering why... There was a proposal which, in the initial draft, suggested the jurisdiction of the service level agreement would be dependent on chosen IANA functions operator. Is it because you would want to leave this freedom to...?

ALAN BARRETT: Yes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you.

ALAN BARRETT: Okay. Yes, we removed that because we wanted to leave it free for decision in the future. Okay. Any other questions? No. Okay. Thank you.

So I'll now take off my CRISP hat, and I'll put on my ASO AC hat, and I'll invite, who is next? Wilfried Woeber to speak about the progress of selection of a Board member.

WILFRIED WOEBER: So, thank you Alan for handing over to my part of the presentation. My name is Wilfried Woeber, I am on the ASO for the RIPE NCC service region. And I'm also involved this year in the process of Board of Director selection for the ICANN Board seat nine.

What I would like to do here right now, today, is to give you a rather brief snapshot of where we are in the process, while the process looks





---

like. A couple of details, and what to expect between now and the end of the procedure.

Regarding the, or just to take a premature introduction, the process itself, to select the Board member for seat nine or seat 10, actually involves a couple of steps, which some of them have to be gone through in sequence, some other in parallel. And of course, the first thing to do is to issue a call for proposals, a call for nominations, a call for self-nominations.

And I'm going to come back to that on the next slide, but the result of that is that we are heading for this round, six confirmed candidates. And the distribution of those six individuals across the regions, they are not to represent the regions, but being the regions from which they can be selected to be on the Board because there are...

...in the appropriate location, so you can just then click on the link. Coming back to the procedure or to the various steps in the procedure, there is a rather strict timeline that controls the procedure from the very beginning to the final step. The first step is, I've already said, the nomination for the call of candidates. That timeframe started in October 24<sup>th</sup>, last year, and ended at 31<sup>st</sup> of December, 2014 at the end of the previous year.

Right after that, on the 1<sup>st</sup> of January this year, we moved on to the comment period. So this is actually the period, this is actually the timeframe, when the confirmed candidates are known, and the community is invited to submit their comments. This phase will go on, collecting comments until the end of March. And with the beginning of February this month, we started formally the interview phase.



---

In the selection procedures, there is a provision to have three potentially, three phases of interviews. The first phase is that we reach out to the candidates with a set of questions, and it's the same question, set of questions to all of the candidates. And we ask them to respond in writing. And the second round of interviews are going to be conducted on the telephone, and the procedure would also allow for face to face interviews, but given the timelines and given the meeting dates and locations this year, between now and the endpoint, at the moment, it seems rather not possible or not appropriate this time to go into face to face interview stage.

So for this selection procedure, for this event of this year, we are going to have the written responses, and we are going to have telephone interviews with the candidate. And this is one, two, three of the sections of the five step procedure. And right now, during this week, we are in the comment and in the beginning of the interview phase, we being the interview committee and inter supporting organization, At-Large, we are going to put together, within a few days, the set of questions to submit to the candidates, and ask them to come back with their written answers.

The remaining two steps for the selection is actually the real selection process, where the ASO is going to decide on the candidate between the 1<sup>st</sup> of April and the April 17<sup>th</sup>. So more or less a two week period. And by then, the ASO is going to submit the information about the chosen candidate to ICANN. And ICANN then has the timeframe between April 18<sup>th</sup>, and the end of May to form the, thank you. Thank you.



---

To perform the due diligence procedure. So, the first three steps are under the responsibility of the ASO, and the remaining two steps, the due diligence and the announcement of the selected candidate is actually the responsibility of ICANN. And after we have been walking that procedure, to be finished not later than June 1<sup>st</sup>, we will be done.

We being the ASO. And the date of, or the statement we are going to be done no later than the 1<sup>st</sup> of June. There is also some significance to that date, because at that date the information will be available to the NomCom, which is expected to waltz through their procedure by the time of their Buenos Aires meeting later on in June, because this is going to provide the NomCom, it means to look at the geographic distribution of the members of the Board, and take care of the boundary conditions.

So that's all of that from my end. Do you have any questions regarding the Board of Director selection? That seems not to be the case. So thank you very much and back to Alan. Thank you.

ALAN BARRETT:

Right. Thank you Wilfried. Okay, next I invite Ricardo Patara to speak about the status of IPv4 address pools in the different regions.

RICARDO PATARA:

Thank you. Ricardo Patara, I'm ASO AC for LACNIC region. I don't have the slides, I will just mention briefly the stats of IPv4 address space among RIRs. Just a bit of history. IANA has its IPv4 inventory depleted by February 2011. After that, APNIC was the first RIR to deplete its local IPv4 inventory in April 2011.



---

And for the last slash eight, they had a special [inaudible] for its division in this address pool. According to this policy, any APNIC member can receive up to, less to or equivalent or 2024 IP address. But after IANA start to issue more IP address, after the global [policy] for IPv4 posted exhaustion policy was taken in place.

APNIC also allows members to receive another slash two equivalent from this other pool, but it's the maximum they can receive. Later in September 2012, RIPE NCC was the RIR to have its pool depleted also, and they also have a policy to distribute from the last slash eight. According to this [policy] any member of RIPE NCC region can receive up to a slash 22 equivalent also.

Then we had LACNIC last June 2014. Also have IPv4 inventory depleted, and LACNIC also have a special [policy], according to the [policy], any member can receive up to a slash 22, each six months. So they can return to request additional address space after the six month of last allocation.

For this policy, LACNIC set a part the equivalent of two million IP addresses. Once these two million IP addresses are consumed, another phase of this special policy will take place, and according to the next phase, only new members can receive a public address location. No additional location, just the first allocation. And is limited also to a slash 32 equivalent.

And AFRINIC still have IP address in this [inaudible], it's equivalent to 2.8 slash eights, but they have a special policy to take place when AFRINIC reach a situation where they cannot fulfill requests for IPv4 allocations. And this special policy is called soft landing. It has two phases. The



---

phase will limit the allocation to a maximum of slash 13. The second phase will take place when this pool reach the equivalent of a slash 11, and at this phase, the allocation will be limited to a slash 22.

They also set a part a slash 12 for any new future need they can foresee in the future. And we have also ARIN. Leslie kindly accepted an invitation to talk about ARIN, so I will allow Leslie to come here. Thank you Leslie.

LESLIE:

Good afternoon everyone. I have a very quick update on IPv4 depletion status at ARIN. I have no slides, but I have my security blanket, I have my laptop with me so I don't forget anything. So currently, there are .37 slash eight equivalents remaining in ARIN's available inventory that's listed on an inventory counter on our homepage. It gets updated daily.

That .37 does not actually include some space that we have reserved per policy. There is a slash 10 block reserved for IPv6 transition. So far we've only issued a single slash 24 from that block, so I assume that will be around for quite some time. We have a slash 16 reserved for critical infrastructure, Internet infrastructure providers.

And then we have quarantine space, and we have about six slash 16 equivalents, and that space is basic. It's returned to ARIN or that gets revoked by ARIN for non-payment of fees. And we hold it for three months to clear filters, and then we put it back into the available inventory. So the available inventory fluctuates on a daily basis, depending on what we're issuing, what comes back to us.



---

And also depending on when we get allocations from the IANA. I think that Ricardo mentioned that there was a global policy, and it allows each RIR to get an allocation from IANA twice per year. So far since the policy was implemented, each of the RIRs has received two slash 12's from IANA. So Ricardo also mentioned austerity policies at some of the other RIRs.

ARIN has no austerity policy, so we're issuing from our last slash eight, and we will continue to issue until we have run out, whenever that may be. So far in the ARIN region, it's kind of interesting. It has been extremely orderly. We haven't seen any rush to get IPv4 address space like you would expect, and like what happened in the APNIC region.

We hit our last slash eight in April 2014, and we're still working from that last slash eight. So it has been very slow. In fact, in 2014, we only issued a little bit over a slash eight in total to our community. So we don't actually make projections, predictions, on when we'll run out. We sort of leave that to the experts like Jeff Houston, but we may run out, or at least getting down to the last bits of space, maybe as early as late spring or early summer.

There is really no way to tell, it just depends on who is coming in for space. Whether the large providers take the large blocks. I think that's all I've got. Thanks.

ALAN BARRETT:

Okay, thank you Leslie. Thank you Ricardo. All right. So we still have lots more time. I would like to remind everybody that the RIRs and the ASO do not do policy development during these ICANN meetings. The



---

development of RIR policy happens elsewhere in the five regions. And so everybody is welcome to get involved.

You can get involved in the policy development process in any region, even if you do not live there or work there, or have any involvement there. Okay. So, as you know, there are five RIRs. We've divided the world into five pieces. ARIN for the much of North America, LACNIC for South America and parts of the Caribbean, RIPE NCC for Europe and parts of the Middle East, and APNIC for the Asia-Pacific region, and AFRNIC for Africa.

So, each of those RIRs has a regional policy development forum, and they have mailing lists. They have two public meetings every year. So between the five RIRs, there are 10 public policy meeting per year, where everybody is welcome to get involved in the policy development process.

We're also trying to encourage a little bit more cross community involvement between ICANN stakeholders outside the number's world. So for example, we're trying to encourage the ICANN RALOs to possibly have meetings at the same time and place as RIR meetings, and some of the RIRs are doing that already. A couple of the RIRs have assigned some kind of agreements with the RALOs, that they're going to cooperate.

So it's great to see that. So essentially the point I want to make here is that the RIRs do their policy work somewhere else, but you're welcome to get involved. In most cases, there are mailing lists and meetings where you can stand up and speak.



---

All right, any questions? And that's all we have prepared. So we can go to open question and answers, otherwise we can end this session early.

All right. I'm not seeing any questions. Oh, yes, Sébastien. Please use a microphone and state your name.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Hello, my name is Sébastien Bachollet. It's not really a question, but just, I wanted to acknowledge that you are coming to the ICANN meeting and that's a good thing. When you do policy in your region, the fact that you're here, even if it's so few people, it's very important for the overall community. And I say that [inaudible] because I know I need more duty in this organization [inaudible]. But thank you very much for being here and being part of the community.

ALAN BARRETT: Thank you for that comment. Okay. Any other questions, comments?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. [Inaudible] from the National Law University Delhi. On the issue of policy development, since the CRISP proposal mentions that, well the RIRs are okay with ICANN continuing as the operator. According to the policy development process, the ICANN Board effectively has a veto on the proposal that is picked up from the community, in a loose sense.

From the bottom up, this can be detected twice by the ICANN Board. So once this, as this proposal reaches its final stage, how is the policy separation between ICANN continuing as the operator, and ICANN





---

Board having this kind of say in the proposal going to take shape?  
Thank you.

ALAN BARRETT:

Right. That's a very good question. We have regional policies and global policies in the numbers community. The regional policies are worked on in their regions. The global policies, and there are very few of them, do have some involvement by the ICANN Board. The way global policies work is all five regions have to agree on the same policy. It could be minor difference in the wording and such, but it has to be the same essence.

Then if the five RIRs agree on the policy, and if the policy requires some involvement by the IANA, then the ASO AC will check that all five RIRs follow their documented procedures, and if that test passes, it will be passed onto the ICANN Board where, as you say, it looks as though they have a veto power.

They do have the ability to ask questions or raise concerns and refer the policy back to the RIRs. But I think if that happens a second time, so if we go around the loop twice, and there is still no resolution, then I don't have the MOU in front of me, but I think it goes to arbitration. And I think it's a binding arbitration. That's never happened.

In the past, every global policy has been ratified by the ICANN Board quite promptly. And we don't anticipate any problems in the future. The CRISP proposal is not going through this process. The CRISP proposal is not going through the global policy process, it's going through the ICG. So I don't think it's subject to the same concerns.



---

Does that answer it? Thank you. Okay, any more comments, questions?

RON DA SILVA:

Ron da Silva, also on the SO AC. I think just clarification, it's not a veto power that the ICANN Board has, it is a validation that the process has been followed. So a rejection would indicate that there is concern that we didn't properly follow the process, not that they have any jurisdiction of whether or not the policy makes sense. So it's not a veto, it's a validation that we, in fact, as a community, followed our own bottom up process, and have ratified it as a global policy. Does that help? Thanks.

ALAN BARRETT:

Right. Thank you. Anything else? No. Okay. Thank you everybody for your attention. Thanks for attending this session. And we're going to break early.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**

