
ICANN83 | PF – GAC Discussion on WHOIS and Registration Data Issues and Meeting with the ASO
Wednesday, June 11, 2025 – 10:45 to 12:15 CEST

JULIA CHARVOLEN

Hello and welcome to the ICANN83 GAC session on WHOIS and Data Protection Policy on Wednesday 11, June at 8:45 UTC. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Stands of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form. Remember to state your name and the language you will speak in case you will be speaking a language other than English. Speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. Please make sure to mute all of the devices when you are speaking. With that, I will leave the floor over to Nicolas Caballero, GAC Chair. Thank you, and over to you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Julia. Welcome back, I hope you enjoyed your coffee. So, this session will be running until 11.30 local time, that is for 45 minutes. And for that, I have the pleasure of introducing my good friend, Gabriel Andrews, who is the co-chair of the GAC Public Safety Working Groups. He's from the U.S. David Bedard, and I hope I'm pronouncing your last name, well, from Canada. We have Laureen Kapin online, also a member of the

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.

Public Safety working Group from the United States, and I understand she's online, right?

Excuse me. And also Melina Stroungi from the European Commission, who I also understand will be joining us online today. We also have a guest speaker, Sebastien Ducos, Chair of the GNSO RDRS Standing Committee, and also, it is my understanding, former chair of the GNSO, if I'm not mistaken. So, always a pleasure to have you here. As I said before, this is a rather short session, 45 minutes session, and we started already late. So, without further ado, let me hand the floor to Gabe. Gabe, over to you. Is it you or Sebastien?

GABRIEL ANDREWS

It's going to be, I believe, Laureen, starting with the background.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

All right. So over to you.

LAUREEN KAPIN

Hi, folks. My name is Laureen Kapin, and I practice consumer protection law at the Federal Trade Commission. And I'm speaking today in my capacity as a member of the Public Safety Working Group, and if I couldn't be with you in person, I am delighted to be with you virtually.

Next slide, please. I'm going to give you a little bit of background. I understand there are new GAC members in the room and maybe

a refresher for folks who are familiar with registration data, domain name registration data issues. So WHOIS, the real question is, why do we care about these issues?

Why do we care about domain name registration data? Well, the GAC actually has a very long history of talking about the importance of this issue. And domain name registration data tells us who is the person or the entity that registers the domain name, and it's an important tool. And in 2007, way back when, the GAC actually issued principles regarding what was then called the WHOIS services. And they have recalled this more recently in the Abu Dhabi communiqué 10 years later, noting that this is an important public policy issue because law enforcement uses this information in investigations, enforcing their national and international laws to combat against abusive use of internet communication technologies.

And to put that down to earth in the real world, for example, if my agency learns about bad guys and girls imitating us using a domain name that sounds like us or sounds like the domain name used to report complaints to us, we want to be able to know who is behind that domain name. So we look for the domain name registration data about that as an investigative tool. And sometimes law enforcement wants to know who is behind the domain name because that domain name has been misused by a third party, it's been hijacked. So that's one reason why it's important. But it's not

just law enforcement, it's businesses and other organizations, they get imitated, too.

They have a reputational interest in making sure that bad guys and girls don't misuse their domain names. So they use this information to combat fraud and comply with relevant laws and safeguard you and me when we're online so we don't get ripped off. That's also related to people misusing intellectual property and infringement. We have our constituencies at ICANN who are very interested in that work. And then, finally, but not least by any means, you and I may want to check out who is behind a domain name when we're deciding who we want to deal with.

Should I make this online purchase with this company? How long has this domain name been registered? Is the person someone who has been associated with malicious conduct online? WHOIS is a tool that can allow that sort of information to be used as one of the building blocks for our information as a consumer. And it's also relevant, even though our data protection laws have changed, and what was once a system that anyone could access despite typing out a query, is now protected so that people's personal information isn't available to the world.

And that's an important interest, too. And when we talk about this topic, you'll constantly see the balance between letting folks have access, lawful access, to this information, balanced with the need of the data subject, the person whose information it is, to be protected by appropriate laws, and, in particular, the EU's General

data protection regulation. So when it came time to change policies regarding the WHOIS, that spawned a whole host of policy work streams in ICANN, many of which are still ongoing.

But one of the things that the GAC emphasized is that even with these changes, which are more protective of the individual's domain name registration data, that there's still should be an effort to keep WHOIS quickly accessible for security and stability purposes, particularly for consumer protection and law enforcement investigations and crime prevention in general. And then, in certain cases, to keep WHOIS quickly accessible to the public for legitimate purposes. And that type of system is in fact in place today and still being worked on. I see I need to slow down. Apologies to the interpreters.

Next slide, please. I'm going to give you a little bit of a sense of our timeline here. We always have what I will say, a visually busy and packed slide on timeline. But what's important for you to know is that green indicates what has been completed, yellow is not started and an uncertain timeline, and red is ongoing. So, let's zoom in a little bit on some of our ongoing and not started issues.

You'll see that this whole process started in 2018, and that was when certain data protection laws came into to effect, and we had several phases of policy work implemented so that we could take into account the necessary balance that needed to be used for the domain name registration system, access to that and disclosure. So I'm happy to report that Phase 1 of those policy efforts have

been completed, as have Phase 2a. But where we are now is in that EPDP, and that stands for Expedited Policy Development Process. I'll put expedited in quotes because it hasn't been as quick as one might have hoped.

But where we are now in 2025 is the Registration Data request Service. And we're there because there was a determination that the Phase 2 recommendations were going to be too complicated and too expensive to implement. And so we have the registration data request Service as a pilot program that's in place to allow access, lawful access, to this information. And that took 11 months to develop, and it's proposed to be in place for at least two years, and there's current proposals on the table to extend that even more, with enhanced functionality. And you'll also see right at the top, that one of the topics that is still being discussed are urgent requests, which you'll hear more about in a few minutes.

The other thing I want to point out is that our work on accuracy, the whole reason to get access to this information is actually to make sure that you are getting information that is accurate so you can follow up on it. Although, you think information can have utility, and you may hear more about that later. But real information is the gold standard. There had been a scoping team working on data accuracy, but you'll see that has been paused for several six-month periods, and it's still paused.

The other topic that is still being worked on is privacy proxy, that's the system in place to put that information behind another

provider that is providing privacy services, and that is a system that is still in place. Also, that is ongoing work that's being done on that. So there you have an introduction to this information, why it's important, and where we are in 2025. And I will pass the baton over to my next colleague to tell you more about some of the substantive issues, particularly urgent requests. And I think that is my colleague, Melina.

MELINA STROUNGI

Yes, thank you, Laureen, and hi, everyone. I hope you can see me and hear me well. So, yes, urgent request, this has been very high on the GAC agenda. As you know, this issue had been on ice for a while, but since the last ICANN, there has been some progress, also with the starting of the IRT. But before going to the latest updates, we wanted to give you a background refresher. So, urgent requests were part of the Board-approved EPDP Phase 1 policy recommendations, and ultimately, they were part of the Registration Data Consensus Policy that was published without the section on urgent requests, on the timeline to respond to urgent requests. What are urgent requests?

There are requests for disclosure for non-public registration data in circumstances that pose an imminent threat to life, serious bodily injury, critical infrastructure, or child exploitation. Why they were not included? Because an agreement on what is an appropriate response time would not be reached. So the GAC's position was that it should be 24 hours to respond to urgent requests, while

contracted parties back at the time had suggested to extend this deadline by two business days, plus one business day for complex or multiple requests.

So because an agreement could not be reached, this point was left out. Just to remind you that the GAG provided input at several stages of the developments leading to the adoption of the registration data policy, in particular, with the public comments that we had submitted in November 2022, also in a letter to the ICANN Board in 2023. And in a letter to the GAC, the ICANN Board concluded that it is necessary to revisit this policy recommendation and urgent requests and that it needs to consult with the GNSO Council.

Then in the ICANN79 GAC St. Juan communiqué, the GAC had issued advice to act expeditiously to establish a clear process and a timeline for the delivery of a policy on urgent requests to respond to the vital public safety interests related to such requests. Next slide, please. The ICANN Board then sought the GNSO Council input on what would be the next steps and described this as an unprecedented situation, because neither the bylaws nor existing procedures account for a situation where a policy recommendation that has been previously adopted should be revisited prior to implementation.

So, among the many concerns that ICANN Board expressed was the fact that in order to be able to truly respond to imminent threats, a much shorter timeline should be appropriate. So, for example,

minutes or hours rather than days. The Board additionally had raised the issue of law enforcement authentication and authentication of urgent requests in general. So, for example, that this should be identified and that the cross-border system that can do that is not available to ICANN in the moment, and that it cannot be done without the assistance of law enforcement authorities and governments, something that the GAC, especially through the PSWG, offers to help with.

And as we will see later, the work on that front, on authentication, is progressing very well and it is ongoing. Then, the GNSO Council responded to the ICANN Board and proposed to schedule a trilateral meeting between the ICANN Board, the GAC, and PSWG representatives and the GNSO Council. Next slide, please. The GAC then proposed to ICANN Board that there should be two tracks of work that should be run in parallel. One authentication track and one policy track.

Basically, one track where we would explore possible mechanisms to authenticate emergency law enforcement requesters, what we call the authentication track, and then, with the hypothesis that the requests have been authenticated, then determine what should be an appropriate response time for urgent requests. So this is the so-called policy track. This GAC's proposal was discussed right before ICANN81, and the latest developments is that both tracks are in a very good path.

So, for the authentication track, the PSW co-chairs have initiated the formation of a practitioners group with representatives from several umbrella law enforcement organizations and also from several stakeholder groups in the GNSO. And this group has been meeting every two weeks after ICANN82 and will continue also to meet as needed. And then the policy track, so shortly after ICANN82, ICANN Org reconvened the EPDP Phase 1 IRT to determine what it is an appropriate timeline to respond to the urgent requests. This IRT group has met twice already before ICANN83 and met for a third time yesterday.

Next slide, please. So what is the latest developments and the progress up to date? So for the policy track, the response timeline for requests that are authenticated, so it's very positive that the IRT has started. This is what also the GAC had asked for, so we are really welcoming this development. As I said, there have been three meetings in total, including the one from yesterday. Just to remind you, this IRD has a very narrow scope. Basically, the only issue they're discussing is the timeline, nothing more.

And there has been a discussion on the ICANN Org proposal. So ICANN Org came back with a proposal to have two hours to acknowledge a request, an access request, and 24 hours to respond to such a request if it is urgent, and there have been divergent views across the community in relation to that proposal. So, although there has not been a consensus yet on the 24 hours, nevertheless, the 24 hours remains, for the moment, the only proposal that it is on the table, there have not been any other alternatives proposed.

And so the contracted parties yesterday and also in previous meetings have raised certain obstacles.

So now the community is discussing together, also with the GAC, to see how these obstacles can be addressed. And although it is true that new issues seem to be arising quite often, it is reassuring that most contracted parties, mentioned also yesterday, that they receive a very limited number of urgent requests and that they usually deal with them quite frequently, sorry, quite quickly. So in terms of obstacles, some of the things that they mentioned is that they have liability concerns, that they have concerns about resources, especially for smaller registrars. They also raised the possibility to have a longer timeline in extenuating circumstances.

They also raised issues of different jurisdictions, for example, that notions like a threat to life can be interpreted in a different way depending on the jurisdiction. And also, they flagged the need to ensure that the urgent request channel should not be abused, that it should not be used for nothing, and that a due process should be in place. So a GAC representative was there in the meeting and gave reassurance on most of these points. They explained that the law prevails in any case on ICANN policies and, of course, requests need to be lawful. Jurisdiction issues is a factor to take into account when making a disclosure decision.

So, in other words, we understand that there could be circumstances where requests could be in theory denied and that the disclosure is not automatic. Now, on the next steps, ICANN will

circulate the text seeking to take into account all these different positions, so we expect more meetings of the IRT to come. I will pass the floor to Gabriel, who will give you an update on the authentication and on the work they do with law enforcement.

GABRIEL ANDREWS

Thank you, Melina. This is Gabriel, PSWG. And, briefly, the progress is good. We're having conversations that are showing that there is a genuine path forward. I don't want to count chickens before they're hatched, but we have discussions that are seeking to identify existing or aspirational tools that law enforcement have that can be brought to bear to help authenticate our law enforcement agencies around the world and help with the ICANN use case. The way that we've identified potential tools and capabilities that could help breaks down into sort of two groups.

We've seen that there are existing law enforcement portals, or those that are being actively worked on by our partners in Interpol, that might be used to serve as identity providers, where there's already mechanisms to authenticate all of the various member agencies that exist within them, and to pass that authentication on to ICANN. And so we're exploring with ICANN Staff how that can be done. Further, because that's a process that might be expected to take some time to really iron out, we're also helping to identify lists of information that might be useful in the short term.

These are lists of various law enforcement agencies, the countries that they are from, and certain identifiers that are associated with

them, and to make these lists available to ICANN, potentially for integration into the RDRS, but also just available to registrars, if we can make that happen. I, again, want to stress that we're still in discussions with ICANN about how we can make this happen, and they have some decisions to make on their end.

But overall, the fact that these conversations are progressing so well, I think is cause for optimism. Next slide. I think from this point forward, it's going to be Sebastien and myself talking about the Registration Data Request Service. So, Sebastien, I'll turn it over to you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Thank you, Gabriel. So again, I'm Sébastien Ducos, Chair of the RDRS Standing Committee. Yeah, sorry, next slide, please. So a slide that looks a lot like the one that Laureen presented earlier, but just basically focused on where that EPDP went and where it is. So, as Laureen said, the recommendations that came out of the EPDP Phase 2, known as SSAD, were presumed to require development and a large amount of money.

And so the Board initiated a new process at that time, it didn't exist before, of an operational design assessment, which was conducted by Org, by Staff, and which indeed found that if the SSAD were to be implemented in full, I don't have the exact figure, but it was upwards of \$100 million to develop that tool. So the recommendations had been voted in by the GNSO council, they

were in the hands of the Board, the Board still hasn't voted on them.

But the Board raised an alert, came back to Council and said, hey, could you look at your recommendations and tell us if they are really what you want to do because it seems very expensive? And I was tasked, this is already four years ago, with looking at what we could do, and what the small team at that time proposed to do was a pilot on a simplified version of the SSAD, essentially a ticketing system, allowing to have a central point to take requests from the public, from law enforcement, from IP lawyers, and other concerns in the public, to make those requests, and those requests to be funneled onto the different sponsoring registrars for a given domain.

So we've been running that pilot now for a year and a half. It should end in October. As Laureen hinted, even though the pilot is going to finish, the tool that we've built in that process is likely to be maintained or should be maintained and possibly enhanced. But more importantly, we're now with a set of recommendations that were voted by the GNSO Council that will need to be revised, and we're working, right now, I don't want to preempt because there's another slide about that, but we are looking at what recommendations should be revised and why, and so on.

And we'll need to go back into the hands of the GNSO Council. There are processes to do this, either the Board sends this back to us or we recall it. And in order to realign the policies with what now,

knowing what we know from the pilot, we believe it should be.
Next slide.

GABRIEL ANDREWS

All right, I'll quickly go through these. So this is where you can find the RDRS if you want to take a look at it. This is for the newer members who might not have had the opportunity to do so before rdrs.icann.org. Next slide. And again, for those that are not as familiar with the topic, this is why it matters. When domain name registration information is redacted, you see what's on the left, which is very close to nothing. It's not entirely nothing.

When it's unredacted, you can find very useful contact information for those public service missions that Laureen articulated. This is why it matters. Next slide. We've had conversations between the GAC and the Board, and the GAC itself has raised several points over the course of the pilot and the experiment, raised some concerns regarding things like the participation of all registrars, which is currently there's, I think, 90 something registrars that are participating in the pilot, which isn't all, but it's a sizable number.

We've raised concerns about integration of privacy and proxy services into the system, which has been hit or miss, the development of authentication mechanisms, which is why I've personally been so invested in working on law enforcement validation, and the voluntary participation of ccTLDs. And in conversations with the Board, they have shown that they've heard

these concerns and they share them, and this is very gratifying.
Next slide.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Sebastien Ducos again. Oh, previous slide. Yeah, thank you. So the standing committee was tasked essentially with four tasks, part of the report that we're drafting. One, to find trends, so over the first year, and after the first year, we decided that we had enough months to months data in order to give an idea of trends amongst all trends, but it's not the key figure is to try to get an evaluation of how many people would come and use what sort of ballpark figure we would talk about, and what type of entities would come and make those requests and understand what the proportion of law enforcement, IP lawyers, others would be on the system.

All these reports are published and available on the RDRS ICANN website. Then possible technical updates. The pilot was only a pilot, there was only so much we could build to have something operational, but there's already a number of improvements that are being suggested. One of them, as Gabriel hinted, for example, is to have an interface for ccTLDs to be able to participate. Others are improvements such as APIs and others, but I won't get into details. The lessons learned: so what do we see in the pilot that makes sense to us to keep, and possibly what we see shouldn't be kept?

I don't have any immediate example of that, but at least we know that, even though it was voluntarily a simplified version of the

SSAD, it has a purpose, it serves a purpose, and that it should be kept, at least the portion there that we're working with. And this is the phase that we're in right now, going back to the SSAD recommendations and make our own SSAD R recommendations, because they're policy recommendations, make our own smaller recommendations, our view of what should be done, to send that back to the GNSO Council, who, I assume, not my decision there, will spin a new policy-building body, PDP or another form, I don't want to preempt, that will look at those recommendations to have inline a new set of recommendations, a new bigger recommendations that are policy, and that can go back to the voting and going to the Board.

So we finished chapters one and two. The lessons learned is basically, we've put everything, but there's always a bit of back and forth. Now that we're looking at the original recommendations again with a fine-tooth comb, and the chapter four on that analysis of the original recommendations is happening now. Should be finished in the next month, month and a half, because we will need to publish an initial report end of July in order to be able to have a comment period opening in August that we want to run until about mid-September, and please do come and comment, in order to be able to wrap the whole thing by ICANN84.

The comment period can't run much beyond mid-September because at that point we won't have time to finish our report, but this is where we're at. Next slide. And I can't remember if it's mine or yours. No, it's mine. So we're looking at those

recommendations. And essentially, as always in these things, either you keep everything, you throw everything out, or you analyze point by point and you make the changes that you want. This is basically the route that we're taking. SSAD, RDRS will continue being a tool that we want to see existing. There's no hint of wanting to put that in the bin, but essentially, again, not what it was or what it was recommended four years ago that is too large, too costly, and unsustainable.

Next slide, please. Okay. So very, very quickly, there was 18 recommendations, this is only the titles, they go for pages. But essentially, the big chunk, or half of the cost of what SSAD was going to be was the accreditation system. So, a system where users identity would be fully verified, we would verify who they were, what rights they had to be able to request in order to give the registrars when they received the request a full view of who that individual would be.

And that was a very expensive exercise, mainly because they required humans verifying that documentation worldwide. That we have done away with for the pilot, and for intensive purposes, we are looking at how far we want to pare this down. There might be some level of accreditation, we're still discussing it, definitely for law enforcement and possibly for other governmental entities, such as CERT, for example, that deal with security. But that we are, even though we didn't test in the pilot, we're looking at to what extent we want to pare that down, or what we want to maintain.

Then there is a bunch of recommendations that actually were implemented in some way or form, at some level in the pilot, and there again, we are assessing if we're keeping them, if we're keeping them at the level of the pilot, or if we should be extending it a bit. I'm not going to go into the details. Obviously, afterwards, everything that had to do with SLAs and making the system mandatory for the pilot, it wasn't mandatory, but the SSAD recommendations had the idea of mandatory participation by registrars, and we will have to find a path to go back to it. And then the big chunk I want to mention is the financial sustainability.

One of the big questions that we had originally is \$100 million is a lot of money, but if you have a billion requests, it's not that much, it's 10 cents a pop, it's okay. So it was evaluating what that market or regular request, particularly with regards to what WHOIS was receiving, which was billions of requests.

GABRIEL ANDREWS

I think we need to probably go through--

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Okay, I think I'm done with this slide. Thank you. Sorry for that. We can--

GABRIEL ANDREWS

Revisit this one, maybe in the future because of the amount of time. So sorry to interject. There's important discussions to be had on

price, but due to time constraints, I think we'll revisit some of that in the future and go ahead and move on to the last. Let's go ahead one more. As was just mentioned, there's going to be an opportunity for public comment in August on the final report that's coming out of the standing committee.

This is a slide for reference. When that public comment happens, the GAC should be aware that there was prior GAC comments and advice pertaining to the original asset recommendations, we might want to go back and revisit them. Here are some useful links for that that could be of service. And proceed. Thank you. I believe, is it David?

DAVID BEDARD

Yeah, thanks. So I'll try to be brief, just because I know that we have just a few minutes left, but I'll cover some of the accuracy history here. Next slide, please. Great. So, the GAC has consistently emphasized the importance of accuracy for quite some time. So, on a number of occasions, the GAC has highlighted the importance of accuracy on the security, stability, and resiliency to the DNS and highlighted ICANN's continued work on accuracy, the latest of which was reflected in the Seattle communique.

So, as was mentioned prior, work on accuracy has been stalled since 2022. There was an accuracy scoping team that was formed in 2021, and as an initial step in the policy development process around accuracy. This was essentially to help facilitate community understanding of the issue and to articulately or accurately define

and scope the issue of data accuracy. So, the group recommended that register surveys be developed and administered, as well as an audit of current register procedures on verification of data accuracy.

However, the GNSO paused the work of the scoping team and deferred consideration of survey recommendations, and sort of that pause has persisted ever since. So, coming in 2023, ICANN Org concluded that it sort of lacked legitimate purpose to request individuals or bulk access to registration data for accuracy reviews, and suggested that analyzing registered data, audit data, or ccTLD practices as alternatives to get a better look at accuracy. And then I'll fast forward a bit just to say that in 2024, the GNSO Council acknowledged that existing proposals lack sufficient data to advance accuracy work and initiated a consultation with ICANN Org and stakeholders on regulatory threshold questions.

So that's kind of where we were at prior to the last ICANN meeting. The GAC had issued a response, as well as other community members, to the threshold questions. And in our response, the GAC stressed that work on accuracy issues should be informed by relevant data and that that data should inform considerations on evidence based in narrowly scoped next steps on accuracy. So this sort of lands where we are today.

So since ICANN82, a GNSO small team was established to determine next steps on data accuracy. The team is now reviewing responses to those threshold questions, which would include the

GACs response as well. And the team has suggested a number of next steps. So, investigating shortening the timeline for registrars to perform registration data validation and verification from the current 15-day limit. Also, a bit of awareness in terms of registrant education to encourage the submission of accurate data, and then also work to ensure registration data records show when a domain is suspended due to inaccurate data. So just keeping track of those accounts that were suspended due to inaccurate data.

So it's encouraging, as we're expecting, as we heard yesterday that we should be hearing expected results in the coming weeks. And as we heard in the GAC Board bilateral meeting yesterday, they provided more information on accuracy related requirements in ICANN's contracts. So basically, looking at what some of those contracts require reporting on accuracy and verification of accuracy as well. So, due to challenge also with addressing accuracy directly, the Board noted accuracy could be addressed indirectly through policy developments on separate issues as well.

Next slide, please. So this brings us into considerations for the ICANN Prague communique. So, as we heard, there's a few issues right now that I think that we don't necessarily need to be issuing any advice for these, but certainly issues of importance. Here, we heard the Registration Data Request service update. So I think that there could be utility in sort of articulating as the GAC and how we look forward to the steering committee's final report on future work, improvements to the system, and then how the system currently addresses some of those SSAD recommendations, and

also sort of reiterating our call for this system, or for mandatory participation by gTLD registrars in the RDRS.

And then on to urgent requests for disclosure of registration data, so I think that we think that we should sort of highlight the important work that is happening in the practitioners group and that they've made really important progress both within the short term and long term. And also sort of acknowledge the policy work that's being done in the IRT as well, and that the GAC continues to highlight the importance of responding to urgent requests within the 24-hour response time, which would be consistent with previous GAC communication in previous communiques.

And then, lastly, on the registration data, we could reiterate the importance of accuracy, and then, of course, welcome the next steps suggested by the GNSO small team. Somebody is holding a sign. GNSO small team and related remarks from the Board. So that's it for me. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so very much, David, Sebastien, Gabe, Laureen, and Melina. I apologize because we should have called this session GAC report, not discussion, because the idea was to have some time for discussion for a Q&A session and everything, and it's our fault, and we'll try to do better next time. There's absolutely no time for questions. I had a question as a matter of fact, and sorry for going a little bit over time. If we can go back to slide number 11, please.

There's an important thing that I wanted to mention for the sake of clarity, let's say, and I'll try to be quick here, but I really think there's a fundamental problem with the way we do things, I don't know what the solution might be. But let's say I'm a government representative from the small Magellanic cloud galaxy sent to planet Earth. So I was parachuted here and I see the expedited policy development process. And I take a look at this, okay, the whole thing started in May 2018, May 2019. Oh, an interesting way, EPDP Phase 2 SSAD, July 2020 and then SSAD Operational Design Phase, 2021, 2022, Board GNS consultation, alright, 2023, 2024, seven years after.

What do we have? These guys on planet Earth, they have a strange way to do things. Go back and explain your minister. Like I wanted to communicate to planet Earth from the small Magenta, or, I don't know, Jupiter, and we need to this. In my humble opinion, there should be a better way to do things, I don't have a magical solution for this, but one thing for sure is that my king or my whatever minister back home wouldn't be so happy about the way we do things or about the efficiency of whatever process, whatever internal mechanics or process we have. So I'm very sorry. I have a queue, and I have India, I can give you the floor for 30 seconds. And sorry for my ridiculous example, but anyways. Thank you.

SUSHIL PAL

Thank you, Chair. This is Sushil from India. Just one. First of all, we will request for a GAC advice on the slide which was last because

if we don't do that, we'll be actually letting the foot off the pedal. Let's build up the pressure on the GAC because these have been pending for a long time. So we would request for a GAC advice.

The other thing, RDRS has been more than... it's more than the life it was proposed for. It was meant to be for two years, but we don't see it coming to an end in any which way, which is progressing well. And we don't see SSAD in sight yet, we only see RDRS being supplemented with additional features, which is a positive sign.

And we also see that there is also another track, which is kind of the authentication track for handling the urgent request. If we merge, I think it's better to take the authentication track on the urgent request side and RDRS platform work together, I think we'll have some semblance of whatever we were looking for in SSAD, and that was a suggestion from my side. Thank you so much.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, India. And that's all we have time for. I wish I could open the floor for comments and questions, this would have been a very good, a very interesting discussion, for sure, right? And again, apologies for going over time. Thank you so much, David. Thank you so much, Sebastien, Gabe, and Melina again, and Laureen.

And my apologies for being so direct, but I really think we should do something for our friends from Jupiter and the small Magellan cloud are going to be really confused. Thank you so very much. At

this point, let me welcome also our colleagues from the ASO, more than welcome to approach the head table. Please come over. Thank you very much.

And let's welcome our colleagues from the ASO. I have Nick right here, and I don't need to introduce our distinguished vice chair, Marco, from the Netherlands. We're also joined by Egypt, Christine. Welcome, everyone. So, without further ado, and taking into account that we're a little bit behind with the schedule, I'll hand the floor directly to you, Marco, or is it Nick, to kick off the session?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Well, I'm happy to. And thank you, Nico. And welcome back, colleagues, and thank you, Nick, for joining us, and, of course, Christine. Very briefly, to give you an introduction of what we're gonna talk about, and then also for your background, Nick, we had some discussions with the committee and also I'd like to highlight and thank you for the very informative webinar that served as a preparation for this.

I hope it was useful. We did that on purpose on time so GAC members could use the opportunity to weigh in on ICANN's public comment. So I believe some of us did. With that, and I don't know, we don't have a lot of time, but we felt it would be good to follow up with the ASO here to look a bit reflecting back on all the comments and feedbacks you've received and at further steps. So, after deliberations with the committee, we've put up some

questions and we pre-shared them with you. So unless you want to say something, Nico, I think.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Yeah, very quickly. ICP-2, and this is for the benefit of the new GAC representatives, that stands for Internet Coordination Policy, in other words, RIR governance. RIR, again, standing for Regional Internet Registries. So with that, Nick, over to you.

NICK NUGENT

Yeah, thanks very much for having us. Thanks also for the webinar that we had earlier with you to brief you on the document. Just to set some context again, the Internet Coordination Policy 2 is a document that governs the recognition of new regional internet registries. If there were a desire to have a new regional internet registries, Jupiter NIC, to use your example, or Antarctica NIC, what would the process look like to potentially recognize that new RIR?

ICP-2 was enacted or adopted in 2001, so it's a bit old, and we are in the process, as the ASO/AC, of creating a new document to update the procedures for not only recognizing new RIRs, but also memorializing their ongoing obligations and the potential for derecognition if the RIR continues to not comply with its ongoing obligations. So the document that we published is not called ICP-2 or ICP-3 or ICP-4, rather, the new document is called the RIR Governance Document. That document has been published for comment and consultation.

And yeah, if we could get the slides going here, that would be great. And so we previously presented a webinar to this group, and the purpose of this is just to update you on the consultation that we conducted as well. I'll be very brief with my remarks so we can reserve plenty of time for questions and comments from the community. So we published a document and we conducted a public consultation on the document from 14th of April to 27th of May.

We received a healthy response from the community, we received 17 submissions from the ICANN consultation, and in parallel, we conducted consultations in each of the five RIR regions, and that included in-person presentations for all of the RIR meetings that were held during the consultation period, it also included webinars for those RIRs that were not meeting during the consultation period, as well as before other bodies, ICANN communities, such as the GAC and the ALAC.

And we have preserved all of the feedback and comments that we've received. You can see in the bottom bullet point in the link to all of the information from that consultation. Next slide, please. So these are just some metrics from the consultation, just to show that we had a high level of engagement across our in-person presentations, across our webinars, our mailing list that we opened in each of the five RIR regions. We had a healthy robust response and discussion, and we also published a blog, and you can see some of the metrics on that.

Next slide, please. So, after receiving all that feedback, the purpose of the ASO/AC coming to ICANN83, although we often attend ICANN meetings, the purpose of our work this week is simply to digest all of that feedback. We care very much about the community's input on the document, we solicited it in multiple venues, as I mentioned, and so we've been meeting all week to read every single comment, every single suggestion, every single question that came in, and not a small number of them, some very long responses, including from some members of the GAC, which we very much appreciate. As we've digested this feedback, we've divided the feedback into roughly three categories or buckets.

There is feedback that is actionable, that we thought, that's a really good point. We missed that, or that's something in the document that we need to update, or we need to modify the language. We haven't been clear in a particular regard. So our goal is to incorporate that language, or that suggestion, into the next version of the document. We call that actionable. There were lots of comments that were very applicable, very insightful, and I'll go over some of those comments in just a moment, but they went beyond the scope of the document, or I should say, they went deeper than the document can go at this point.

So, the RIR Governance document is meant to be a high-level framework for how RIRs are recognized, what their ongoing obligations are, and how they might be de-recognized. And there were comments along the lines of, well, how is this going to work in terms of notifications and timelines? And if there's a handoff

process, how is that exactly going to work? Are you going to escrow the data? Are you going to escrow the source code? These are all excellent questions, but it's simply not possible to get into that level of detail in the document.

Rather, the intent is that there's going to be another document, which we're calling the implementation procedures, that's going to include all of those more low-level details. And that document can change in a dynamic fashion, won't be subject to broad ratification procedures and whatnot. So a lot of those implementation details, we thought, great feedback, but we're not going to incorporate all those details in the document, that's going to live in a separate place. That's the second category, the second bucket.

The third are simply comments that were insightful, but we thought, that's probably out of scope for what we're trying to do. They speak to other issues outside of the RIR system, or the intent is to sort of fundamentally re-architect the RIR system. Those are helpful comments to get because it's interesting to think about these things, but our charter was to revise this particular document, which is related to recognition, operation, and de-recognition. And so we can't get to some other restructuring ideas that were proposed. Or some were simply in conflict with some of the core principles that we attempt to embody in the document, and so we don't intend to incorporate those.

But we do intend to respond to a lot of the feedback and say, this is why we've taken action on this, this is a great suggestion, and we're

going to try to incorporate this in the document. Or this is a suggestion that's interesting, but we don't think it's going to work in conjunction with the principles of the document because of X, Y, and Z. So we intend to respond to a lot of these, but again, a lot of great, thoughtful commentary. Next slide, please. And so we thought we'd give you just a sampling of some of the comments that were received, some of the feedback that was offered just in this slide and the next slide.

For example, one of the common pieces of feedback related to approval thresholds. So, the current structure of ICP-2 is that ICANN decides whether to recognize a new RIR. That hasn't happened since 2005, given that AFRINIC was the last new RIR. But if indeed Jupiter NIC or Antarctica NIC, there's a desire to potentially recognize that, what's that process going to look like? And the nature of the RIR system and the relationship between the RIRs and ICANN has changed over the last 25 years. And so the current draft document provides a two-track or a two-stage approval process. The idea is that first, the RIRs would consider the application, and in the current draft, would need to unanimously approve of recognizing that new RIR.

And then, if the RIRs do approve that unanimously, the decision goes to ICANN, who makes the final decision. We got a lot of commentary, a lot of feed... I'm supposed to slow down. Okay, thank you for the sign. We got a lot of feedback that unanimity might be a high bar, might be infeasible, or that it might create conflicts of interest among the RIRs. So that's something we're

working through, and we'll not offer our decision on that just yet because we're still fleshing it out, but that's it. Consistent piece of feedback is to think carefully about the right approval threshold.

Another question was whether ICANN should be able to initiate a proposal to recognize a new RIR. Another issue is suppose that ICANN ultimately rejects a proposal, should ICANN's decision be reviewable or appealable in some fashion? Additionally, if indeed it's necessary for another RIR to take over RIR services for another RIR, what should that look like? How do we guarantee that there's sufficient continuity, that the handoff procedure is smooth?

Next slide, please. Just a few more pieces of feedback that we'll offer. The current draft notes that it is intended that the total number of RIRs should remain small. The reason for that is that a lot of coordination needs to happen between the RIRs. And so, with each new RIR, the level of complexity grows and the potential for fragmentation increases. And so there was a lot of commentary on how exactly we determine the right number of RIRs.

As I mentioned, we got a lot of very helpful feedback about details as to how certain things would work, how certain notices should be made, things of that sort, what do good governance, corporate governance practices, what should they look like. We decided, again, a lot of those things will be set forth in a separate implementation procedures document. There were comments around the need to audit quickly, to audit well, to identify problems early.

And lastly, one of the innovations in this document is that each RIR is required to implement anti-capture measures to make sure that no single entity or group of affiliated entities can effectively control the RIR. Rightly so, we got lots of questions and comments about how one can determine effective control. So I won't get into how we've decided to respond to each of those pieces of feedback, and to a large extent, we're still working through that, but we just wanted to give a sampling of some of the very thoughtful feedback that we've received so far.

Next slide, please. So what are the next steps? Well, we're going to take this feedback, we're going to create a version two of the document, the next draft, and we aim to publish it by late August or early September. Then we'll conduct another public consultation on that revised document. And it's expected that we will publish it before ICANN84 so that participants at ICANN84 can use part of their time at the meeting to work through the document and to formulate their feedback.

So, in this case, the consultation closed just before ICANN83. In the next instance, we hope to provide the consultation to span ICANN84 so you can have time to meet together to discuss. Then we expect to close the public comment shortly thereafter.

Next slide, please. So we realize that part of the purpose of this meeting is to be available to answer questions by the GAC, and we are happy to make ourselves available for that. To even potentially

see the conversation, we'll ask some questions of you, which you're free to ask of us or comment on or not as you like.

If you'd like, we'd be interested to know if there are any provisions that you would like more information on. Why did we draft a particular provision in that way? We did think carefully about it, but maybe our reasons are not always apparent. And in addition, we would ask you, what can we do to improve the next consultation? We think this one was very successful, but there's always room for improvement and we're looking for feedback in that vein. And I think that's the last slide.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Nick. Some good questions, I already see a queue. Before I turn to that, I've got one question with regards to the ICANN84 plans. Would that meeting include a public session of the ASO to have a public discussion with the community? Or would that be a possibility to consider that?

NICK NUGENT

I don't see why not. We'll have to, of course, do the planning. We haven't begun ICANN84 planning yet, but I don't see any reason why we wouldn't have a public session. We had a public session in this one as well, but it wasn't very well attended because we had already closed the consultation and already conducted so many webinars. But I think that's a great idea.

MRCO HOGEWONING

Wonderful. Then I have China on the queue, and then Netherlands. So China, please.

GUO FENG

Thank you, Marco. Guo Feng from China for the record. So share some comments on this topic. I would like to thank members of ASO for coming here to discuss ICP-2 with the GAC. The rational allocation of IP resources and the security and stability of the IP infrastructure affect the operation of the global internet. Since China has a big size of internet infrastructure and internet population, so the use of IP addresses is huge.

Therefore, we hope to see the efficient, safe, and stable operation of the global internet address resource architecture. The ICP-2 policy development process will lead to important adjustments to the governance structure of regional internet address resources around the world, and will affect the governance of internet address resources in the future years. With that, we suggest that the ASO, or perhaps together with NRO, can take advantage of ICANN meeting this week and the next several months to carefully discuss and review the feedbacks and suggestions collected from all stakeholders, properly handle issues flagged during consultation.

It is anticipated that you can come up with a revised version of RIR governance document that can keep in line with the principle of

fairness, security and stability in relation to internet address resources, and then proceed to the subsequent approval processes. So thank you once again and good luck to the following procedures. Thank you.

NICK NUGENT

Thanks very much. And that is how we've been proceeding and hope to continue and finish that process soon. Thanks so much.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, China. I have Netherlands next.

MAAIKE VEENSTRA

Hi, Maaïke Veenstra for the Netherlands. I have a question regarding the process, because you mentioned that the actionable inputs would be reflected in the next draft of the RIR governance document, which will be discussed during the next ICANN meeting. I was actually wondering if you have any indication on how many drafts there are going to be on this document?

NICK NUGENT

Great question. So, we do have a working assumption, subject to revision, that the next draft would be something like the final draft. Now, it's our hope that, obviously, if a major issue were spotted that required a third draft, then that would be forthcoming. We're not going to artificially limit it to two.

Likewise, even if it is a final-ish draft, that, if there's a typographical error or a tweak that can be made, then we might have a version 2.1 that is more of a, hey, we're sending this out to let everybody know we changed this, but we're not opening up to a fresh consultation on the addition of this comma. But our intention is to, but we obviously have to do what is necessary in light of the comments and the feedback we get. Thank you.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you. And I've lost the-- Russian Federation next on the queue. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Russian Federation, you can you please go ahead? The floor is yours.

VIACHESLAV EROKHIN

Good morning, colleagues. I will make a little contribution. I will speak Russian. Dear colleagues, I would like to make a short comment that has to do with the process of public comments, documents, and ICP-2. As you know, we had two sessions for discussion of this document. In December, we discussed the organizational principles for RIRs, and recently we were discussing the other document. In the course of discussing the principles, there was a document that was created that has to do with the

foundational principles of the organization of the Original Internet Registries, RIRs.

This document was published, or the final version of document was published on the ICANN website and also on the NRO website, and it can still be found there. After that, during the latest discussion of the governance document, we see that this document included principles of the organization of RIRs. It is a part of this document, but I would like to turn your attention to the fact that in some of these principles, the text was changed. During the webinar that was held for the GAC for the NRO and ASO, I asked a question, why was the text changed in this case? And I received a general answer that we thought that this would be better.

Who thought that? Why did they think that? Why is it better? All of this raises the question of transparency, accountability, and accountability of the work of the multi-stakeholder model. It is not clear to us why the new version of the document introduces modifications that were not included during the public hearings, taking into account the fact that the principles that we were discussing in December were supported by all the ICANN organizations, ASO, ALAC, etc.

I would like to, again, point out the process of preparation of these documents, and I would like to call on to the organizers to very carefully examine all the changes in the text and justify them or be very careful in general with these changes and also report on why changes were introduced. ICP-2 is one of the foundational

documents, it is fundamentally important that all of the text and all the all will be founded on the proposals made by the community. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Russian Federation. Nick.

NICK NUGENT

Thank you very much for the comments. So, just to set context. The way that we decided to undergo this project, undertake this project, was we could have provided a draft document, a full draft document of the RIR governance document as a first step. That would have been one way to proceed. But we thought that that would probably be too much to just dump the full 10-page document with all the provisions and cross-references and just say, what do you think, community?

It could invite a lot of discussion about small issues or formatting, or typos, or many details. So, rather, we thought, a good way to stage this is, first, let's provide a set of principles, and there were 24 core principles that were sort of atomic and very short and simple. For example, an independence principle, or a good corporate governance principle, or an anti-capture principle. Each of these could be considered in isolation and evaluated in isolation, and then we put out the consultation that allowed the community to comment on each distinct principle and to get feedback on the

high-level concepts before we proceeded to draft the full document.

We thought that that was a better way of staging the drafting, getting good feedback early in the process. And as a result, when we put out the principal's document for comment and we received feedback, exactly what we hoped would happen did happen, which is that we got some comments that suggested, maybe this principle isn't such a good idea, or maybe it needs to be further developed or changed in this way. So, we regard the fact that the full document differs from the principles as a feature, not a bug. Just as we hope to make changes between Version 1 and Version 2 based on feedback, we regard that as taking the feedback from the community into account when drafting.

So, indeed, there are changes from the principles to the draft, but that was part of the learning process and getting feedback from the community. So if there are questions about why we changed a particular treatment of an issue between the principles and the draft, we're happy to address that. But to be clear, the principles and each draft, none of these are official documents that are locked in stone or are meant to be permanent, they're meant to be drafts, they're meant to be revised and improved upon from version to version. So if any of those changes were large, we don't think any of them really were that large.

But one example I'll give is that in terms of the threshold, in terms of how many RIRs are required to approve, that might have

changed from the principles to the draft, but to be honest, I can't recall precisely, we're happy to explain why we made those changes. I think we'll continue to make changes in response to feedback. And again, we're happy to answer questions as to why any particular thing was changed, but we regard this as part of the drafting and learning process.

MRCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Nick. Yeah, and I think also what I heard in between the lines is that the GAC prefers to have a clear track changed document on future iterations of the document, but I guess that's the natural ICANN process. We have roughly 12 minutes left in the session, I've got four people in the queue, so I think we're good. But the next one up is Egypt, then. Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, and thank you for the excellent presentation. So I had three things in mind coming to this session. First, the early signals from the input you received, which you already covered very well in the presentation. And second, how many drafts should we expect before the implementation, as Netherlands already asked. And finally, regarding how to help us in the upcoming consultation, I think we struggled, similar to Russia, in comparing the drafts.

I think it's a very good approach to have it in stages and go through iterations. I appreciate the difficulty coming up with the red line version, it would be too difficult with this approach, but maybe a

one-pager summary of what was changed, especially with the common messages you're receiving if you can highlight what the changes in the new draft and if there is a pressing message that was not accommodated, maybe a one line of why not? Thank you.

NICK NUGENT

Yes, thank you. I will obviously need to discuss it as a group, but I don't see any reason why we can't do those things. Maybe three things that I think you've identified. As for the red line, you're right, it would have not really been possible to create a red line between the principles and the full draft. But I don't see a reason why we couldn't have a red line between Version 1 of the draft and Version 2. I think that seems entirely plausible.

MANAL ISMAIL

Even better.

NICK NUGENT

But wait, there's more. What we'll try to do is have a summary of describing the changes that were made beyond the red lines. And then, thirdly, we can't respond to every piece of feedback, but we're going to have a separate document that summarizes some of the common and most salient issues or pieces of feedback that we received, and how we reason through those and what we've decided to do with them. So those are three things that we're going

to try to do. Hopefully, folks will feel that the Deltas are a little bit more detectable between version one and Version two.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Nick. Thank you, Egypt. Then next on my queue is Malaysia. Usman. Sorry, my mistake, Nico. Correct, India. Sorry, and now I have somebody else on India. You have the floor, please.

SUSHIL PAL

Thank you. This is Sushil from India. Thank you, Nick, for the great presentation. Just a comment that it's a very important draft, and we should not rush through this, and I think we are going at a very fast pace. This is the fastest work I've seen in ICANN so far.

And if we can handle the urgent request matters for five, six years, and the matters of DNS abuse for five, six years, I think this is something, since we're looking at the governance of the IR, RIR, I think we should not rush through this and should incorporate the feedbacks given by the stakeholders and definitely make the approval body of this, which we find is pretty much skewed and is not a multi-stakeholder in a true sense.

So, in the interest of the fairness and equity, I think we should give it more time so that all the stakeholders come and are incorporated at least. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, India. I have Malaysia next and then Switzerland.

NICK NUGENT May I respond briefly to that?

NICOLAS CABALLERO Yeah, go ahead.

NICK NUGENT Thank you. Thanks for your comments. Perhaps it is faster than I can with our process, so it may not be apparent how long we've been working on this. We first received the request to begin this process from the NRO EC in October of 2023, so we're approaching the two-year mark, and this process will take more than two years total, but certainly will take as long as is necessary to make sure the appropriate procedures are followed. And as for the ratification procedure, that's a little bit beyond our scope, but we're happy to talk to you about that. And also refer you to the NRO EC, which is more involved in that.

SUSHIL PAL Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO So, thank you again. India, is that an old hand from Pradeep? Okay. So, I have Malaysia and Switzerland, and we have seven more minutes. Go ahead, please, Malaysia.

RUZAMRI RUWANDI

Okay, for the record, my name is Ruzamri, Alternative Representative for GAC Malaysia. First, I would like to thank you, the ASO, for conducting the public consultations. This is a good effort, and we really appreciate it. We have submitted a formal return feedback to the ASO, but I hope ASO received that as we did receive an acknowledgement of the submissions, and I'm more than happy to re-email the formal written feedback. While reviewing the proposed documents, we have concern, particularly on paragraph 2.6.

We noted the inclusion of the phrase at its complete discretion. So, based on our understanding, this phrase appears to confer full discretionary power upon the RIR to establish and dedicate number resources to one or more sub-regional registries, including the RIR. So, we have the concerns as this could be interpreted as granting a single party or authority to make critical decisions on matters that may significantly impact national internet governance. It is important to note that such discretionary power is not reflected in the current ICP-2, which outlines the criteria for the establishment of new regional registered internet.

We propose that the phrase at the complete discretion in paragraph 2.6 of the governance document be omitted or alternatively rephrased to reflect a more collaborative and consultative approach. This would help to ensure a fair and transparent decision-making process concerning for

establishment of sub-regional registry and it would also strengthen the legitimacy of future sub-regional registry arrangement and uphold the principle of community, governance, and fair representation, especially for governments and internet communities that are directly affected.

NICK NUGENT

So, as I understand it, you're referring to section 2.6, which speaks to whether or how, or the conditions around which RIRs can create national internet registries or other sub-regional internet registries, and it sounds like Malaysia takes exception to the fact that RIRs have discretion as to how they do that. It sounds like Malaysia would like more controls or parameters around that. Do I hear you correctly?

RUZAMRI RUWANDI

Yeah, to put more some collaborative words at the point, to omit at least complete descriptions.

NICK NUGENT

Okay, thank you for the feedback.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Malaysia. I have Switzerland next.

JORGE CANCIO

Sorry. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. Thank you for the explanations, for the information, this is obviously a very important process. And if you have seen the reactions, there is a lot of interest from many parts of the GAC, of the community.

As many of the questions have been of procedural nature, I would suggest to you and to the team running this, that you look into the Sao Paulo multistakeholder guidelines that provide some process steps on how to run a multistakeholder process which is open, transparent, and inclusive. I think many of the things you are doing already. But many of the questions that have been placed today could be addressed if you looked into that and tried to abide by the recommendations that are included there. Thank you.

NICK NUGENT

Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much. We're running out of time. We have three minutes, so Switzerland, Japan, USA, and Egypt. So, please be brief and straight to the point. I have Japan next.

TOMONORI MIYAMOTO

Thank you. This is Tomonori Miyamoto from Japan. Thank you for the presentation. I understand that the more details, like the operation matters or procedures, will be discussed later, maybe after the issue of new version of ICP-2, but do you have any plan for

the timeline for the discussion, are you planning to issue another document for the operations?

NICK NUGENT

I don't have a timeline. I hope it's soon, I hope it's reasonably in parallel, but it could be later after the ratification, just because these are things that the RIRs would need to evaluate between themselves. But we're early in our thinking on that, so I don't want to make any firm commitments. I'll take your comments as registering the feedback that we perhaps need to provide more information about what this separate implementation procedures document would look like. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Japan. I have USA next.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. Susan Chalmers for the record. We support any necessary and further efforts by the ASO/AC, including developing further iterations of the RIR governance document to find broad consensus within the community on the document.

NICK NUGENT

Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, U.S. Egypt.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Thank you very much, Christine Arida for the record. I'll be very quick. I had the same question like Japan, and since there is no visibility on that yet, I would really encourage that since we're having already a two years mark coming up, I think working in parallel, because the broad lines are there, we could start on the operation. It will take some time, I just hope that given the situation in Africa, it would be good to move on quite quickly with identifying operational matters timeline.

NICK NUGENT

Yes, thank you. And I should have noted that there already exists an implementation procedures document connected with the current version of ICP-2 that's been, I think, adopted and published. But this new document, we need to provide more visibility on the process around that. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Egypt, Nick. Netherlands, you have the last question or comment.

MARCO HOGEWONING

I'll have the last, and the slide is already up, I think. And thank you, Nick, and thank you for all the members. I think this discussion reflects that this is and remains an issue of importance to the GAC. I'll try to capture some of what was said in a few brief lines in our

communicate, but if any members have particular input, please contact me, come and find me, I'll try and present that during one of the upcoming drafting sessions, but any input as early as possible, please. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Netherland. Which brings me to the next. On the one hand, thank you so much, Nick. Thank you for taking all the questions. Thank you for your detailed explanations and for your patience. On the other hand, some housekeeping details for my esteemed colleagues, we'll have a lunch break now, a 90-minute lunch break.

And please get some extra coffee, because right after lunch, we'll be starting the communicate drafting. And that's why Marco was referring to any potential input from GAC members regarding RIR governance. So get that extra ristretto or cappuccino or whatever, and please be here at 1:45 sharp. Thank you so much. Thank you so much, and thank you, Nick.

NICK NUGENT

Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]