
ICANN79 | CF – Joint Session: GAC and ALAC and GAC Bilateral
Sunday, March 3, 2024 – 10:30 to 12:00 SJU

DANIEL GLUCK:

Hello and welcome to the GAC meeting with the ALAC on Sunday the 3rd of March 2024 at 14:30 UTC. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in 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. And please make sure to mute all other devices when you are speaking. You may access all available features for this session in the Zoom toolbar.

With that, I'll hand the floor over to GAC Chair, Nico Caballero.

NICO CABALLERO:

Thank you very much, Daniel. Please take your seats. We're about to start. Let me call the session to order. So welcome everyone. Welcome, Jonathan. Welcome, Alan. Welcome, everyone—Tracy Ros, everybody. Sorry if I forget to mention anybody, but I just want to make sure these 45 minutes ... This session will be running till 11:15. I just want to make sure everybody has enough time to give their presentations or their speeches or to say whatever they need to say at this point, and then only afterwards. I'll open the floor for Q&A. So welcome again.

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.

Without further ado, let me give the floor to Jonathan Zuck, ALAC Chair.
Floor is yours.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you very much. Hello, GAC. Excited to be here again. So thank you very much. We enjoy working with you on a number of issues because we really share a common interest in terms of the citizenry, the average user are the folks that you're concerned about and we're concerned about. And so when we get asked, what do you want from the next round, or what would be considered a success associated with the next round, we're asking a different set of questions than other people in the ICANN community. We're asking whether or not the lives of everyday people have gotten better or worse. Are communities better represented? Are indigenous communities better represented? Are people using non-Latin scripts better represented in the program within the ICANN community? And so we've said that the only way to measure success of the next round is if the pool of registries grows bigger than it is now and includes a much broader geographic and economic and cultural diversity. So that's the number one goal that we put forward when talking to the Board and others inside the ICANN community about the next round. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO:

Thank you, Jonathan. As a matter of fact, we had a very interesting exercise yesterday that took about ten minutes, not even ten minutes, using paper/pen, the old-fashioned way. And it worked very well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Totally transparent. Right there in front of everyone.

NICO CABALLERO: Absolutely. Exactly. And everybody identifying themselves. Full transparency, SOI kind of thing. So I think we should do that more often in order to find quicker and maybe more efficient solutions for whatever issues we might be dealing with.

So let me give the floor to ... Is it Ross? You will go ahead and obviously we'll be talking about ... Let me see the Yes, Ross and Tracy, please go ahead. The floor is yours.

ROS KENNYBIRCH: Great. Thank you so much, Nico. And just in the interest of time, if we could go to the next slide, please. Thank you. Great. So thank you, colleagues. My name is Ros. and I'm the topic lead for the GAC on the Applicant Support Program. And I just wanted to start off today's session going back to the question of why was the Applicant Support Program introduced? And I think to contextualize this session, it's important to note that it was intended to address the goal of fostering diversity, encouraging competition, and enhancing utility of the domain name system. In fact, one of the main historical calls for pursuing another round of new gTLD applications was and remains to improve global representation, including from SIDs and LDCs. It is great to be speaking here today after this morning's session on universal acceptance as well. A few colleagues have made some excellent points since ICANN 78 about linking the Applicant Support Program better to

UA and IDN efforts, and this linkage should indeed be a focus as we seek to encourage applications for the program.

Next slide, please. So now we'll move on to discussing some of the challenges that the ASP faced in the 2012 round. And as we have discussed previously in the GAC, the ASP from the 2012 round experienced a number of challenges. We have discussed these at length in the GAC, but to provide a quick recap here, they include low awareness of the program, including in regions of the globe where ICANN's presence is less well known or experienced. And illustrating this, there were just three applicants to the program last time. Another challenge was difficulty with accessibility in terms of the application process, which created a high barrier to entry. And then finally, a less holistic approach was adopted last time, which focused more on financial support and to a lesser extent on [a] non-financial support program.

Excellent. Next slide, please. Great. Again, in the interest of brevity, I will not go through all of the GAC's communique texts which have included language on the ASP. However, I did want to highlight a few cross-cutting themes. One is a focus on global geographic diversity. The GAC has seen the ASP as an important opportunity to encourage global diversification of the new gTLD application program, reaching organizations across Latin America, the Asia Pacific and Africa. Secondly, long-term support. The GAC has consistently advocated for a holistic approach to the ASP, with ongoing support provided, including the potential to substantially reduce or eliminate ongoing ICANN registry fees to expand financial support.

I will now bring in Tracy Hackshaw to offer further reflections and themes, but I hope this provides a useful context for the conversation today. Thank you.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Thank you, Ros. And I will also be brief. And I just wanted to reiterate the issue of outreach and communications. So, in the previous program, it was acknowledged, and the various reports and audits that were done subsequently indicated that the communications aspect of the program was insufficient, to say the least. So one of the things that we are attempting to ensure that we address and rectify and as we say, take in front in this program is make sure that the outreach and communications activity does become more effective or is more effective. There obviously will be limited funds that would be available for that program, and we need to work with all of our stakeholders and partners and governments in the At-Large community to do the outreach, utilize the available resources at its most optimal level to reach those who need it the most, the outreach and communications, and to target the potential applicants, those who will not know or may not know of what's happening in this program, of what's available and how they can participate fully.

So what I just wanted to say, keeping it brief, is that we need to really fine-tune and focus in on this issue, as that was pointed out as being the main challenge before. And let's not make the same mistake that we made previously. Let's ensure that we do what we need to do to address this, given that we knew it was a problem in the previous program. So let's not make the same mistake again now.

Thanks, Ros. We'll go back to you.

ROS KENNYBIRCH:

Great. Thank you so much, Tracy, for emphasizing that really important point. If we could go to slide nine, please. So, flipping through the GAC position summary (and I would encourage colleagues to go back and look at those slides; this presentation will be made available), I will shortly hand it over to Justine and Tracy to discuss in further detail. But I wanted to flag this high-level slide, which offers a visual depiction of some of the challenges we are seeking to address to ensure the next Applicant Support Program that we're working on is a success. This includes program communications. We've not seen a communications plan with detail on implementation and milestones to comment on. Program funding. Inflation has been mentioned in this context previously in the GAC and the need to consider expanding the financial package in the event of a high number of applicants, successful applicants applying. And then the program structure itself and the development of the ASP evaluation review panel are further considerations.

So with that, I believe I'm handing over to Justine, and hopefully that has set the scene well for today's conversation. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Ros. Hi, everyone. Great to be here in front of GAC again. My name is Justine. I'm ALAC Vice-Chair, but I'm also the topic lead for subsequent procedures in the at large community. So just moving on to what Ros was saying, there is an opportunity for the community to

comment on the draft applicant support handbook. That's out for public comment at the moment. The public comment closes on the 2nd of April, so I would urge the GAC members to have a look at the draft handbook and put in comments to see if to address any gaps that you might find or anything that you think might be worth rectifying. This is the time to do it.

But you'll see that in terms of ... Sorry, can I go to the next slide, please? In terms of the draft handbook itself, there are parts of it which are color-coded, and that's a reason for that because there are certain dependencies which are still not resolved; hence the color codes. I won't get into what the color codes mean. It's on the slides. But insofar as what is available at the moment in the draft handbook, there are things that pertain to the program structure, eligibility criteria, which I think is probably the most interesting part for everyone's attention. There's also things like if the applicant is allowed to change the application midway—that kind of thing—and the evaluation of the application.

Next slide, please. I just want to point out some of the things that the Subsequent Procedures Implementation Review Team has worked on. And actually there's a sub-track out of the SubPro IRT that was tasked to review and work on this draft handbook together with the ICANN Org support staff.

So some of the things that we have already changed from the last round to the next round are things like that the application for ASP status is now separated from the main round. So the idea is that there would be ample opportunity for an applicant who is interested in getting support

to find out before the main round opens whether they have qualified for applicant support or not because part of the ASP program is that it's not just a financial support, but there's also non-financial support involved. And the non-financial support is still being discussed under SubPro recommendation 17.2. But the idea is that the sooner you get to know whether you qualify for applicant support or not, then the sooner you can avail yourself to all the other non-financial pro bono services like legal support, back end support, back end registry support, that sort of thing. So you have more time to prepare and you have support to prepare your application for the string in the main round. So those two processes are separated now: the one for ASP status and the one for the string.

So insofar as for ASP, the application for ASP, it's being targeted for a twelve-month window, application window, from quarter four 2024 to quarter four 2025. So you'll note that the window for the main round, the string, is targeted to open only in quarter two of 2026. So there's a bit of a gap there. And there's a reason for that as well.

ICANN Org is trying to commit to twelve to 16 weeks of timeline in terms of evaluating an applicant support application. Obviously this is going to be subject to whether the application is complete or whether there's additional information required, that sort of thing. But they're going to try to commit to a twelve- to 16- week time window for assessing and evaluating the applications for ASP.

And there's some key differences. The last round, if you applied for applicant support and you didn't qualify, then your application for the string would automatically be disqualified. For the next round, that's

not going to happen. So if you apply for ASP and you find out you don't qualify for ASP, you're still entitled to apply for the string, just not with support. That's all.

And in how the separation works in terms of applying for ASP and applying for the string, is that for ASP, the evaluation and the application is going to be focused on the applicant and not the string. So there will be no mention of the string in your application for ASP.

Next slide, please. Just going through very, very high level, what are the key changes between the last round and the next round? In terms of this, the evaluation is going to be on a pass-fail basis and there's no scoring involved for the next round. And in terms of challenge mechanism, this is still being discussed. It's part of the SubPro supplemental recommendation process that GNSO is helming. So that's still a question mark over that, whether it's going to be put into it. But the idea is to allow the applicant to question a determination by the support application review panel that's going to make the decision as to whether they qualify or not qualify for applicant support.

Next slide, please. Okay, so in terms of how next round is going to work is that in the previous round, we only had three categories of evaluation criteria. In the next round, we're going to have five, and it's going to be split into two phases. Some of the evaluation categories are a replicate from previous round, but they've expanded it for the next round.

And the most interesting part of it is the eligible entities. So that's the part that I mentioned earlier that probably deserves most attention and would attract the most interest, I would imagine. And the reason for that is because now we have identified the target applicants that we are

trying to reach for the next round; so entities like nonprofits, charities, international organizations— intergovernmental organizations; apologies—indigenous and tribal peoples' organizations, social impact, public benefit, micro and small business, and the same ones in less-developed economies. So there's a special category for those entities in less-developed economies.

Next slide, please. Okay, so this gives you an idea of what the criteria would applied for intergovernmental organizations.

Tracy, did you want to take this?

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Sure, no problem. So this category is playing as an IGO. The [clear indicator]—I'm not going to read everything on the screen—is basically trying to indicate that if you are an IGO, you do have to follow the definitions that are very clearly done by the UN system: specialized agency or treaty organization, et cetera, et cetera; one who has a standing invitation to the UN system. We need to provide a document that indicates that you qualify to become that IGO.

And if you want to—the next slide—the type of support that's available would be both financial and non-financial. So I think it's important that we make the observation that applicant support is not strictly based on just the money, but also on the non-financial side of this. But we do have to take a careful look at this aspect of the program because this could be an area where applicants who are trying to get access to funds may be shunted off to pro bono service providers and not access the

funds as they need to be, as they see fit to startup, and may not actually get into the program accordingly.

I'm going to hand back to now to Justine in interest of time to finish this slide off. Thanks, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Tracy. So you see that there is a combination of both financial and non-financial types of support on this slide. So we're not going to go through too much of it. It's there. I think something to point out is basically two things. One is you see the first bullet, ASP training (I think it's something that GAC asked for, really) and the last bullet, which is also something that we supported in terms of ALAC, which is to reduce or waive annual registration fee for an applicant who succeeds in getting a string delegated and then starts to operate the registry. So it's additional support once they start getting up.

And you'll see that there is a whole bunch of color codes there. I just want to point out the green ones where it's subject to supplemental recommendation 17.2.

And I will hand it off to my colleague Greg to talk about the progress for supplemental recommendation 17.2 and the ALAC's position on that. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you, Justine, and good morning, everyone. 17.2 is an important, really, change, a major change in the program, moving from what is essentially a financial support to more holistic support, and one that

goes away from just covering fees, although there is a fee waiver, as you can see.

So let's move to the next slide, please. So one of the Board's concerns was that in expanding the program, that it would just mean paying more money for more services. So rather than that, we first define this as an array of resources useful for the entire lifecycle of the application. And it's really not just the application. It's the registry and the TLD as a going concern. The idea is to model this to a fairly great extent on what's called a small business incubator and provide an array of services and supports and expertise that would maximize the possibilities of success for the applicant, rather than what seemed to be, the last time, almost, if not a punitive then,, at best, a neutral program. So the idea is to provide access to a variety of services.

We can look at the supplemental recommendation on the next slide, please, and you can see in the cross-outs, when we get there, what's changing: taking away a reference just to financial support and replacing it with application support and covering costs being replaced by the idea of resources. And in terms of the resources, the plan is for those resources to be offered on a pro bono or no-cost basis to either ICANN or the applicant in order to support this program. Ideally, the program would be operated on a regional basis so that we can find applicants where they are, as opposed to running the program from, say, a central location, say, in North America or Western Europe, and put resources closer to the applicants.

The idea ultimately is to be able to support applicants who are capable, but not necessarily ready to run a TLD. Clearly, these companies are

going to need the wherewithal to raise funds and to operate a business with a fairly substantial cost structure. So the resources may include economic and accounting and even advice from financial and investment professionals, but not providing investment bank services or anything like that.

So this is all still really in the process of being designed, and you can see here a link for suggestions from the community which should be considered in a possible implementation. It would be really good to get this right, or much closer to right, so that we have not only more applicants to the ASP program, but more successful applicants, or for that matter, if applicants find out that they don't have the wherewithal for success, they will know that earlier in the process. That is, in essence, part of the process as well: making sure that there are applicants who are capable of moving from the incubator into being a fully-formed chicken, so to speak, in the barnyard of registries and TLDs.

So that is really the ... If we can move to the next slide, please. This does need to be well-funded, because even with pro bono support, there's going to be a lot of other services, some of which will need various structures around them. And even if the services themselves are not being charged for by the hour, there's going to be to be infrastructure. We would hope to have organizers or sherpas within the regions who would connect the support to the applicants. This isn't going to just happen by itself. So the idea is to try to meet the applicants' needs and to ultimately meet the ecosystem's needs to broaden the base of potential applicants and not make this such something where the incumbents have such an advantage. Indeed, we hope that some of the

incumbents will be involved in helping to work in the incubator model to provide mentorship and support.

So I think that probably has taken enough time and we can hand it back to Justine, who can go over the next slide and beyond. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Greg. So just very quickly, I think slide number 18 summarizes what Greg has just elaborated on.

In terms of the next ... Can we get to the next slide, please? I just want to highlight some of the ALAC positions on applicant support. So, in accordance to what Ros has introduced us to in the beginning of the session, we want to refocus the attention on making ASP a success. So go back to the intended purpose of ASP, which is to diversify the applicant pool, target underserved, underrepresented regions and communities, and increase, obviously, the pool of applicants. And we need to have some sort of metrics to evaluate the success of that.

In terms of the holistic approach, I think Greg has spoken at length about it, and I'd like to finish off by saying basically that in terms of the awareness and funding, those two are the two components which remain in terms of question mark for us. We know that ICANN Org has appointed a communications vendor to help with the communications, but as I think Tracy mentioned, we have not actually seen the details of a communication plan for this ASP and for the New gTLD program, by the way. So we would like to emphasize to ICANN Org and the Board as well, and hopefully with GAC support, that we need to have this communication plan open to the community for input as well as

participation because GAC's network and ALAC's network put together is where the communication can be viralized.

And in terms of the funding plan, we only know that, from the operational design phase assessment report, a figure of \$2 million is mentioned. If we're going to succeed with this ASP, I think we're going to need more than \$2 million. So again, there's a question mark on ... We have not had any progress report on the funding plan from ICANN Org.

With that, I will hand it back to Ros.

ROS KENNYBIRCH:

Great. Thank you so much, Justine. And just to recap ... I know we got a little detailed there, but to recap on the broad points for colleagues, again, looking at the mission behind the Applicant Support Program, it was introduced with the goal of fostering diversity, encouraging competition, and enhancing utility of the domain name system (so just to conclude, by reinforcing that key point), and one of the main historical calls for pursuing another round of new gTLD applications was and remains to improve global representation. So again, to sort of conclude all these with that context as well.

And then just to provide a quick recap of some of the challenges from the last round and things we're seeking to address, there's low awareness of the program, as we discussed at length, including in regions of the globe where ICANN's presence is less well known, accessibility in terms of the application process, and addressing the

challenge of a less holistic approach. So it's looking seriously at both financial and non-financial components of support.

And then finally, again, as has come through here today, it's just to really emphasize the importance of long-term ongoing support to ensure the long-term success of successful applications and that really, really core focus on global geographic diversity.

So hopefully those points sort of encapsulate what we've been talking about in a quick two minute summary today. But I'll pass back to Justine where we're going to talk a little bit more about next steps before closing and asking for any questions and comments. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks, Ros. I thought you were going to do the closing, but never mind, never mind. So I just wanted to point out that there are two opportunities for GAC to participate in this process about putting in comments. One I mentioned, which is the public comment review period for the draft ASP handbook. The second one is more about 17.2, recommendation. 17.2, which is the GNSO Subsequent Procedures supplemental recommendation community consultation. Too many words.

And in terms of joint action between ALAC and GAC, we were contemplating two possible ways: cross-endorsement of GAC statements and ALAC statements, if you were to put in a comment for the public review, the public comment process, or possibly a joint communication of some sort between ALAC and GAC to the Board or to ICANN Org. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you so much, Justine. And thank you, ALAC, Justine, Greg, Jonathan (I'm going to give the floor to Alan) and obviously to Tracy and Ross from the GAC. Thank you so much. Alan, please go ahead before I open the floor for questions for Q&A. Go ahead, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Way back when, something like five or six years ago, the ALAC and the GAC got together, and I guess we were commiserating over the fact that we both have a continual stream of new people coming into our organizations who really don't understand all of the buzzwords and acronyms and complex topics of ICANN. And most of them don't have the time to read the 4,000 pages that would probably be necessary if they were trying to understand them.

NICO CABALLERO: That was actually me not so long ago.

ALAN GREENBERG: We put together some joint advice, essentially asking ICANN to please help us. It's dragged on for a long time for a bunch of reasons, and I won't go into the details now, but we have ultimately come up with a plan to ask ICANN to develop a small number of short documents, primers, which will introduce to people who don't have all the right buzzwords to start with, who don't have the background, what it is we're talking about in some of these subjects. And the list is there. We came up with a list, and between the GAC and the ALAC, we've refined

it to ten items, and you can see they include things like DNS abuse, a really important topic, but it's not a term that someone coming into this group for the first time knows what that means. And the list goes on to registration data, the multistakeholder model, expansion of the TLD namespace, which we've been talking about here, and ends with a new one in ICANN's topics. That is sustainability. What should we be doing to make sure our organization doesn't help hurt the world as we're trying to fix the Internet?

So we're optimistic. We're about to send this list into ICANN. We don't have a timeframe for when we're going to get these documents back, but we are hoping within months, not years. And this item is officially being closed by the Board. And I'm delighted that we can report now that we are going to get something out of it, which hopefully will help us and all of the people involved in our groups. So thank you.

NICO CABALLERO:

Thank you so much for that, Alan. This is what I was referring to right at the beginning when we talked about the short meeting, the short ten-minute meeting, yesterday—the standing meeting, so to say.

I have a queue. I have Iran and Indonesia. For the sake of time, we have ten minutes for Q&A. Please be straight to the point. Thank you beforehand. Iran and then Indonesia.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Thank you very much. It has been a very useful and comprehensive and rich presentation. I thank all of you, the presenters.

One of the issues that everybody (in particular, newcomers) face are acronyms. To read a document, they have difficulty because they are stuck in the middle of document. They have to look at different pages, different area to see what this acronym means. And finally, they may be fed up not to continue. So we have to find a way, and there are ways. If sometimes you need ALAC or GAC, I can present you something.

Number two, the \$2 million, if I correctly understood, is not sufficient. Totally is not sufficient.

Thirdly, we should provide a way how to avoid abuse of the support applicants and so on to forth. That means a rich entity registered in a least developed country and using this budget and so on to forth. We face this problem in other organizations and we have to find a way how to avoid that. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO:

Very good question indeed, Iran. Thank you for that. Would you like to answer to that, Justine? Alan? Jonathan?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Sure, I can take that. Thank you for the question or thank you for the comment. Kavouss. If you look at section five of the draft handbook, which talks about the eligibility criteria and specifically what applies to which kind of eligible entity, you may find some of your fears allayed that way. So if you believe that that is insufficient to allay your fears, then that's why I'm inviting GAC to comment on that. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO: Alan. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, just very briefly, acronyms are way near the top of our list of things that defeat people trying to understand what's going on. So, yes, we understand that.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you so much, Alan. I have Indonesia and then the CTU. Indonesia. Ashwin, go ahead.

ASHWIN RANGAN: Yes, thank you, Nico. Well, the gTLD names for geographical has been regulated in the ICANN bylaws. I[’ll] just ask the team here, how about the other important names as you remember, like dot-Islam [and dot-]Halal. [They] were discussed for about six years before finally it was rejected. How about other names, similar names like that, for example, relating to culture, for example, say ... Well, I just take an example. Batik for example is a culture of Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore. What about if one of this country make the word “batik”? I don't want to meet Justine in front of a Kuala Lumpur court for talking about dot-batik. She is my friend. But I just wonder if these kind of things, the possibility of “nice” conflict like this, can be avoided. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you for the question. Unfortunately we don't have policy to disallow that, and that is part of the multistakeholder model that we live in. There is no policy that was built by the community to address

those kind of questions. So the only way you might question something like that is possibly through an application comment or a GAC advice or an objection. So that is the extent of the answer that I can give you at this point in time.

ASHWIN RANGAN: Who can put the objection? For example, if you put dot-Batik, how can I put the objection? Can Indonesia say we object?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The GAC.

ASHWIN RANGAN: Oh, GAC as a whole. Okay.

JUSTINE CHEW: Can also submit an early warning that's without get consensus and raise it that way as well.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Indonesia. Thank you, Justine, for answering. I have the CTU. Nigel, go ahead, please.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE: Thank you, Chair. Just to add our support to the points raised about applicant support, the Applicant Support Program, and the need for strengthening it, I think very simply we have to look at how it worked the last time, what were the results the last time, and what can we do

better this time? So the last time we had, I think at the end, maybe one successful applicant from the Applicant Support Program. The question is what are the targets that we're going to set for this round and how much money are we going to put into the effort for this round? That \$2 million that everyone says is inadequate I think is a brought-forward figure from the last round. And certainly if you don't move up from that you can't really expect very much better results. So I think it's critical to assess some realistic or more realistic substantial examples of what our targets would be and put the adequate funding in place so that we get better results.

So I would encourage the GAC to support the enhancement and the enhancement of the ASP and the points that have been raised earlier. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you, CTU, for your comment. There's no question there. There's just encouragement for the GAC, and thank you for that. I have ... Sorry, Ros, go ahead. I have Trinidad and Tobago, but go ahead.

ROS KENNYBIRCH: Yeah, just to thank our colleague from the CTU for those really valuable points. And just to say I think that reemphasizes the point we've made today, that while there needs to be more of a focus on non-financial support, financial support itself does remain a key point in this. It was raised at ICANN 78 as well by GAC colleagues about the impact inflation over the past couple of years could have on this funding package and,

given that was the number over a decade ago, there is a good case to be made for that package to be expanded as well.

On what success looks like, I would refer our colleague to the GGP final report, which is due to be considered by the Board. The group came to the conclusion that at least ten successful applications would go a significant way towards making the ASP a greater success. What we've said within the GAC is higher numbers than that. The number, I think, 40 or 50 was floated in the GAC at ICANN 78. So just to be clear on that too, the GAC has traditionally been looking at that target even more ambitiously, which I think is worth noting here. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO:

Thank you, UK. I have Trinidad and Tobago and Brazil. You would like to say anything before that, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I was just going to reinforce what Ros said. Somehow in the ODP, they did manage to capture inflation in the application fee. Somehow it made it into that conversation. So that's gone up by \$55,000. So I think a case can be made that the money going to applicant support could go up to it as well.

NICO CABALLERO:

Thank you, Jonathan. And we're absolutely running out of time again. I have Trinidad and Tobago and then Brazil. Go ahead, please.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO:

Thank you, Nico. Very quickly, this is a legal issue. I did note that the applicants were either being denied yes or no, but no scoring. And I'm

wondering if that in itself would raise a legal issue where somebody may want to challenge the mechanism or have a review mechanism, and there is not the ability to understand where that person may have fallen short. So it's just to understand whether the process itself would not then raise some sort of litigious issues later, where you may have a lot of applicants and maybe just one or two are successful, and the persons who are not successful are not told why they're not successful, and they feel this is an opportunity once in a lifetime and there's not an ability to appeal within a certain time frame. That time frame may be too long and they would have lost. So I'm just wondering whether these things were taken into account. But thank you very much for the presentations. Fantastic. Great job.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you, Trinidad and Tobago. No question then, as far as I can see, apart from your comment.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: Just a comment.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you so much. Brazil, please go ahead.

LUCIANO MAZZA: Thank you very much. Well, thank you very much for the presentation and the thorough work on this issue. I think there's a broad agreement on the concept that support should go beyond the financial component, as you clearly indicated.

My comment and question comes to means of implementation, because then, as you indicated, when it's financial, it's something that is, let's say, clearly actionable or waiving fees or paying fees. But when it comes to those kinds of support that are not financial, it seems, of course they require some additional work in terms of making sure that that can be implemented. How are you envisaging that next stage of this work? What kind of engagement or framework should be in place to make sure that non-financial components of the support could be effective? Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks for the question. Well, if you see in the draft handbook, there are placeholders for those sort of things. So ICANN Org is well aware that the community wants to have a go, really, at providing great non-financial support. We're stuck at the 17.2 recommendation because that is the one that deals with non-financial support. So that has to make its way through council, GNSO Council, first, and then the Board. But we hope that there won't be any hiccups along the way.

And in terms of implementation, once the Board approves that, assuming that they approve that recommendation, the supplemental recommendation, then it gets sent to the implementation review team, and you have reps on that community. So please provide comments and push things through that community. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO:

Thank you so much. Two minutes over time. This is incredible. Thank you so very much. Justine, Jonathan, Alan, Greg from the ALAC and

obviously Tracy, Ros and [K]ristina. So thank you so very much. We need to close, unless you have any other comments to make. No, that's not the case. Thank you so very much.

Let me also welcome the ASO. At the same time, we have the next session with them. So let me welcome Hans Petter Hollen, Paul Wilson, Michael Abejuela and Herve Clement from the ASO. Please come forward. Welcome.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you so much for inviting us. It's great to be back. I was here only yesterday, so I think the new level of dialogue with the GAC now is really important to both of us. So thank you for being behind this.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you so much and welcome again. Please take your seats. So again, welcome to the GAC ASO meeting. The session agenda for today is as follows. We'll be talking about IPv4 transfer policy in terms of input on the effectiveness of the current IPv4 transfer policy, and then some insights in the volume of address transfers taking place, and then IPv6. Sorry, I need some tea at this point or coffee or something. I'm sorry.

So without further ado, welcome everyone. I already mentioned your names, Hans Petter Hollen, Paul Wilson, Michael Abejuela. Who's Michael Abejuela, by the way?

UNIDENTIFIED MALES: [inaudible]

NICO CABALLERO: Okay, okay. Thank you so much. And the lady over there?

HANS PETTER HOLEN: So if you go to the next slide, please.

NICO CABALLERO: I am on the next slide.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: So thank you. So I just put in here for the reminder of everybody. So you've introduced me. I was on stage yesterday. Paul Wilson is the head of APNIC, and then Michael is the stand-in for John Curran from ARIN that hasn't arrived yet. Athena at the end is also [and NRO AC stand-in]. She's the chief legal officer there. Michael is the legal guy at ARIN. So we also have legal expertise here.

NICO CABALLERO: Just in case, before I forget, Marco from the Netherlands, of course, from the GAC.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: And then to repeat the story from yesterday, the NRO AC is the policy arm of the ASO. We're on the NRO executive console, so we're kind of running the RIRs. But [Ivrea] here is then on the ASO AC, which is the policy arm of the ASO. So just to clarify that.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you. And UK as well. Nigel Hickson, GAC Vice- Chair. I already mentioned Marco from the Netherlands. So welcome again, without further ado, let me give the floor to, I guess, Marco. Yeah, go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING: Thank you, Nico. And indeed, I'm Marco, the GAC alternate for the Netherlands and been spearheading this session. So thanks for all the GAC colleagues who commented either on the mailing list or personally to me to give some insights. And of course, also very much thank you to the ASO and the NRO for taking up our invitation and also for the session yesterday.

So I believe we have put a few questions in slides. And I believe also Hans and his colleagues have prepared some of these answers. So I would suggest we move to that first. We don't have a lot of time, but I hope there's ample time also for you to chime in and ask some questions from the floor, but just to provide some guidance and also based on comments made during ICANN 78 and previous sessions. So I've asked the NRO to provide some insight in the IPv4 trading market.

And with that, I think I can leave it to Hans to talk us through some of the data points that they can provide also on pricing of IPv4 addresses. Thank you, Hans.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Yeah, thanks for that, Marco. So if we go to the next slide, we have some statistics on number of transfers that happened within the regions. And without diving too much into these numbers, there is a large number of transfers in the European region with RIPE NCC for Europe, the Middle

East and central Asia. I had a look a bit on this, but there is a lot of smaller transfers there than in the other regions. There are also policy differences.

But then if you want to have a look at the historic data, going to the next slide, you can see how this has developed into different regions. But the question here was really between the regions. So if you then switch to the next slide here, I'll pass this over to Paul. There you are, Paul. And then you can speak to this slide.

PAUL WILSON: Hi everyone. Thanks.

NICO CABALLERO: Before that, please don't forget to state your names for the benefit of the scribes. Otherwise we might have mistakes. So please go ahead. Sorry to interrupt.

PAUL WILSON: Sure, yeah. I'm Paul Wilson, the head of APNIC. So what we're showing here are some stats about transfers of address space between regions. This matrix shows the source RIR on the left axis and the recipient on the right. So you can see transfers between any pair of RIRs in either direction. The numbers represent the number of transfers firstly, and then the number of addresses transferred. And those numbers are highly variable, not really well related to each other when you consider that the largest transfer we might process would be maybe 60,000 times the size of the smallest. And we have got really quite an erratic kind of

pattern in the way transfers actually happen. It's very hard to find patterns or trends in the transfer process just because of the huge disparity in the size versus the number of transfers and also the sort of opportunistic or episodic nature of transfers.

Just to talk, just to step back a little, the whole point of opening up a transfer process within the RIR system, I would say, was primarily to provide an incentive for addresses which are not well used. And we've known that a large amount of the IPv4 address space is either not used at all or not efficiently used, but difficult for various reasons for the RIRs to recover back into our free pools from the original recipients, many of whom have had those addresses in their possession for decades.

The idea of the transfer market was to provide an incentive for people to release address space that was underused or not used, and then for others to pick it up. But the actual occurrence of unused or little-used address space is very distributed around the world, and the sort of circumstances in which that address space might be used or might be able to be freed up are quite unpredictable as well. So really what we're seeing is just an evening out and an improvement in the utilization of address space as it happens to be possible across the entire Internet.

Let's go to the next slide. In terms of the trends, here is a chart which shows the transfers according to their destination. So we've got three groups, three clusters, of columns there for APNIC, ARIN, and RIPE NCC. And what we see are those as the destination of transfers. There's a lot of address space that has been destined for, has been transferred to, APNIC, the Asia Pacific region, and almost a very similar amount transferred to the RIPE region over history. And the total amount of

address space here is pretty large. It's upwards towards 20 million v4 addresses, which, if you're familiar with the basic unit of IPv4 allocation, is equal to more than a /8 or more than a single very large block of addresses.

Now the gray color there for the large columns at APNIC and RIPE NCC represent the fact that those addresses have come from ARIN. And so the vast amount of address space that has been transferred has been from the ARIN region to either APNIC or RIPE NCC.

Now AFRINIC is not listed here because AFRINIC has got no transfer policy currently at the moment. LACNIC does have transfer policies, but the numbers actually don't register on the chart here in terms of relative to the numbers at the other three RIRs.

Another way to look at this is on the next slide, which simply shows the same data clustered. ARIN is the source of almost all the addresses transferred to either APNIC or RIPE NCC. And there's a little bit of transfer backwards and forwards between those two, between APNIC and RIPE NCC, just in the small numbers of millions of addresses.

But what this represents overall is, as I said before, kind of an evening out and a redistribution of a significant amount of IPv4 address space, which previously had not been well used, and where the holder of those addresses decided it was sort of in their interest and it was a useful thing to put them on the market and transfer them.

So, next slide. I don't know if we want to open for questions about any of these figures so far, because we're moving on to the next.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think we can continue a bit until we're done with all the IPv4 stuff before we take some questions.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, so this is elaborating more on the questions that Marco added that he's collected from you. It's providing insight on pricing. And my first answer there is that the RIRs are not parties to the transactions, so we do not keep records on the prices of the transactions. That's completely between the parties that makes the transfers. As RIPE NCC, we have just engaged external researchers to do market research into how this market functions. So hopefully later this year we can share some details into our findings there.

But some of the IP address brokers do public prices. So if you go to the next slide ... Next slide, please. You can see the development this year from one of the players in the market, where you can see that by the size of the transfers, the price varies. So there are transfers in the range of \$50 to \$55 per address, down to between 30 and 35 for the green. That's the medium-sized smaller block. So the bigger blocks have a higher market value than the others.

Going to the next slide, there is another scatter plot of the individual transfers over longer time. And you can see that from back in 2015 or 2014, when this market started, the price per IP address in transfers were around €10. And then it's been peaking up to \$60—not euros; sorry—in 2022, and then going down to between 30 and 40 now.

And what's setting the prices in the market? Well, this is as any other market where items are transferred for money. It's supply and demand.

And there are manufacturers going into this, the economy at large, the willingness to pay, markets opening up for growth, for building more Internet services. That's kind of driving the need for more addresses.

And I think we have another slide also from another provider that kind of tells the same story here, that depending on the sizes, the price goes up, and we're still seeing the same trend there from the 30th and up to the \$50/60dollar per address.

Next slide, please. And then that's back to you, Marco.

MARCO HOGEWONING:

Yes, well, I think you've captured already some things. I personally found it interesting to see that the prices are developing downwards a bit in that sense, maybe to start from basically the bottom question. And please, colleagues, do ask for the floor if you have any particular questions based on what was just presented. This is just sort of a rough sketch to give us some talking points, but in terms of ... Yes, we see this go down. So what are your expectations towards the future? Because I find it interesting that price is taking a nosedive, so to speak.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I can try to answer that question in two ways. One is the idealistic one. Well, this market will be dead when we have all deployed IPv6, which is actually the next topic here. And then it's the realist to say that this market will go on forever because there is always a need for some amount of legacy IPv4 space. But we have Herve on the panel here and he's working for one of the bigger providers in France. So maybe you have some comments on the predictions of this, Herve.

HERVE CLEMENT: So I won't put my SO/AC chair hat on for that, but my orange collaborator ... One, it's a very open discussion, very public, in fact. So we have started working on IPv6 since, now, 20 years, something like that, et cetera, so they are very conscious about the IPv4 depletion. And so we try to manage very carefully the use we do with IPv4, et cetera. So we try, as a lot of actors, of course, to be very serious in deploying IPv6 in the different part of our networks, core access and different services like fix and mobile, et cetera, et cetera. And if we want a step without the necessity to have IPv4, we need all the ecosystem, all the actors, so not only the ISPs, but the others, to be IPv6 compatible, which is not specifically the case currently, but it's something as ISPs. So we try and we push to do. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. I don't think we have any ... I see a hand up right now. Sander Steffan, go ahead, please.

SANDER STEFFAN: Hi, Sander Stefan, community member. I actually talked to a bunch of the IPv4 brokers about this price dip. And they don't know for certain, but they have the feeling that at the beginning of COVID the prices went up, which caused a lot of people who were considering to sell to put their addresses on the market, which caused a flood in supply, which crashed the price again. So it's possible that that is one of the reasons.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Certainly an interesting theory. There's more questions, actually. Sorry, I didn't bring my ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I have Bangladesh. Bangladesh, please go ahead.

SHAMSUZZOHA: Thank you. This is Shamsuzzoha from Bangladesh. And just a query that I think one of the rationales for allowing the transfer policy in different IRRs is to make sure that IPv4 pools are better utilized, especially for the organizations who don't utilize or have some additional block allocation. So it's to allow that and to make it effective utilization. But is there any incentive for the lots that if they are not using any blocks, they get it back to the RIRs? Because allowing the transfer is one of the incentives that you make money by transferring it, but if there is [submitted errors], is there any incentive program from different reasons? That's my query.

PAUL WILSON: I can answer that. As I mentioned before, the original incentive, I believe, for the transfer market in the first place was to liberate address space that was not being well used. And the vast majority of that existed in the United States as what we call legacy address space, which was actually allocated in large amounts prior to the advent of the RIRs. In fact, one of the reasons for instituting the RIRs in the first place was precisely to take a much more careful approach because so much address space had been consumed, about a third of the entire Internet address space, by the time the RIRs started.

So it was a third of the address space sitting primarily in the USA. And that's why we see a large amount of address space having been liberated, or put back into circulation, if you like, since the transfers came about.

But for, let's say, modern times, RIRs have got quite formalized agreements with members that make it much more orderly in terms of bringing back address space which is not used, or where companies have gone out of business, for instance, and also allowing them to transfer.

In the case of APNIC, we actually undertook, precisely because from our region there's so much demand for address base from emerging markets, a pretty serious process of bringing back unused address base from members and from the legacy, and were able to bring back a couple of million addresses into circulation and put the rest of it, any of them which may have been in that sort of legacy historical state, back into proper agreements and management.

So depending on the demands of the community of each of the RIRs, we actually have sort of prioritized accordingly activities like that that actually do bring address space back into the reserve pools or the available pools at the RIRs.

In APNIC's case, we've probably recovered enough address space there to last for another two to four years before we might finally run out of IPv4. As Hans Petter said before, the whole direction and the thrust of a lot of our work these days is towards IPv6. And so really, although may be used in pockets for the rest of the foreseeable future, the actual

demand for IPv4 is going to effectively disappear. The market value will go to effectively zero when v6 is deployed.

And I'd also say another interpretation for the change in the IPv4 price is actually the successful ongoing deployment of IPv6, which is actually reducing the demand and therefore the value. And that's something we can talk about in the next session, I think.

HANS PETTER HOLEN:

And to add to that, APNIC has taken a lead to look at reclaiming address spaces. RIPE NCC is following this closely. We published an article on analyzing the legacy space in the regions, seeing how many we have not been able to reach out to. And then we will have a community policy discussion following that on what do we do with this because it's kind of trying to have two thoughts in the head at the same time. Recovering address space in order to make the v4 Internet flourish and grow in emerging market is important. On the other hand, if there is too much legacy space available for a low price, the incentive to go to v6 is not as high.

So some IPv6 purists would really like to see the IPv4 price going really high up. So there is a much stronger incentive to move to v6. So this is a delicate balance.

NICO CABALLERO:

Thank you, Bangladesh. Thank you, Paul and Hans. Before we move on to the next topic, which is IPv6, if I understand correctly, I have Papua New Guinea. Please go ahead, Russell.

RUSSELL WORUBA: Thank you, Chair. And thank you, distinguished colleagues. On behalf of the Pacific islands, we'd like to pay special tribute to Paul for all your wonderful work you've done for APNIC. And we understand you'll be leaving your role in the not so distant future. And I think on behalf of all of us at GAC, we would like to just congratulate you for your wonderful work that you have done. Thank you for giving me the opportunity. That means that I'll be requesting for a 24 block after this.

But I think one of the pushes in the emerging markets is the uptake of digital transformation that's happening. And as a country, as Papua New Guinea, we're pushing that instead of asking for v6 blocks, we should be focusing on making these applications v6 native. That would really find that balance which we mentioned. So just a comment on that, Chair.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you thank so much for that, Russell. I have Egypt. Go ahead please.

EGYPT: Thank you Nico. And thank you everyone for a very informative presentation. And apologies for asking a question off topic. When we were discussing the session, we expressed interest to hear about the status of AFRINIC. So if we can just allow a little bit of time at the end (and sorry for not flagging this when we discuss the agenda) under any other business, this would be great. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO: Absolutely. Egypt, thank you for that. I have the lady over there, I can't see your hand. And then I have Niger. Yeah, so you go ahead first.

[CONSTANCE BERGER]: Thank you. I'm [Constance Berger]. I provide [RIRs] for the public administration of Germany and I thank you for this presentation. Marco, thank you for this really intensive transfer information. From my perspective, governments have the responsibility to think about the design process of IPv6, IPv4, about the infrastructure in the country. It's very important to set up reliable infrastructure based on IPv4 in the future. The whole communication depends on this design of these infrastructures. And so far I am thankful for your information. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you. I have Niger. Kammiri,, please go ahead.

KAMMIRI SOUROUMPO Good morning. Thank you very much. My name is [Camiri Sogumpo] of Niger. In the wake of this lack of v4 blocks, I wanted to know if there were some incentives with regards to RIRs in order to deploy IPv6.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: So the five RIRs have different fee structures. And I don't have a quick analysis on the top of my head on whether there is an incentive or not. But I think all have been mindful to make sure that getting IPv6

addresses does not increase your cost. The RIPE NCC has a very flat membership fee of 1550 euro per year, while the other RIRs have a structure where the more addresses you have, the more you pay.

So I think in the early days there was in several regions no driver that would drive your cost up if you used v6. But over time that is changing because all of us are not-for-profit organizations that need to recover our costs and that needs to be split in some way. So if we had a strong incentive for v6, then we would have no revenue whatsoever once we've done the transition.

So it's a very delicate balance to make sure that we just get the cost recovery of what we do. We're not here to make a profit, but we also need sustainable funding in the future.

So I don't know if you want to add anything to that, Paul.

PAUL WILSON:

I think it's important to understand that the actual address registration and allocation registration part is really a very small component of the overall process of deploying Internet infrastructures. And so there's only so much that the RIRs can do through the allocation process or for that matter the pricing, which frankly is a very modest cost also compared with the operation of infrastructure. But according to the needs of the communities, different RIRs are involved more or less, in the promotion of IPv6 through training and education, through direct support, even through helping to obtain funding towards IPv6 deployment, informing governments, helping governments to make

policies that may be reasonable within their Internet communities for encouraging IPv6.

So it really is an ecosystem, right? There are many factors at play, and the RIRs do play the role that we possibly can, but we also rely on occasions like this and many other similar ones, to try and promote an understanding of what would be the incentive for a country or for a business or for a government to take action towards IPv6. We're all very willing and keen to be able to offer advice specifically to individual circumstances if you'd like to discuss that.

MARCO HOGEWONING:

Thank you, Paul. And that actually we're conscious of time, we've got 15 minutes left, and also our interpreters do deserve their lunch. So trying to speed up, since we have a few more agenda items, if I can get the next slide, because I think this is a nice bridge on where we are to actually a bit more on (thank you Niger, for that question) incentivizing IPv6 deployment. And then I promised, when we set the agenda, to give a few examples of both Internet policy and public policy. Yeah, we have seen incentives both at the ICANN level, for instance in the applicant guidebook, where there was the requirement to have IPv6 support, and with various other icon policies that sort of try to encourage top level domains to support IPv6.

I also, from my experience in the Netherlands, have seen some success, for instance in our ccTLD, with providing some economic incentives by offering it just a tiny little discount if, for instance, you do IPv6. But as a provider, that usually adds up.

For the sake of time, if I can get the next slide, because of course then it's also about us government. And I think [Constance] also pointed to that. Yes, we have, and also in the Netherlands, experience with making IPv6 support mandatory for our own services and also for our own ICT purchases, to various results. Sometimes it's very successful. Sometimes we don't really see a lot of impact. I know that some countries have experience with at least sort of asking for IPv6 support in auctions and then licensing schemes about that. There's of course a lot of promotion going on also in our country for things like an IPv6 task force or more broad promoting standards. I know our colleagues in Czechia recently formally put an end date on IPv4 as per parliamentary motion.

Yeah. So sum it all up, and as I said, conscious of time, what do you think of all these? From your experience (and you're obviously the expert here,) what do you see as successful acts? What do you see as successful policies where you say, like, “Well, that's where it made a lot of difference in country x or y”?

HANS PETTER HOLEN:

So thank you for those questions, Marco. We're registries. We register resources and we keep track on them. We don't know what they're used for and how they're used. Now, both APNIC and RIPE NCC have research departments as well. So we do some research in this area and we publish on this.

We haven't done specific research that links one certain public policy into what effect that handle the market. But I think that's an interesting idea and I'll take that back to see what we can do on that.

What I can say is that our approach has been on v6 for capacity building. So for the things mentioned here, on the requirements on gTLD operators and so on, I don't know the effect of that, but it's a necessary criteria. If that isn't in place, there will be no v6 users that will be able to address that content.

Then the next question here is that, well, should you mandate v6 for the customers of the gTLD? Well, that's a very good idea, but the blocker you will reach then is all the hosting providers, if they have v6 available, so that a customer that wants to have a blog or an email service actually can easily put that in place. So it's a long thing.

I think the thing that governments can and must do is getting it into the purchasing policies. And I think I got into a public debate in Norway when I became RIPE Chair, before I was the CEO of RIPE NCC with the Norwegian government on their lack of speediness on implementing such policies, although they said that it was a recommendation, but things are slow.

But I think I may pass and ask Ondrej Filip, who has been working in the Czech Republic, on what the thinking has been in now. So Ondrej, you want to comment on that?

ONDREJ FILIP:

I'm really happy to comment, sure. So in the Czech Republic, the government passed a resolution that says that all the governmental services will be provided on IPv6 only. And that's going to happen on 6 June, on 2032. The logic behind this resolution is that it's 20 years after the commercial launch of IPv6, so it's a very memorable date. And the

logic is that 20 years is enough for adoption of a new protocol. So since that date, no governmental services should be provided on IPv4.

So at least we have some kind of end date for IPv4. And of course, now we are trying to find some other countries who will join this effort, because stopping governmental services effectively forces or isps to adopt IPv6 and will probably help a lot the boost of IPv6.

So that's the news from the Czech Republic. It was passed like two months ago.

PAUL WILSON:

Thanks, Ondrej. I'd just like to make a point on timing, because some of us have been around for the last 20 years or so and know that IPv6 has been sold and promoted for 20 years or so. And it's fair to say that, in fact, looking back, there was a big oversell of IPv6, which started a long time ago with national task forces, government policies, a whole lot of action that actually was well intentioned but ill-timed. The RIRs actually spent quite a bit of time saying, "Hang on. Slow down. What you're saying about the necessity of IPv6 is over. It's exaggerated and it's going to come back and not really help.["] So we have been talking about v6 for a very long time.

I think governments that took steps probably ended up with mandates and other policies. They probably ended up being lobbied by their own industries who said, "Hey, what you're saying here is not true. It's not in the interest of our national industry to be taking these measures now, because we don't need to. We've got other priorities," et cetera, et

cetera. So what happened was not really very much over 20 years in that arena.

But really the times have changed very much. We've got 45% of IPv6 deployment across the Internet by at least one measure, 35%, according to the APNIC measures, 45% across the Asia Pacific in terms of end user deployment. There's no doubt now that IPv6 is absolutely operable and working and has got very distinct benefits. But there's still a huge disparity, like a digital divide, if you like, between countries where the ISPs collectively have deployed about 80% or more at the national level (it is effectively an IPv6 Internet) and, with many others at the country level, almost none. And I think that is something that's going to be a serious ongoing cost, a cost which isn't quite recognized yet in terms of what it actually means to not move, but it's one that it's going to be incurring more costs as time goes on.

We're starting to see very useful results where the actual improved performance of IPv6 in deployed networks is being recognized, for instance, by gaming ISPs, where IPv6 actually is a selling point because of better performance and also in the simplicity of networks, which are single stack. So if you have a network which is only IPv6, you've just eliminated the entire IPv4 security question. You've got half of the attack surface, if you like, and there really will be big advantages to those who will make that final step.

So the time is kind of ... I don't want to eat these words in another five or ten years, but the time really is now to move and to actually promote that there are real benefits.

One of the things that we have seen ... Hans Petter mentioned research which is maybe not as systematic as you might expect, even at this stage. But one of the factors that we've seen at APNIC in charting not only the national averages but the movement of individual ISPs is that in many, many cases, it's one ISP that makes a move and then fairly quickly the others follow. And that can be seen in the figures. And it's a fairly good indication that there are competitive advantages, that people need to see that it's possible firsthand, but then also they see that they're losing out somewhat in not deploying those services.

So things can move pretty quickly. But it just is a combined effort across the globe that needs to continue until we catch up the remaining 55, 60% of the net. Thanks.

NICO CABALLERO:

Thank you, Paul. There's a question from the Russian Federation in the chat room, and the question is, what is the status of the situation with AFRINIC?", a question that was also raised by Egypt, by the way. "What lessons have been learned by the RIRs/NRO, and what needs to be done to prevent this in the future?" Thank you Russia, for the question. And thank you Egypt, by the way.

HANS PETTER HOLEN:

So thank you very much for that question. The situation with AFRINIC is something that RIRs are following very closely with ICANN. We have scheduled weekly calls in order to stay on top of this.

Due to the nature of the Mauritian court system, where all cases in front of the court, all the information about them, is confidential (if you have

more questions about that, you can direct them to our lawyers here later on), it is very difficult to give a status of what's actually going on right now. The fact that we know is that AFRINIC does not currently have a CEO. The CEO contract expired. AFRINIC does not currently have a board with the quorum.

However, there are multiple cases in front of the courts where some of these questions on whether the AFRINIC board has a mandate to steer the organization or not is being challenged. So there is no definite answer on the situation on the governance.

When that is said, the really good news is that the staff at AFRINIC are really heroes and keeping up their work and the organization is operationally functioned. So yes, there should be in place good governance like a CEO and a board, and there should be new board elections, which is the long-term solution that the RIRs and ICANN are following closely and trying to see how we can affect that.

So that's the operational status of AFRINIC. I would have loved to have much more detail and present that to you, but due to the nature of the Mauritian court system, it's not possible to share the status of the cases in front of the Mauritian court. So if there is a Mauritian GAC representative here, it would be very interesting to hear about that and how maybe the Mauritian government can bring more transparency into this situation.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

You can still get IP address from AFRINIC, right?

HANS PETTER HOLEN:

So yeah, as I said, AFRINIC is still operational and you can get IP addresses from AFRINIC.

So the second question: what is done about this? So on the global level, the NRO EC has developed a procedural document describing our current understanding of the policy that's labeled ICP-2. It's from the very beginning about accrediting new RIRs. In order to become an RIR, there were some clear criteria, and implicitly we believe that that also means that we need to fulfill those criteria after we've been accredited. And that is now the procedural document that we are developing together with the ASO AC, with comments from them, and we will publish that shortly.

The long-term solution here is that we've started a policy review of ICP-2 in order to add explicit chapters on the maintenance or the ongoing audit criteria and so on for a functioning RIR, such as having a board, having a CEO, having an operational policy process, and so on and so on. All of these are on a high level in ICP-2, but it's making it explicit that there is a commitment to it ongoing. Also, there's the question of having the registry data preserved outside the organization in case of this.

So there are actions going on. There will be a public open process for this longtime review of not only accrediting but also the ongoing criteria and then eventually de-accrediting an RIR in the event that is necessary. That is something that I would not really like to mention because that causes a lot of fear once that is mentioned. If our colleagues at AFRINIC hear us talking about possibility of de-accrediting an RIR, that has a tremendous negative effect on them personally. But it is something that we must look into and that will be part of that public process.

So I don't know if that answers all of the questions. Now, there is an aspect here also for the other RIR: what are we doing with our governance? And each of us are reviewing our governance processes and making improvements to them to make sure that what happened in AFRINIC will not happen with us. For instance, with RIPE NCC if all the board members disappear, the managing director now has the capacity to call for a GM to have a new board elected. That's a simple adoption to the bylaws. And then if there is no managing director, well, 200 members can call for that. So there are a lot more checks and balances in place that we have learned from AFRINIC to make sure that this doesn't happen to others.

NICO CABALLERO:

Thank you so much for that, Hans Petter. As a matter of fact, we're already over time. I have Japan, Iran, the UK and Egypt. Please be brief and straight to the point. We're already over time. Japan, please go ahead.

SANAE KATAYANAGI:

Thank you, Chair. First of all, thank you for the wonderful presentation. I would like to ask a question. How can I get detailed information or best practices about IPv6 deployment? Are there any useful websites? Thank you.

PAUL WILSON:

I can say for APNIC that we've got an extensive series of IPv6 training material, case studies, deployment stories, et cetera, on the APNIC blog.

So that's one place to start. And if there's anything more needed, then please contact APNIC. You also have JPNIC in Japan. Thanks.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Japan. Thank you, Paul. I have Iran, the UK and Egypt. And I'm closing the queue right here. Iran, please go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yeah, thank you very much. It was a very useful meeting. I think we should have more often meetings with the ASO like the GNSO and ALAC that we have. I think we should have more contact.

Having said that, I think Resolution 180 of the Pillar plenipotentiary conference in Bucharest 2022, in various parts of that, explains difficulties and problems—for instance, developing countries having or encountering for the transition from IPv4 to IPv6 and also assistance they require from the regional organization or entities like [inaudible] and RIRs] so on and so forth. So I don't want to take time and I invite the ASO to kindly, if they have some time, look at that Resolution 180, various part of that, and try to see whether according to their availability and the possibility, to what extent they could contribute on that, just as a matter of ... to be very brief. Thank you.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Thank you for that. And we will definitely look into that.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you, Iran. Thank you, Hans Petter. I have the UK and then Egypt. Nigel, please.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE: It was really very brief indeed and we can pick it up again. Just to echo what our distinguished delegate from Iran has said, this has been just so useful and it exemplifies the fact where we perhaps need a follow-up session in due course, not least to address the remarks that our distinguished guest [Peter] from APNIC mentioned in terms of that, although at the moment IPv6 deployment is going ahead, it's going ahead in a very disparate way, and there will be some issues in the future unless we do better.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you, UK. Egypt, please go ahead.

EGYPT: Thank you and thank you very much for this informative update. It's good to know about this public process, and I hope we will be kept informed about this. It's important to know the role of the governments in all this. We're not really happy sitting back and watching without being able to move things forward. It would be good to find some time to discuss further the governance of the model and the accountability of the RIRs and the different governance mechanisms and different characteristics of the different RIRs. But thank you again very much. Thanks.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Yeah, thank you very much for that. And we will make a note of that. And we're happy to engage with you on future meetings as well.

NICO CABALLERO: And with that, sorry for closing the queue. I wish we could stay here for two more hours as usual, but we need to wrap up the session. Thank you again, everyone. Sorry for going five minutes over time. Thank you Hans Peter, Paul, Michael, Herve. Thank you, Marco. And I'm sorry but I forgot the name of the lady over there. Thank you, everyone. So we'll have a lunch break now. This is for the GAC colleagues and we'll be back in the room at 1:15. Enjoy your lunch. Thank you so much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]