

---

BUENOS AIRES – ASO Address Council Public Meeting and Workshop

Wednesday, June 24, 2015 – 08:45 to 10:15

ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

FILIZ YILMAZ:

Hello, everyone. Thanks for coming in so early. We are going to have another couple of minutes before we can settle for technical issues here for the upload of the slides, and then we will start. Thank you.

Good morning again, everybody. I hear we are ready to go, so if you can take your seats, there are plenty of them around, so we can start.

Welcome to the Address Supporting Organization Address Council Public Meeting and Workshop. My name is Filiz Yilmaz. I'm the vice-chair of the ASO AC, which is the abbreviation of what I have just said. We are the body at the ICANN for dealing with the IP addresses in general. Some people like to call it the "N" at the ICANN.

There are five regional Internet registries in the world, you may know, managing the registration of IP addresses and AS numbers. The delegation of these resources are done based on policies developed by their associated regional communities. These are bottom-up policy development processes.

Address Supporting Organization consists three people from each of these regions, again supported by these communities. So we are coming from those bottom-up policy development processes and elected mechanisms.

---

***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.***

---

We will facilitate this session to highlight recent discussions and activities that these regional Internet registries and communities have been busy with.

The aim of this session is to have it interactively, so after each agenda point, we will have some discussion time, and our presenters have been primed that they will keep their presentation to a limit. Right? No surprise there.

The agenda details are published on the website, the session website, but please don't be confused. We shuffled them around a little. What you see at the session site is not exactly what's going to happen here.

First we will start with how to participate in this RIR policy development process. This will be presented by ASO AC chair, Louis Lee. Then we will continue with the CRISP Team activity from Nurani Nimpuno. She's the vice-chair of the CRISP Team. This has been the main activity of the RIR committees in the recent times, and it's very highlighted.

We want to give an update of this work to this date, and we will conclude with the RIR IANA operational update by Axel Pawlik. He's the NRO chair at the moment.

If there are any other business, we think that we will still have time towards the end of the 90 minutes.

One last thing I've been noticing before we start: we are also proud at the moment at this session set up there is exact, perfect gender balance, I've been noted. So thank you very much.

---

Louis Lee, can we start with you? Thanks.

LOUIS LEE:

Thank you so much, Filiz. Good morning, everyone. I am Louis Lee and this is Louis Lee's hat. Welcome to the session. We'll jump right in.

But just a little bit – whoa, I'm sorry. Yes, hold on. Right. Green button. Forward. Technology.

So we're just going to cover a little bit about the ASO and relationship with ICANN, number resources, and then go into the policy development process.

The ASO, and specifically the ASO Address Council, have several duties. We advise the ICANN Board and community of IP addresses and AS number topics. We also appoint two ICANN Board members. Along with that, we do appoint members and other members to other working groups and participate in those activities that way.

Number resources. What are they? This is a definition posted up on our website, but you can think of number resources as a credit card system. For instance, you have a card with a set of numbers. You might not even care what the numbers specifically are, but what you do care about about that number is that it is unique. It gives you some rights. It lets you use those numbers to tell a merchant, "I will pay you if you charge my purchase against this set of numbers."

---

To get these numbers from the credit card company, you fill out a form and make a request. You show that you need this. They'll evaluate that and hopefully you'll get a credit card number from that.

In much the same way, an IP address is a unique identifier for you and your equipment on the Internet. There's also another set of numbers called autonomous system numbers. These numbers identify an IP network, a group of IP addresses that you are controlling, you have administrative control over. You tell the rest of the world, "If you want to reach these addresses, come to this network." That's done through announcing it through the autonomous system number.

Now, how do you get these IP addresses and ASNs? Well, one way you can do that is to first check with your regional Internet registry. Each registry has a community that would develop its own policies to govern how the requests come in, how they're evaluated, and determine whether you should receive an address or not.

If you do not meet these criteria, you can go to your LIR, your Local Internet Registry, or your ISP.

Oftentimes, as you're setting up a network, getting connected, you would be offered an IP address directly from the ISP anyway. So have a look to see if that's large enough a block of addresses for you. If it's not big enough, the ISP will typically give you a larger block or tell you how you can get your own directly from the ISP.

In some regions, there are NIRs, which are National Internet Registries, which could also help you get addresses through the RIR system.

---

I briefly described the regional Internet registries, and you can see on this map how the regions are divided up. If you're familiar with the ccNSO or the ICANN regions, they are broken up fairly similarly, but not identically.

For instance, in the ARIN region, you see that it is primarily made up on the map as the United States and Canada, but you might not be able to see easily on this map that there are many Caribbean countries also covered. I believe we're on the order of 34 economies, somewhere on that order, for at least the ARIN region.

Then you see in RIPE, covers Europe and Russia. APNIC would cover the Asia region and also Australia. You see that the LACNIC region would cover not only South America, but also parts of North America that consider themselves part Latin Americans.

And of course, not to shortchange AFRINIC, they cover the African continent and some economies in the Indian Ocean.

How do you qualify for IP addresses from the regional Internet registries? Well, one way to see if you meet the requirements is to look at the policy manuals at each region. If you are a multi-regional entity – you have a network that covers not just North America but also somewhere in Europe or across other regions – there is a comparative policy overview that you can have a look at.

You can reach that through the NRO website, which is NRO.net. Under the Policies tab, you'll see the link to the RIR Comparative Policy

---

Overview. I've given you a first page here with some table of contents items.

What if you don't qualify? Of course, ask your ISP, because typically smaller blocks of addresses your ISP should be willing to give to you. But if you are asking for a large block that the ISP is unwilling to give you or work with you to get, and you don't meet the policies as you see on the policy manual, you could really change the policy to meet your needs.

I would first urge you to talk with the RIR staff to make sure that you are not misreading the policy manual or maybe it could be interpreted in a way that actually meets your needs already. So that could help you right there. But you do have the option to change a policy, and that is how the policy manual is built.

We have an infographic that covers the policy lifecycle. This policy lifecycle describes how the policies are developed within each region. Then if it's a global policy, it would work up to the ICANN level. A global policy is defined as one that covers the IP address and AS assignments between another NC, like IANA, and the RIRs.

But even so, your request would typically fall under the regional policy requirements. To do so, you would participate in an open, transparent and bottom-up process. These policy proposals would be submitted within your regional, and the process is the same across regions in that they have community input. There is time for debate and discussion, a call for consensus, and a last call, then implementation.

---

They vary from region to region a little bit with timelines, how often that the policies are evaluated – things of that nature – but typically they are fairly similar.

This is a brief snapshot of the current policies that are under discussion or recently worked on, whether they are ratified or abandoned. If you would like, this should be posted up on the website soon with all the titles, but the summary is that there are about 30 policies, with 17 under discussion, one at last call, 8 that are ratified – so they would soon to be implemented – and 4 of them were abandoned.

These policies cover topics such as AS numbers, DNS – specifically the IN-ADDR, which is reverse DNS – IPv4, v6, the process itself, region of use, and transfers.

Regions of use and transfers are covering topics that relate to how you use the addresses within your region, if you are allowed to use it within region, also outside the region, how much of it – 50%, most of it, all of it, things of that nature. These are questions that the communities themselves are grappling with.

Transfers have to do with the transfer of resources, either within the region, between members, or between members that are in cross-regions.

Just some highlights. RIPE is soon to implement an Inter-RIR v4 Transfer policy. ARIN and APNIC already have such a policy in place

---

with allow the members within the ARIN and APNIC regions to transfer resources between each other.

After RIPE implements the v4 transfer policies, then it will enable the transfer between RIPE, ARIN, and APNIC amongst the three. In addition, there is a inter-RIR proposal over at APNIC.

Regional of use proposals at AFRINIC and ARIN. Why? Because v4 has run out. So do you allow an entity to request address space that is from those regions but use them in a different region?

If you would like to see the full listing of the proposals, here are the links to each of the regions' proposals.

A final note about the participation. You can attend the policies of policy meetings in person. There are 14 around the world. Or you may also attend via remote participation means.

In addition, you may do so via mailing list. The links are posted. A final note about that is that you do not have to reside in the region to participate in the process. If you have an idea that works or if you ever want to talk about ideas that other people have, please feel free to do so. It's just a matter of signing up for the mailing lists. Keep a look out on what's going on on those lists.

At this point, I'll take questions.



---

FILIZ YILMAZ: Thank you, Louis. Any questions you would like to raise to Louis Lee about PDPs or the Address Supporting Organization? Our structures babysit at the ICANN for a? No?

LOUIS LEE: Nothing from [inaudible]?

FILIZ YILMAZ: Okay. I just want to make a comment before we move to the next speaker, Nurani, here. I think it's very important to note that in many cases, in almost all, PDP processes that are in place at the regional Internet registries, they've been there for a very long time, and they are proof that they are working with the recent activity that we see. They are well-established processes.

The very minimal part of it I think is important to highlight. You do not even have to be present at the meeting in person. You do not even have to travel. It is very significant that the main participation is your active participation is depending on how much you want to participate. It is attached to an e-mail address and a mailing list most of the time. The level is totally how much you want to be out there. It's depending on the individual's choice.

Is that rightly so to be said?

LOUIS LEE: Yes.

FILIZ YILMAZ:

Thank you. Okay, now we turn to Nurani. Nurani is the vice-chair of the CRISP Team. The CRISP Team, you may have heard it. It is one of the circles that has been shown in many slides so far, feeding into the IANA transition process. They are an integral part of that process.

She will talk about how it was formed, what happened so far, and where they are at now. Thank you, Nurani.

NURANI NIMPUNO:

Good morning, everyone. My name is Nurani Nimpuno, and I am the vice-chair for CRISP Team, the team responsible for taking and developing the proposal for the numbers community in the IANA transition process.

Thank you very much for being here in the early morning session. I know a lot of you have been here for a week already, so I appreciate the effort of coming here.

Thank you very much for that lovely introduction. I think Louis really gave a very good and comprehensive overview the RIR structure, so I'm not going to go into that. But I'm just going to emphasize the parts that actually both Filiz and Louis already talked about, that the RIR communities are open, bottom-up, inclusive, and transparent.

Really, in the numbers community, they're not just words that don't mean anything. That's actually something that the members of the RIR communities live every day.

---

The IANA stewardship process in the numbers community was initiated in each of the five RIR regions. As soon as the announcement came out from the NTIA, the RIRs individually started the discussions with their communities.

Throughout the whole year last year, input and feedback was gathered in each region. It was then decided to put together a team to represent each regions and to try to reconcile or consolidate all the input that we'd received. It was decided to have a team of 15 members, two community representatives, and one RIR staff. I'm one of the community representatives for the RIPE region.

What did the process look like? Well, as I said, the discussions really started on a regional level first, and it was then up to the CRISP Team to gather all that feedback and to discuss it all and to reach consensus on the text that then finally ended up in the proposal.

It was very intense work over a very short space of time. We worked over Christmas and New Year's to finally deliver the proposal on the 15<sup>th</sup> of January this year.

As you know, the CRISP Team is only one of three operational communities that were identified to have a stake in this transition. The other two operational communities are the protocol parameters, which are the IETF – they put together a group called the IANA Plan – the CWG Stewardship Group, which is the names community. Then as part of the names community's process, they also created a separate track, which was called the CCWG, which was the group that was finding solutions for accountability issues in the ICANN structure.

---

The three groups have worked very independently so far, with the CRISP Team and the IETF delivering their proposal on the 15<sup>th</sup> of January, but where the names community very early on flagged that they needed a little bit more time.

They produced a second draft of their text in May, and they've now actually submitted their third and final draft. So the CWG is now going through the approval process through the supporting organizations, and they will then deliver their final proposal to their ICG, which is their IANA Transition Coordination Group.

I will cover this a little bit more as we proceed, but given that we realized that we're getting very close to the final submission deadline from the ICG to the NTIA via the ICANN Board, we found that it was very important for us to very early on work with the other communities to try to make sure that we didn't create any conflicts or that we could reconcile any potential conflicts between the proposals.

What does the numbers community proposal look like? Well, it's a document that's available on the NRO website. But I'll walk you through some of the very key elements.

The IANA functions, stability and reliability, was really one of the criteria defined by the NTIA in starting this process, that it was important to continue to provide these services by the IANA to their community at large in a very stable and robust manner.

This was also really a key component in the proposal by the numbers community. As a result of that, the numbers community said very

---

clearly that they're happy with ICANN as the provider of the IANA services.

The proposal suggests to stay with ICANN as the provider of the IANA numbering services. However, it was also important to put in provisions for an orderly transition to another operator should that need arise sometime in the future. But that is not a priority at this point in time at all for the numbers community.

Another component was for the RIRs to establish a service level agreement with the IANA operator, in essence, replacing the role with the NTIA and overseeing the IANA's numbering services. The RIRs would instead establish an SLA with ICANN – in this case, the IANA numbering services operator. It's a bit of a mouthful. But for us, it was important to really identify the part of the IANA services that applies to our community.

The numbers community has since long many established bottom-up processes and structures, but it was felt that we could in the review process maybe add an extra element of community participation.

So after discussions with the various communities – there were a few different models discussed – we agreed that a review committee that was community-based could assist the RIRs in reviewing the service levels.

So that was another element that we said. We set up the framework for it in the proposal, but we said that it should be up to each RIR

---

community to establish a review committee or come up with a model that works for them.

Then there was also an element with the intellectual property rights, where it was felt that the intellectual property rights – the trademark, IANA, and their domain name, IANA.org – should stay with the community.

So we find, especially in the ICANN context, of course, a lot of discussions centering around accountability. It's a question that we also get a lot on the numbers proposals.

How do the IANA accountability structures look like? In the above charts, you'll see the NTIA having a contractual accountability with ICANN, and that the IANA numbering operations have all organizational accountability within ICANN.

So what we're essentially proposing is to replace the NTIA with the five RIRs with the help of this community-based review committee to provide community advice. Apart from that, the five RIRs and ICANN have contractual accountability, and then there's still organizational accountability between the IANA operator and ICANN.

As I said, the role of this review committee is to provide advice to the RIRs in reviewing the service levels, and really to make sure that the community's voice is heard directly in this process.

It's agreed that it should be made up of community representatives, equal representation from each service region, and the RIR community would be driving the member selection of this.

---

I'm also very happy to say that, after having asked the RIRs to propose a review committee charter, they have this week published such a charter. We welcome feedback on that charter.

This is just a graphical representation showing that there's equal representation in each regions. As you can see, all the review committee members are very happy with that set up.

Okay, so the IANA service level agreement. We had discussions very early on about what should go in the service level agreement between the RIRs and the IANA operator. It was felt that as community representatives, we are not lawyers and it was not our task to write this contract. We're not the contractual party. That's the RIRs and ICANN.

So instead of trying to draft a service level agreement, we said, "Well, what we'll do is that we'll put together a set of principles that we expect the RIRs to follow when developing this SLA."

Just to highlight a few things, the obligation to issue reports on transparency and accountability was felt important. Obviously, security performance and audit requirements. There needs to be a review mechanism of the IANA operation, and there needs to be mechanisms to handle if there are problems with that. And it also handles some of the intellectual property rights and the rights over data.

It was also very encouraging. Although we worked under a very intense, short period, it was very encouraging to see explicit support

---

for the proposal by the wider community, both throughout the process but also once the proposal had been submitted. For us, that was very important to see to get that confirmation from the community that we'd met their needs.

All the RIRs have also since then had meetings in their regions, and in all those regions, there have been explicit or implied – but in most cases, explicit – support expressed publicly for the proposal.

We were also very encouraged to see that Steve Crocker at the last ICANN meeting said that the ICANN Board can see nothing fundamental in the proposal that they have a problem with. That's very encouraging moving forward, given that this service level agreement will have to be established with ICANN.

This is just a very quick overview of the community engagements. I'm not going to go through it, but it's just so that you know where to go and where you can get the proposal.

I'll just mention that we were very conscious of listening to the community's input. Each and every comment or piece of feedback that we received on the proposal was received, acknowledged, and documented in a spreadsheet that we made public, just to make sure that it was clear to everyone that the process was transparent and that everyone felt that they were heard.

As for the coordination with the other operational communities, I mentioned that of course we have three very separate proposals, but



---

all these three proposals will be consolidated into one as the ICG puts forward that to the ICANN Board and to the NTIA.

One of the things that we identified very early was that the IETF and the numbers, CRISP proposal had different text on the intellectual property rights. But we established very early that that didn't mean there was a conflict between the two proposals.

In the CRISP proposal, we mentioned the IETF trust as a potential holder of the intellectual property rights, the IANA trademark, and the IANA.org domain, and we reached out to the IETF community after we had submitted our proposal. They expressed publicly that they were willing to host that, so that was very encouraging.

We didn't know at that point what the names community was going to do, but we felt that it was important that we communicate early to them what was already on the table.

If you read the current text in the names community, it potentially offers a different solution. Because of this, the ICG has requested the CWG to resolve this potential conflict. But both in informal talks with the CWG chairs, but also in the public session I think the day before yesterday – the CWG session – we were very happy to hear that they stated that the text that is in there is not agreed text. It's in square brackets, so to speak. Essentially, the CWG doesn't have a position on IPRs at the moment, and that they're also committed to work towards a reconciled solution. We're very happy with that and we feel very encouraged that that can be easily resolved.

---

Where do we go from here? As I said, we've already started working with the other IANA communities. The names community is waiting for their proposal to go through the approval of the supporting organizations and advisory councils, and it will then be submitted to the ICG.

They have a slightly different model where they suggest a Post-Transition IANA (another acronym, PTI) which is a legally separate but wholly owned subsidiary of ICANN.

The RIRs are currently looking at this, and they've come up with some statements about how we think we can work with this. We don't really see an issue with it. It's just a matter of seeing what works for the numbers community.

We also note that the names community's proposal has a separate review process and a separate contract. That really means that it allows all the three communities to have their separate processes, their separate reviews, processes and structures, and a separate contract. So we see no conflict there, and that's very encouraging.

One of the things that we have brought up in various places is that we believe that parallel processing is essential in this as we move forward, and it's not just because it's a bunch of engineers and it's attractive to them. But really we think it's the pragmatic way to move forward, given that we have a limited amount of time and we are all committed to this transition. And really, the various processes are not dependent on each other, so we feel that a lot of these things can be

---

done independently. The RIRs and the numbers community is already moving forward with a lot of these things.

I mentioned that the ICG is now looking at all the three proposals and will be reviewing them and consult with the community as they move forward to a consolidated proposal. We are in the process of resolving these potential IPR inconsistencies. The RIRs have produced a first draft on SLA and had a comprehensive round of feedback on that, and they're in the process of publishing a second draft.

It was also encouraging to see that the ICANN Board has made their comments on the SLA. From what we can see, there are no stumbling blocks there. So we hope that that really means that as the RIRs enter into negotiation with ICANN, there may not be many issues that need to be resolved.

As I said, the community-based review committee, the charter for that has been published. We welcome feedback on that. Then we're looking to finalize that.

What's still to come for us? Well, clearly the negotiation with ICANN over the SLA terms. We find ourselves in the middle of a lot of speculation of political nature, of what various parties in the process may or may not accept or may or may not think. Really, for the CRISP Team, and for the community, our priority is that we are committed to the success of this transition. We're committed to the transparency throughout the discussion process, which we is why we asked ICANN and other parties to commit to submit their comments in public. And

---

we respect the principles agreed in the proposal because that is what our community has given us, and that is what we need to respect.

Finally, we are confident that the numbers community proposal reflects the needs of the community, but also that it meets the set needs of the NTIA, the requirements set out in the announcement by the NTIA.

I don't know if you all heard Larry Strickling this meeting really emphasizing that the work of the remaining communities now should be focusing on looking at the requirements, making sure their proposal meets the requirement. We feel confident that ours does.

The numbers community has signaled that we are ready. We are moving forward to put together as much as we can before the transition so that when the transition happens, it happens in a very smooth way. And we're very optimistic about the future steps.

You'll find more information on this page. With that, thank you very much. I welcome any comments you may have.

FILIZ YILMAZ:

No comments? Okay. I guess it's crystal clear from the CRISP Team. I have a question, and in fact maybe to my own colleagues here, we have representatives to other working groups and that are linked to the whole process as well. One of them is the Accountability Working Group, Cross-Community for the ICANN accountability. That is somehow linked.

---

Is there any extra comments you want to provide? We have four representatives to that community working group.

Yes, Athina, if you would like to.

ATHINA FRAGKOULI:

Good morning, everyone. My name is Athina Fragkouli. I'm the legal counsel of RIPE NCC. Together with Izumi Okutani, Fiona Asonga and Jorge Villa, we are the ASO representatives of the CCWG for ICANN Accountability.

We are following this process and we participated in this process from the very beginning of the formation of this group. We wanted to make sure that any proposal that comes out of this group will not be a delaying factor to the IANA Stewardship Transition, and also that it will not interfere with our numbers community matters with regards to ICANN.

We are confident right now to say that the draft proposal that has been published does not affect the CRISP proposal, time-wise. The CRISP proposal has no prerequisites that are a matter of business of the CCWG.

Having said that, there have been concerns from the numbers community that some of the proposals may cause a delay to the whole IANA Stewardship Transition. During the public consultation of the first draft proposal of the CCWG, there has been a request by the numbers community to review the proposals against these transition timelines.

---

Other than that, that's the input we got from the numbers community. They feel confident with the already-established relationship we have with ICANN that also includes appealing mechanisms that are described in already-existing agreements and then we'll use with ICANN.

It was strongly suggested that any proposal should not interfere with our relationship, and in particular, that appealing mechanisms that are suggested by this group should have the number matters out of their scope.

I think these are the two main messages we got from the numbers community, and we're going to make sure that they are conveyed to the group.

Thank you.

FILIZ YILMAZ:

Thank you, Athina. Any further comments? I just want to make an observation myself, if I may, for the two minutes that I can give to myself.

There's a lot being said here about these processes. This is a colossal moment in many ways at the moment for the Internet in general and how operations are linked to policy development processes, etc.

I think one thing I would like to note is, as much as a numbers side of the transition may be quite straightforward in a lot of ways the way we see it, there is also a little bit to say that these very-established

---

processes that we've been using for over all decades in different regional Internet registries I think contributed to the success of this.

We were really able, in my opinion, that as communities to move ahead and take the job and put them in the already-established processes, and then produce a product out of it, rather than first trying to build a process, discuss the process details, and then put it in the system and work through the goal.

So I just want to make a note of that because I think this should be a good example for future work that may come ahead. We never know what's going to happen in the future, but I think it's good to make a note of that, at least for myself as a mental note.

Thank you.

NURANI NIMPUNO: [inaudible]

FILIZ YILMAZ: Of course, Nurani.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you. I'm not going to vehemently disagree with you, but thank you for that comment, because I think that we sometimes forget to communicate that. We worked very hard on this proposal but in some ways it was an easy task. It was made easy simply because we were – well, for several reasons. It was made easy because we felt that the

---

numbers community, they had these structures put in place already. We did not have to resolve all the world's accountability issues because we felt that trust in the RIR communities.

As someone who's participated in the RIR community for a very long time, there were no red flags that popped up in my head about, for example, establishing a service level agreement between the RIRs and the IANA operator.

But the other is that I think because the RIR structures have matured so over a long time, there were processes and mechanisms we could follow. We didn't have to set up a new working group, and we didn't have to make a big call for participants. We didn't have to say, "Hey. Does anyone know about the IANA numbering functions? Does anyone want to give us input on that?"

We had this wealth of knowledge in all these communities, and we had people who had been participating in RIR policy-making for a long time. We had just simple things. We established a new global mailing list, but in the regions, we had mailing lists where we could start these discussions. We had meetings where these people came together already.

So really, if we hadn't had that, then we would have had to do the work of the last 20 years now in six months. And we didn't have to do that. All the CRISP Team had to do was to listen to the community, the diverse range of opinions, as you always get, and then to find a consensus position.



---

From a personal perspective, it was a very rewarding process. It was an exhausting process, but rewarding.

Thanks.

FILIZ YILMAZ:

Well, I guess we are all thankful for the hard work you put in. Yes? You have a comment there? Could you please tell us your name and [inaudible] your question? Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay. Thank you very much. My name is Seun Ojedeji. I'm from Nigeria. I'm one of the chairs of the AFRINIC Policy Development Working Group, and I'm also a member of the CWG, but I'm speaking of my personal self right now.

First, I want to congratulate the CRISP Team for doing a good job, especially during the period of December. It was quite hectic and I never knew if CRISP was going to pull that off before the deadline. But they did, so I think it's a good thing to appreciate that.

Just a couple of –

NURANI NIMPUNO:

Sorry, could you speak a little bit closer to the microphone? We're struggling to hear you. Thanks. Perfect. Thank you.

---

SEUN OJEDEJI: But I don't need to start all over again, right? Okay. A couple of comments.

The first is based on the presentation that has been made and based on the proposal of the numbers community. It seems very clear that the numbers community is not willing to actually engage PTI directly. I'd like to get that confirmation.

The other clarification is in relation to the IPR. Does the number community actually require that as a precondition to transition? That is, is there a requirement that there must be a transfer of the trademarks before the transition can happen?

A third question is in relation to the lifespan of CRISP itself. Now you've submitted a proposal. ICG is looking at it. Is CRISP going to last throughout the implementation phase as well? Or was there a full proposal from ICG that will consider the CRISP group is done and dissolved?

Thank you.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Okay, I'll try to answer your questions. From what I heard, I could hear two questions, one about the IPR issue and the other about the role of the CRISP Team.

SEUN OJEDEJI: There are three questions.

---

NURANI NIMPUNO:                 Sorry?

SEUN OJEDEJI:                     There are three. The first one you missed is the one in relation to the contracts. That is, I want to get that confirmation based on what was presented, that the numbers community is not intending to consider engaging PTI directly, based on then names proposal, which [inaudible] proposes to [inaudible].

NURANI NIMPUNO:                 Right. So your question is if the numbers community is reconsidering signing a contract with ICANN and instead signing directly with the PTI.

SEUN OJEDEJI:                     Exactly.

NURANI NIMPUNO:                 Okay. Thank you. I'll start with your first question about who to sign with. It was actually a question that the numbers community got from the ICG, or one of the considerations. The RIRs have actually publicly stated that they are looking to sign with ICANN because this is what was in the proposal and this is what the community has expressed.

There has also been a statement made by the APNIC Board, the regional Internet registry for Asia-Pacific, which was then also

---

supported by the other five RIRs, saying that they are looking at the PTI, and also that, if the RIRs were to sign with ICANN, there should be a provision in the SLA about the PTI, as there's a subcontracting relationship there.

I'll let Axel add anything if he wants to before I move on to the other two questions. Thank you.

AXEL PAWLIK:

Not that much to add there, really. The design idea behind the [inaudible] CRISP proposal is to keep it very, very simple, to keep it very similar to what we already have in place for the last 20 years, and to make any transition as much a non-event as possible.

So in that sense, I think it's all fairly straightforward. We want to present a contract, an SLA, that is flexible enough to be signed tomorrow if we could, if we had it ready, so that it would be a belt and suspenders-type of solution.

The NTIA contract would still be in place, and we would have the next level underneath it already, so in time, when the NTIA contract goes away, we would have another contract that would take over and would not change much. So as simple as possible.

Signing with ICANN is the obvious thing. PTI isn't there yet. Should it pop up, then there should be clauses in the contract that makes it easy to assign the contract to PTI – or subcontract, something like that. But at this time, it's the ICANN.

NURANI NIMPUNO:

Okay. I'm happy to respond to your other two questions. Apologies. I should note also that the chair of CRISP, Izumi Okutani, is also sitting here.

Okay, so your second question was about the IPRs. If you read the CRISP proposal, it does state that this should happen as part of the transition. If you look at the IETF proposal, it doesn't necessarily say that, so there are no conflicts between the two. But if you look at the CRISP proposal, it does say it should happen.

As we move into this final phase, and as the ICG needs to consolidate the proposals, at this point we have not received any questions to revise that proposal, so we stick with our proposal.

If we were to get questions from the ICG or from the other communities, if the names community would offer another solution, of course we would take that back to the community. But it's not for the CRISP Team or for the RIRs to change anything that the community has agreed on.

I hope that answers your question about the IPRs.

Then finally, about the role of the CRISP Team, your question is very timely because we are currently looking at the charter of the CRISP Team and whether or not we need to revise that to take this into the final stages of the transition.

---

From our perspective, we were set up by the community to represent the community in this process. Once that process is over, there is no role for the CRISP Team. So we're only here to shepherd our proposal and to explain it to the community and to go back to our community if there are changes needed. But once that's submitted, personally I don't see a role for the CRISP Team.

Thank you.

FILIZ YILMAZ:

Thank you for the questions and comments. I believe we can move on with the next agenda point.

Axel, are you good to go to talk about the recent IANA interaction with the RIRs? Thank you.

AXEL PAWLIK:

Sure. I'm awake.

FILIZ YILMAZ:

And you have coffee.

AXEL PAWLIK:

And I had coffee. Right. So we've heard from Louis early on about the policy process and how to participate in this and how to receive numbers that you need from the RIRs. Also we heard about IANA transition. It's a very exciting topic.

---

I want to give you a bit of an update on what's actually the status of the RIRs in terms of numbering, and also how much interaction operationally we have with IANA, because that's at the centerpiece of all of this.

This is the [inaudible] type of slide. We are running out of IPv4 address space, and this is actually out of date. I woke up this morning and had breakfast and checked my Facebook site and I saw that ARIN has 0.04 /8s left. So we're hitting the wall. But that's no news, really.

There are a number of regionally different policies looking at depletion and what do there. I won't go into much detail. The presentation is available online, of course.

Basically the idea is in many areas that we reserve a little bit of address space for new entrants to the market that future generations would still have a little bit of IPv4 left to use in parallel with IPv6.

Transfers. As IPv4 has become a rather scarce resource these days, it does not come as a big surprise that transfers are happening quite a lot, certainly within the RIR service regions from member to member. Some members need address space, others maybe not so much anymore because they have maybe gone forward to IPv6 a bit more than others.

So transfers are happening, which is fine. The RIRs' main priority and interest in this is that we know about it. We run one global registry together, and this registry must be up-to-date and correct, so information about transfers should be available to the RIRs. We don't

---

want things to happen in darkened back rooms. That's the reason we put as little as possible obstacle in the way of this.

You see a couple of tick marks here. This basically indicates in which RIR's service region transfer policies are available for inter-RIR transfer, also. It's quite interesting, of course. You've seen that that various RIRs have different levels of IPv4 address space left. So obviously there's an interest of getting some of the data space transferred between regions.

There are all sorts of discussions. The latest one come to the table is RIPE NCC implementing its transfer policy there.

Now, the amount of interaction we have with IANA is relatively low. Basically, we're talking about allocation [inaudible] based on global policies. This one is a table that shows the latest allocation of IPv4 addresses – half a million each – to the RIRs. This is based on the post-exhaustion IPv4 allocation policy.

Twice a year, every RIR gets about a fifth of what's left in IANA. Occasionally, IANA receives a little bit of address space back in terms of space that has been recovered. The idea is that this space is distributed among the RIRs equally.

Then we from time to time get allocations of autonomous system numbers, also fairly straightforward – a couple of interactions there per year, not very much.



---

This is a nice slide that shows you the absolute numbers of v4 allocations, v6 allocations, and ASN allocations over the last five years or so. You see it's not a lot.

This is even more interesting. This is a slide that gives you the activity of IANA for the various communities, the various IANA customers. Well, again, for the last five years, there is a little bit of green at the bottom of the barrel there, and that's us. The amount of interactions that we have with IANA is really, really, really low compared to all the other activities that are ongoing there.

You see over the last year or so quite some activity in the namespace. I think that's mostly the new gTLDs. On top of it, sort of hanging there a little bit in this lovely curve, is the activity for the protocol parameters for the IETF.

So actually, if IANA remembers us – and they do – I'm quite happy about that because they don't have daily interactions with us.

Generally, the RIRs have statistics available on the NRO website, daily updated. The big status report updated quarterly. Please do go and have a look at that. It's quite interesting to see what's happening.

Also, some engineering stuff is going on occasionally with IANA and ourselves. This one is a slide on [inaudible], basically WHOIS replacement, [inaudible] generation. Good stuff. Basically we are working on a process to maintain the other interests there on the IANA level.

---

That actually is all I have to say this morning. I thank you very much. Happy to answer any questions.

FILIZ YILMAZ:

I don't see anyone jumping on the mics, Axel, but I'll ask Carlos if there are any remote participation. No. Okay. Well, thank you very much.

That brings us to the end of our set agenda. If there is any other business or any other comments that you would like to raise, we are here, as well as our colleagues sitting over here. The whole member of the Address Council are here with us today.

If you have any questions not tied to the agenda points, but any other questions, we still have I believe 17 minutes' access to this room, so you may – please.

TOSHIO TACHIBANA:

Thank you. I am Toshio Tachibana. I'm a regular participant of the registry event. Regarding the [inaudible] to the RIR, the whole event, 14<sup>th</sup> per year on U.S. rights. We have a five regional Internet registry and each RIR twice per year per event and 14. What event additional to that?

LOUIS LEE:

Sorry. I did screw up on my addition. There's actually more like 12 a year in that in each region, each of the five regions, there are two public policy meetings, and then at the ARIN region, there are also two public policy consultation sessions held at NANOG. So at ARIN, there

---

are actually four days where you can be doing that. So my addition was incorrect.

TOSHIO TACHIBANA: Thank you very much.

LOUIS LEE: Yeah.

FILIZ YILMAZ: Okay. Thank you then for joining us early in the morning, 15 minutes earlier for coffee. Here we go. Thanks again. Talk to you later.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**