EN

Wednesday, March 14, 2018 – 08:30 to 09:30 AST
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

AKINORI MAEMURA: This is a meeting between the ICANN board of directors and the Address Supporting Organization and the Number Resource Organization. It's a quite regular dialogue session between the Board and the ASO.

So before starting, let's make a roll call. Please state your name from Kaveh, please.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh Ranjbar, ICANN board. I have to leave the meeting a bit earlier, unfortunately.

LEON SANCHEZ: Leon Sanchez ICANN board.

FILIZ YILMAZ: Filiz Yilmaz, ASO AC, RIPE region.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Maarten Botterman, ICANN board.

LITO IBARRA: Lito Ibarra, ICANN board, LACNIC board.

KHALED KOUBAA: Khaled Koubaa, ICANN board.

BRAJESH JAIN: ASO AC member, APNIC region.

OSCAR ROBLES: Oscar Robles, executive director of LACNIC.

HARTMUT GLASER: Hartmut Glaser, LACNIC region.

RON DA SILVA: Ron da Silva, board.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Which board?

RON DA SILVA: I'm always curious which one they'll put up there. That's why I say that.

CHERINE CHALABY: Cherine Chalaby, board of ICANN.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Akinori Maemura, board member of ICANN appointed by the ASO.

PAUL WILSON: Paul Wilson. I'm the head of APNIC, and I'm the chair of the NRO's executive committee.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Aftab Siddiqui, ASO AC chair.

AXEL PAWLIK: Axel Pawlik, managing director of RIPE NCC.

DAVID CONRAD: David Conrad ICANN CTO.

JOHN CURRAN: John Curran, ARIN CEO.

ALAN BARRETT: Alan Barrett, AFRINIC CEO.

KEVIN BLUMBERG:	Kevin Blumberg, ARIN -- sorry. Years of practice. Kevin Blumberg, ASO AC, ARIN region.
RICARDO PATARA:	Ricardo Patara, ASO AC, LACNIC region.
AKINORI MAEMURA:	Thank you very much for coming up to the microphone. Please, the ASO councillors, please go up to the microphone to state your name, please.
HERVE CLEMENT:	Okay. So Herve Clement, ASO AC, RIPE NCC.
NURANI NIMPUNO:	Nurani Nimpuno, ASO AC for the RIPE region.
LOUIE LEE:	Louie Lee, ASO AC from the ARIN region. And this is Louie's hat.
AKINORI MAEMURA:	Thank you very much for the hat. Let's get down to our business. This is the regular agenda meeting between ICANN board and ASO.

This is, basically, the exchanging the recent developments and exchanging the question to know much better each other.

Next slide, please.

Here, okay.

Okay.

The ICANN board of directors in advance made a question to the ASO.

We have the two questions. One is: What are your key goals in 2018?

And second question is what are your most relevant long-term goals? These two are important for us to consider our future at our own with the relevance of the ASO.

So who takes this question to the answer?

PAUL WILSON: We've got a couple of presentations which are on the proposed agenda. So should we start with those, by way of sort of information updates?

AKINORI MAEMURA: Yes, please, Paul. Thank you.

PAUL WILSON: I think first is Aftab.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: NRO. Can you switch it to ASO review update first?

PAUL WILSON: If we can see it on the screens up front, that would be useful, too, please. Thanks.

                       So what was your slide called? Aftab?

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: So first is mine marked 1. Any way we can see it here? Yes, thank you. Yes. So, again, Aftab Siddiqui presenting the ASO review update.

                       So, as you are aware that last year we had the ASO review report came out. And there were certain recommendations. To be exact, there were 18. So we have picked up -- so even that we -- there was a joint statement coming out from ASO AC and NRO EC commenting on each recommendation. But here we have picked up those which directly or indirectly are associated with ICANN as well where we need ICANN's help. So I'm going to present those here.

So Recommendation 1 is ICANN should consider updating the bylaws to reflect the fact that the NRO will, like the GAC, and according to the ASO MoU provide its own review mechanism.

ASO AC and NRO EC both agree that we should proceed on this recommendation. But, as I said, we need ICANN support on this one.

Recommendation 2 is: The NRO should consider updating the ASO MoU to reflect the fact that the appropriate section of the new ICANN bylaws regarding the Organizational Review Section 4.4 be updated as well.

So, again, it's interlinked with Recommendation 1. Again, we need ICANN's help on this one. The NRO should adopt a procedure for conducting periodic reviews of the ASO in line with the processes used by the ICANN Organizational Effectiveness Committee. We agree we should move on and proceed with this recommendation.

This is a bit lengthy one. The signatories of the ASO MoU should consider updating -- updates to the MoU including addition of AfriNIC as a signatory, removal of Appendix B, updates in connection with the responsibility of the ASO as a decisional participant in the empowered community.

Jointly we agreed on 1 and 2 adding AFRINIC as a signatory and the removal of appendix B. Appendix B is outdated already. So there's no problem with that. But the point three was explained in detail that adding something would be duplicative. It's already the updates in connection with the responsibility of ASO as a decisional participant in the ICANN empowered community. Such update would be duplicative. So we don't agree with the recommendation just because there is a duplicative information.

Recommendation 5: Upon completion of every independent review, ASO and NRO and ICANN should initiate discussion as per Article 9. And actually, this is what we are requesting.

Recommendation 8: With a view to increase awareness regarding the mission, main operation, separation of roles between the ASO AC, NRO EC within the ASO, NRO should consider the use of more infographics on its Web site.

I would like to highlight this recommendation here. And I would like you to just park it for a second. Because it is just directly related to another recommendation, which we will -- which is the last recommendation.

13 is the ASO MoU should be updated to reflect the new reality of empowered community and specify that the roles and responsibilities with the ASO must be clearly defined.

The response was, well, it is already clearly defined.

And, again, putting something again is duplicative information. So information is already there.

14 is ASO AC should either confirm that the designated representative of the ASO on the empowered community administration will be chair of NRO EC or develop procedure to appoint another representative. This procedure is already clear. And NRO EC or any alternative representative selected by the EC, it's already been defined. And ASO AC has -- we don't have to do anything on that part. So, as I mentioned, Recommendation 8 is directly related to the concerns with Recommendation 18.

Eight asks for separation of roles between ASO AC and the NRO EC within the ASO itself.

And 18 asks for something very interesting that NRO shall initiate a public consultation involving the five RIR communities to determine the future structure of the ASO. So we are parking 8 right now. Because whatever happens after the Recommendation 18 will be projected on our Web sites eventually.

And, as a response to that, ASO AC and NRO EC agreed to a consultation process. And there was a statement again coming out of NRO EC. The consultation process has already been

started in APNIC and consultation discussions started in the ARIN region as well. Probably all the RIRs, so you can update that as well.

So this is -- these are the three options suggested by the review.

There were three options. As I stated, the status quo, increase coordination, or "two house" ASO structure. It's part of the report.

So, yes, that's it on this presentation. If you have any questions, I'm happy to answer that, which has led to ASO AC.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much, Aftab. It's a quite comprehensive presentation about the ASO and the NRO response to the ASO review final report.

And then could --

Khaled, do you have any initial comment as OEC chair for this regard?

KHALED KOUBAA: So I'm happy to see the consensus and the ASO NRO about the recommendation. And, for example, concerning the Recommendation 13 when it says that it needs to follow up with

a review that we use -- and with the procedures that we use for the reviews.

I think the OEC would be more than happy to follow-up on that point and give the necessary support to you guys.

Also we will be more than happy, after we receive the final report, to circle back. Is there any observation? And we'll be more than happy to work. Thank you.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much, Khaled.

Any questions or comments? Ron.

RON DA SILVA: I'm happy to see the consultation process started. APNIC. I'm just curious if there's a sense of how long that's going to run through all the RIRs and then sort of the aggregation and summary of that. Is there some sort of expected time frame for that to run its course?

AKINORI MAEMURA: Who could take this?

JOHN CURRAN: I mean, obviously each RIR has to run its own consultation process. If they converge on a single vision, then this could be -- I think it could happen within a year of something coming back that we'd bring back to ICANN and the OEC, Organizational Effectiveness Committee, to look at. If it doesn't converge, that's the more interesting aspect, and we need to probably do something, a more ambitious review to study the -- what the differences are, how to harmonize them, et cetera. That could take some time. So it all depends on whether or not we end up with a consensus position coming out of this first round of consultations this year.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much. I think ask Aftab. The recent (indiscernible) in the conference where you had the consultation session and then you were moderating that session, how do you -- how did you like that session, and do you have any comment on your process?

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Thank you, Akinori-san. I have to take my ASO AC chair hat off because I'm also the APNIC region working group chair for this consultation process so I can update you on that behalf that we started the consultation process back last year, it was APNIC 44 in Taichung. So from there we started the working group, and

last month in APRICOT APNIC 45 we had our second session on the consultation process and the consensus from the community was that they don't want to pursue the status quo but it's still the consultation process in the early stage. We are -- we are getting some interesting comment from the community. It's a very open process. If anybody would like to join, they can join the working group and definitely in the APNIC 46 we will have a face-to-face meeting as well. So yeah, it is happening. It's going to a positive direction, and we are quite positive that we can come out with something to share with other regions as well.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you, Aftab. Any question or comment on this regard.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone). I was just wondering if any of the RIRs want to remark. Thanks.

JOHN CURRAN: Just say the update for ARIN. With respect to ARIN, we initiated the consultation over -- using a consultation process over a mailing list. There's just been a handful of comments so far so it's hard to read. We'll actually have our discussion in April in

Miami at the ARIN meeting, and at that time we'll see where the community is. I don't know the status on the other RIRs.

AXEL PAWLIK: For the RIPE NCC basically what John said. We have our meeting in Marseille in May and we'll -- we have started the outreach but we'll have discussions there and then take it from there.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you, Axel. Alan.

ALAN BARRETT: This is Alan Barrett from AfriNIC. We have initiated a discussion on our mailing list but there's been very little discussion. I don't think I've seen any comments. We also plan to have a face-to-face discussion at our meeting in May in Senegal.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you. Oscar, could you?

OSCAR ROBLES: Yes. Thank you. In the LACNIC case, we are starting the public discussions and information in face in April and in LACNIC in Panama in the first week of May we'll be having our consultation. We're taking some precautions because this is a

very tense and complex topic that it is not a -- the most sexy topic that we will be discussing in present time so I want to engage people that may actually have a good idea so we want to take precise steps in order to engage the community and provide comments and information for this process.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much. Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much. Leon Sanchez. This might be a question for you, Paul. Could you please flesh out a little bit more the idea of how the two houses work and what would be the mechanisms, maybe a little bit more detail on that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, Paul.

PAUL WILSON: The three -- the three options on the screen were suggested options rather than recommended options. Though suggested options is kind of candidates, I guess, of representing a spectrum of changes that the -- that the -- that the reviewers felt would respond to the observations and the feedback that they received. As Aftab said -- I'm speaking for APNIC here. As Aftab

said, the APNIC community last year agreed that the status quo was not going to be suitable if there -- we've had the status quo for quite some time. There needs to be -- they felt there needed to be some change. We had what was presented as a straw man proposal to the meeting just a couple of weeks ago in Nepal which was based on the two-house model. So this was something that Izumi, one of the leaders of the working group, talked and fleshed it out just a little bit. But basically I think she took that from what was suggested in the -- in the report. I think it's 9 -- section 9.2. And the way I understand the proposal, it is to take the current components of our -- of our interfacing with ICANN, which happened through the ASO address council and it's responsibility for the policy side of the IP addressing of the community. That's on the one hand is the -- that side, the policy side represented by the ASO AC and there's the registry operational and technical side which is currently represented by something called the NRO EC. What the -- the two-house model suggested is that that can just be re-described as two parts of one instead of two separate parts of two different bodies. So a -- as it's described here, a policy house which effectively replaces the ASO AC, that's a new name for the ASO AC, and the registry house which I guess is a new name for the NRO EC. I think there's no reference anymore to the NRO in the ICANN context, but I think the NRO has its separate existence which is technical and operational coordination amongst the RIRs. That's as I

understand it. It was very much a straw man, very much a statement in a -- in an organized form, I guess, of the specific option that comes -- that fell out of that third option of the review report.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much, Leon and Paul. Any question or comment in this regard? It's my understanding for this two houses structure is that while it is [no audio] the reality is that NRO EC and the NRO, two councils are, you know, combining -- combined with the new naming. So not really substantially different. Just the same, but an organized review we -- we have in the future, is that correct? Yes. Thank you very much. If there's no other comments, let's move on to the -- another. You're presenting at (indiscernible)? No? Sorry. Ron. Sorry.

RON DA SILVA: I have -- excuse me. Akinori, so thank you for kind of simplifying the two-house framework as mostly a labeling exercise. But I -- just looking at all the rest of the recommendations, there -- to me there's a sense of a lot of it is just kind of cleaning up documents and references and an MOU except for one -- one

piece that seems to be consistent throughout the recommendations is with respect to ASO and empowered community. There seems to be some interest in kind of refining what the ASO's role is in the empowered community. Can you share a little bit of light on what those might be? Am I reading too much into it or is there, in fact, some part of the empowered community relationship with the ASO that's -- that's being addressed by these recommendations?

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much, Ron. It's an important point. Who could take this question to answer? Thank you, Paul.

PAUL WILSON: There was -- there was a recommendation about writing references to the empowered community into the ASO section into the bylaws but on a review our teams felt that the -- that the empowered community and the -- our relationship with it is sufficiently documented already. So we are -- what's the term -- members of the empowered community and I suppose we play our role as defined by ICANN bylaws in that the address council and the executive council together have produced a set of what were initially called interim procedures to address the different aspects of the -- of the address -- of the empowered community responsibilities. They've been adopted as the procedures for the

time being, and I think are not yet published but about -- will be shortly published after -- right after the final adoption this week, actually. So that -- that's our -- that represents our -- the way that we -- the ASO/NRO will process those responsibilities as members of the empowered community. John.

JOHN CURRAN: Yeah. To be clear, the empowered community -- the ASO is a member of the empowered community and the ASO, when it exercises those powers, it has to speak with one voice. In looking at the powers of the empowered community, several of them relate to director removal. Since within the ASO the NRO EC has delegated that power to the ASO AC we actually, when it comes to functions regarding director removal, we similarly ask the ASO AC what they believe should be done in this regard. If they come back with a recommendation, then that's what is -- that's the basis for what we would make the decision on. There's a bunch of other empowered community powers that don't involve directors that, you know, we have to follow the function of our going out to our community and asking for views but they don't formally ask for input from the ASO AC. That clarifies things.

AKINORI MAEMURA:	Thank you, John. Any other points? Good. All right. Then just okay, let's move on then to another topic. Okay after.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI:	Just a quick policy update from all the regions. It just -- I won't take much time. Who we are, as we already know, it's just an NRO number councillors and the supporting organization address council. So these are the names from every region. (indiscernible) is already mentioned. For this year, I'm the chair. We have two vice chairs, Kevin Blumberg and Ricardo Patara from ARIN and LACNIC respectively. And all the other members are sitting in the audience and they have identified themselves. We have -- for the global policy development facilitation we have a team of five members from -- one member from each region, that is Fiona Asonga from AfriNIC, Brajesh Jain from APNIC region, Jason Schiller from ARIN, Jorge Villa from LACNIC, and Herve Clement from RIPE NCC.

	Other ICANN activities, we have appointed a few people in different working groups and committees. Two members of the ASO AC are part of CCWG Accountability Steam 2 and that is Fiona Asonga from AfriNIC and Jorge Villa from LACNIC. We have appointed one person on the NomCom committee, that is Brajesh Jain representing ASO AC. We have also appointed one person in the selection panel for Ethos Award. That is Kevin

Blumberg. This is just a summary of the policies in every region, what is happening since ICANN58 in Copenhagen. This is what happened. We had a lot of policies being discussed and then related to either IPv4, IPv6 or any other discussion topic. So you can see that IPv4 policies are just going down, not in APNIC region at the moment but a lot of IPv6 has been discussed and other stuff like WHOIS and mostly targeting WHOIS as well in other parts of the region.

So this is just a summary of the policies.

And, before I take questions, I just want to quickly update on the ICANN board election that is for the Seat 9. We started our process last year. And the

nomination phase was from

2nd of October till the 17th of December. And we opened up for the comment phase that was from 18th of December, and it will close on 18th of March.

And in the middle of the comment phase we started our interview phase which will be started on 17th of March and which will end on 18th of March.

And the selection phase will start from 19th of March and end on the 18th of April.

So we had -- initially had four candidates. And their details are mentioned on the Web site. It's all public information. One candidate will do his nomination on 5th of February.

And the comment phase is still public. You can go and comment on our ASO Web site. And that's all the update from the ICANN board election for Seat 9. Thank you.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much, Aftab, for that quite comprehensive activity update. If you have any questions, please raise your hand. No?

We are all happy with that?

Okay.

Next.

PAUL WILSON: I've got a quick update from the NRO. I've got a few slides, and I'm going to race through them. We've actually got an ASO public session this afternoon as well, which will be a chance to see this in more detail. But I think these slides showed, I think, some of the answers to the questions that the ICANN board had about RIR, NRO key goals, and longer term goals.

And I'll comment on that as well.

The NRO sees itself is a flagship and global leader for collaborative Internet number resource management as a central element of an open, stable and secure Internet.

So we are an informal association of the RIRs formed under an MoU and, more specifically, coordinating the RIRs in our joint activities, promoting the multistakeholder model, and fulfilling the role of the ICANN ASO.

We've got an EC, an executive committee, with a rotating office holder position. So I'm speaking here as chair of the executive committee for this year. And the others who are around the table are listed here as well.

There's a secretariat. Quite importantly, we have a bunch of coordination groups, which are populated by representatives -- responsible representatives from each of the RIRs in communications, engineering, registration services, and a few other informal parts of the coordination structure.

There's a few publications on the NRO's Web site. So we have a regular number statistics report. We have a comparative overview of all policies across all of the RIRs for easier reference.

And, of course, the ASO itself is, as I said, one of our activities.

The NRO has got a number of expenses, including our contributions to ICANN. And we split those contributions

according to a formula which is a weighted formula that's based on the relative sizes of our budgets and IPv4 address holding. So that's the respective responsibility for each of the RIRs for the NRO's budget.

We have a set of provisions, pledges from RIRs for what's referred to as a joint RIR stability fund. So that's really a statement, very publicly, that we'll put in the resources required if there is any question about stability of the RIR system or of any of the individual RIRs.

Something that came out of the IANA transition was the IANA Review Committee. So that's a committee that's somewhat similar to the address council in being composed of three members from each region, two of those elected and one appointed. But, while the address council is responsible for sort of gating and guiding the process of creating global policies through a global policy development process, the review committee is really responsible for ensuring that IANA is carrying out those policies and implementing those policies faithfully and properly.

So that's just a new component of accountability of the system that was designed in the -- as a result of the IANA transition.

The members of the review committee are here, all documented on the Web site, of course.

And, as I mentioned earlier in response to the question, the NRO EC has adopted the empowered community procedures for approval actions and rejection actions, and director removal actions and for other empowered community activities.

So those I think are not yet on our Web site. They need to be formally endorsed this week and published.

We've been through the ASO review. It also is -- was an activity of the NRO in that the NRO is responsible for commissioning that review. And all the details are on the NRO's Web site. We've heard a little bit about this, about the response so far to the review.

A few technical projects that, as I say, are coordinated across the RIRs. So, we're collectively responsible for the RPKI, the resource public key infrastructure. We review the IANA and PTI reporting as part of the IANA's SLA. We're also involved with the identified technology health indicators, the ITHI process, which is ICANN's project which we're plugging into.

Okay. Some statistics of where we are. This is a very short extractive of stats that are compiled by the NRO for all the RIRs. Relatively speaking, you can see that the total IPv4 address space consumption here in the units of /8 address block. Relatively speaking across the RIRs, we are very close to exhaustion of the available IPv4 address space. You can see

here that the largest remaining pool is about three quarters of one /8 block held by ARIN -- sorry, by AfriNIC. ARIN is declaring no remaining holdings because they don't have a similar sort of rationed run-out period that the other RIRs implemented through their policy processes.

This is a chart from APNIC Labs, actually, which shows the depletion of remaining stocks and progressions. You can see with the thin lines projected forward that we are due to be exhausting all of the remaining supplies of IPv4 over the next two to three years.

IPv6 -- of course, we're tracking and encouraging IPv6 deployment across the RIRs. Happy to report that the global deployment is going in a very healthy direction.

So we increased from around 7% at the beginning of last year to around 17% at this point in time. That's well more than a doubling of the end user capability of IPv6 around the world.

We're also watching Google's charts here. So this is Google's chart, which shows a very similar pattern of growth up to over 20% of the user base having access to Google services across IPv6.

Google services, of course, include YouTube and plenty of the bandwidth consumed by Internet users around the world these days.

There's, also from APNIC Labs, the IPv6 leaderboard. And I put this up because it's quite interesting to see which communities -- these are aggregate countries, statistics showing the IPv6 capability aggregated for ISPs as registered in each of these countries or economies.

And it's sort of interesting that we've got Belgium at 59%. We've got India at 58% of its IPv6 user base being IPv6 capable, which, obviously, is a gigantic IPv6 community in India. By far the largest in the world.

But then we have Uruguay in third place, U.S. in fourth. We go through a number of European countries. Japan is in about tenth place. We've got quite a diverse range of countries from different parts of the world here, including Estonia, Peru, Ecuador also in that list of top 25. There are some unexpected results, I guess, there in terms of how IPv6 is being adopted in different parts of the world. So that's the end of a set of data points and stats from the NRO.

I think what I tried to show there is in terms of key goals -- this is a question asked by the ICANN board. In terms of key goals for the RIRs under the NRO that's common key goals, we've got the

implementation of the ASO review. We've got continued support for IPv6 deployment across our communities. We've got the continuation of the continual monitoring and supporting of the remaining IPv4 stocks and the allocation and transfer processes that are under way at the moment, the WHOIS accuracy, the Identified Technology Health Indicators, which I can talk about here, time permitting.

I think that the longer term goals, to move on to the second question of the ICANN board, include what we're starting to see, as Aftab mentioned, is more attention to the policy process to different aspects of the WHOIS policy. So I think it's fair to say that the future ongoing evolution of registry services operated by the RIRs is of longer term priority to us in response to evolving needs. I mentioned RPKI. RPKI is something we've deployed and promoted in advance of our community demands and in advance of widescale implementation of RPKI. So I think we could say that we'll continue to develop RPKI services into the long term in response to the needs of our communities and the industry.

And then I think I'd also say that, in line with the NRO's mission, that our attention to maintaining and supporting the multistakeholder model of Internet governance is a priority for all of us. And that, of course, is most specifically in relation to the RIRs' role in the multistakeholder ecosystem and how we

continue to represent the interest of our communities and our missions in that Internet governance ecosystem.

I'll stop there. And, if there's any questions, sure. I can move into ITHI, but maybe that would be better to move into this afternoon's session.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much, Paul. Quite comprehensive, again, from the operations side of the NRO. Do you have any questions or comments? From the floor as well, of course.

Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: I wanted to say a couple of things. One is to really thank you for this comprehensive update. Your message about the reviews, we've heard it. So thank you for that.

And also I heard with quite interest the suggested recommendation of the two-house approach.

In terms of the reviews, you should know that there is a growing feeling among the community in general that there are too many reviews being conducted at the same time. And it's stretching the volunteers and resources in this organization.

So next year, for example, there are nine reviews budgeted.

And we've heard almost from every constituency that this is not tenable to continue at this rate.

So I know that Goran is collecting a lot of ideas and thoughts and is going to come back to the community with a suggestion of maybe staggering those reviews over a couple of years or three years, take a holistic view at all of this. This may require a bylaw change, but I think there's common agreement that this is necessary.

I really do -- and I think on behalf of the board -- appreciate your ongoing support for the multistakeholder model. And, Paul, your comments at the end about your involvement in terms of promoting your role and your mission within the multistakeholder Internet governance and the support for that and also your role as the ASO role is quite important. And we need your continuing support to that model of governance.

And on that, I really look forward to continued cooperation between us. And it's good to meet.

And I wonder if that format is the right format or is the format you prefer.

The reason I'm mentioning this is that some other constituencies have mentioned that the question and answer session may not be the right format for truly engaging any

discussion and whether -- some like it. Some don't. So I'm just putting it for food for thought whether we ought to have kind of a maybe topic-based discussion. Couple of topics. And say what do you guys think? Should we engage and have people just dialoguing around it? Because the purpose of being here face-to-face is truly to have a dialogue. Any question that could be answered by email, it's, in a way, a waste of face-to-face time, if you see what I mean.

So that's some thoughts are coming around. If we're going to spend time together -- and it's -- we don't spend enough time. You know, that's only two or three times a year -- let's make it more valuable for both sides so that we engage in a dialogue rather than just ask questions and respond.

So that's food for thought for our next meeting.

Thank you.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Paul?

PAUL WILSON: Thank you very much, Cherine. On behalf of the RIRs, I'm sure we appreciate your comments here.

We have a meeting at the end of the week. We are meant to be debriefing on what we've done this week. And we can certainly consider your -- the question you raise about the best way of us interfacing and having a good interaction with the ICANN community here.

I wanted to say clearly, for clarity about the ASO review proposal, that we really are in a very, very early stage of this discussion. The two-house model was identified in the review report as one option of only three identified options. But they themselves are only examples across the spectrum of sort of different configurations. It has come up in only one of our consultation processes so far and only in a very early strawman proposal kind of way as a discussion status. So it would be really -- it would be really premature to start assuming that that is the way that this consultation will go in any other region, let alone how we will converge. And, as John said, it could take us some time to converge on whatever it is that we -- the communities favor. Thanks.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much, Paul. Aftab.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI: Thank you, Cherine, for highlighting those points as well.

My request to the Board members is we have an open session today at 5:00 clock in 101A where we'll be discussing all the policies in detail. So people that are interested in the numbers community, how they do the policy development process, they're more than welcome. And the whole reason for that session is to have a dialogue on the policies and the work we do back in the RIRs and what we do here.

So it's more a Q&A type session. So I would request those board members who are available to join that session. Thank you.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much, Aftab, for the clarification.

Again, there is a public session that will be held from the 5:00 p.m. at the room 101A.

So not only the Board members, but all people are quite welcome for that public session to know and understand well better about the ASO.

Thank you very much, Aftab, for that.

Any other questions or comments? We're coming to the end part of our session. Any other business is welcome.

You're quite happy. Then all right.

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

Let's wrap up this session. We had an ASO organizational review update from Aftab. And then we had update both from the address council and NRO at large. And then ITHI is briefly mentioned by the poll. But it's -- it will -- we will have another chance for to discuss IHTI has discussion for that part.

And then we have some additional comment. And then we have the invitation to the ASO public session.

So that's all I had for this session. Last minute call for comments or question.

No? All right.

Thank you very much for ending this meeting. This meeting is closed. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]