
Draft “RIR Governance Document”

RIR Consultation Report

14 April - 27 May 2025




Table of Contents

<u>Introduction</u>	3	ARTICLE 6: Amendment	
<u>ARTICLE 1: Definitions and Interpretations</u>	4	<u>6.1 Approval</u>	16
ARTICLE 2: Internet Number Registry System		<u>6.2 Rectification</u>	16
<u>2.1 Roles and Responsibilities</u>	5	<u>6.3 Periodic Review</u>	16
<u>2.2 Service Region</u>	5	<u>General Comments</u>	17
<u>2.3 Change to RIR Status</u>	6	<u>Conclusion and Next Steps</u>	18
<u>2.4 ICANN Review</u>	7	<u>Appendix</u>	19
<u>2.5 Coordination Limitation</u>	8		
<u>2.6 Sub-Regional Registries</u>	9		
<u>2.7 Official Language</u>	9		
ARTICLE 3: Recognition			
<u>3.1 Criteria for Recognition</u>	10		
<u>3.2 Effect of Recognition</u>	10		
ARTICLE 4: Ongoing Commitments			
<u>4.1 Operation Requirements</u>	11		
<u>4.2 Audit</u>	12		
ARTICLE 5: Derecognition			
<u>5.1 Possibility of Derecognition</u>	13		
<u>5.2 Rehabilitation</u>	14		
<u>5.3 Effect of Derecognition</u>	15		

Introduction

The NRO NC (which fulfils the role of the ASO AC) published the draft “Governance Document for the Recognition, Maintenance, and Derecognition of Regional Internet Registries” for review on 14 April 2025. This draft document is intended to replace ICP-2: Criteria for Establishment of New Regional Internet Registries.

As part of the process to update and strengthen ICP-2, the NRO NC held a consultation that was open to RIR communities and simultaneously ran an ICANN Public Comment process from 14 April to 27 May 2025. Comments were received through sessions held during various meetings as well via the consultations. Many comments expressed support for the work done so far and the overall draft. Several comments also suggested improvements and requested greater clarity in some areas.

This report contains a summary of the input received through both the ICANN Public Comment and RIR consultations and aims to provide a high-level overview of the questions and suggestions. The NRO NC will use this input to produce the next version of this governance document. Where space allows, the report includes the full text of the relevant section of the draft “RIR Governance Document”, and in other places a summary of that particular section. Readers should refer to the draft document to view the exact text to which the comments refer.

Please note that this is a summary of the feedback submitted, and those interested in reading through the community input in detail should refer to the [Community Engagement](#) page to find direct links to the consultation mailing lists and session archives of all the engagements held during the consultation period.

We would like to emphasize that **members of the NRO NC have reviewed all the comments that were submitted**, even if they have not been included in this report. This report does not include the NRO NC’s opinions on or responses to the comments submitted. The NRO NC will continue to discuss the communities’ feedback as well as the feedback received through ICANN’s Public Comment while revising the RIR Governance Document.

We extend our thanks to everyone who read through the draft “RIR Governance Document” and provided us with their thoughtful insights. Your feedback will help us improve this draft for the next consultation.

ARTICLE 1: Definitions and Interpretations

Article one outlines definitions of key terms used in the RIR Governance Document.

- There were editorial comments relating to consistency of key terms used in the document and clearly defining terms.
- There were also comments on whether the definition of “RIR Services”, “Service Region,” “Resource Holder,” “Control,” “Disproportionate Control,” and “Member Controlled” remain valid in the context of challenges such as inter-RIR transfers, a shift away from needs-based policies and limited membership engagement.

Sample Comments

*“...What do “Control” and “Disproportionate Control” mean in the context of:
- Number resources as assets procuring financial means to “large resource holders” who can challenge the RIR in court if failed to capture it
- Low membership’s participation in RIRs decisions
- RIR “must” participate and cooperate in audit and can’t enforce the same with Resource holders.”*

“Terminology Consistency: A minor editorial note – ensure all key terms (Recognition, Derecognition, RIR, Member, etc.) are used consistently with their definitions in Article 1. For example, the draft uses “Member” to mean participants in an RIR’s governance (not necessarily limited to fee-paying members in all RIRs, since some communities allow broader participation). This should match each RIR’s reality. If there’s any discrepancy (like some RIRs define membership differently), perhaps adjust the definition or add a footnote...”

ARTICLE 2: Internet Number Registry System

2.1 Roles and Responsibilities

This section outlines the roles and responsibilities of an RIR within the Internet Number Registry System.

- Comments noted that the document should ensure that all regions across the globe receive RIR services.
- The need for cooperation and collaboration between the RIRs should be clearly addressed in the document.
- Concerns were raised regarding the concentration of authority with the incumbent RIRs and the NRO Executive Council.
- The document should provide safeguards and steps to support remediation and derecognition to ensure they will not adversely impact the RIR communities.

2.2 Service Region

“Each Service Region shall cover a large, multinational area and shall not overlap with that of another RIR.”

- A comment asked what area would be considered large enough to create a new RIR
- A comment suggested establishing criteria other than area to define the establishment of a new RIR and provided examples of possible criteria such as Internet population, cultural ties and socio-economic connectedness.

Sample Comments

“... objects to the overconcentration of decision-making authority in the hands of incumbent RIRs and the NRO Executive Council. This structure creates a material conflict of interest, particularly in matters involving recognition or derecognition of RIRs. Existing RIRs have operational and territorial interests which could bias their decisions...”

“...It is important that the governance framework sets out a baseline timeline or grace period that a non-compliant RIR must be given to rectify the issues, unless there is an urgent risk to the stability or security of the Internet Number Registry System.”

Sample Comments

“What would be considered a “big enough” for creating a new RIR in the changing landscapes of the global internet?”

“It is recommended that the new metric may include internet population, cultural ties, socio-economic connectedness, etc as valid criteria for defining service regions. This would reflect the Internet’s real-world usage patterns and socio-cultural contexts.”

ARTICLE 2: Internet Number Registry System

2.3 Change to RIR Status

This section outlines the procedures by which an RIR may be Recognized or Derecognized.

- Comments opposed the unanimity requirement for recognition on the grounds that:
 - A more democratic option would be a majority vote.
 - A consensus decision would be better.
- Some comments highlighted concerns about a potential conflict of interests in the recognition process, and suggested an independent review process.
- Comments related to transparency noted that decisions in the recognition and derecognition process should be published for community review.
- Some comments pointed out that it was not clear how the RIR communities contribute to these processes.
- There were varied opinions on the scope of ICANN’s involvement in these processes.
- Some comments recommended developing an appeal mechanism for decisions.

Sample Comments

“Unanimity is inherently difficult to achieve. It means veto power to existing RIRs, making recognition of a new RIR extremely challenging and potentially suppressing regional interests. Furthermore, with this unanimity clause, there seems to be an implicit assumption that there will never be a need for a new RIR in the future, or that a new RIR is fundamentally a bad thing. This perspective doesn't account for future developments and emerging needs. A more democratic alternative could be the more common majority vote. Although, an endorsement by existing one or two RIRs could also be effective.”

“The ICANN approval check after the (RIRs-1) decision would also provide a valuable oversight in the recognition process to ensure that the creation of a new RIR is to the benefit of the _whole_ Internet Registry System and the Internet Community as a whole, and even the existing RIR potentially losing part of its region.”

“Should the subject RIR be derecognised, effort shall be made by the rest of the RIRs and ICANN to ensure a new entity from within the region is promptly recognised to serve the region affected.”

ARTICLE 2: Internet Number Registry System

2.4 ICANN Review

“If it is reasonably believed that an RIR is not complying with this Document, the other RIRs may, by unanimous decision, ask ICANN to conduct an ad hoc audit of the identified RIR, and ICANN shall promptly conduct such audit.”

- The clarification of ICANN’s limited role in the RIR Governance Document was seen as a positive reinforcement of community-based governance.
- The requirement for unanimous agreement among the RIRs before referring a matter to ICANN was welcomed as a mechanism that ensures such decisions are community-driven.
- Some noted that ICP-2 originally gave ICANN a procedural, not evaluative, role — RIRs reported outcomes rather than looking for approval.
- Some respondents expressed concern that allowing ICANN-led audits could undermine community authority by shifting oversight away from the RIRs.

Sample Comments

“Moreover, requiring unanimous RIR agreement before a proposal is forwarded to ICANN ensures that any change in RIR status is community-driven and well-vetted before reaching the final decision-making stage.”

“The whole relationship with ICANN over global policies was not that we were seeking approval from ICANN, it was we were informing ICANN that we had gone through an agreed procedure of consultation with communities and ticked those procedural boxes the content was never a point of negotiation.”

ARTICLE 2: Internet Number Registry System

2.5 Coordination Limitation

“It is an express goal of the Internet Number Registry System to provide stable and reliable services to the Numbering Community. Achievement of this goal requires significant, ongoing coordination among the RIRs, and as such, the total number of RIRs in the Internet Number Registry System shall remain small.”

- Some comments objected to language that creates a goal to limit the total number of RIRs.
- A suggestion to include a review to make sure that the existing RIRs are maintaining relevance and responsiveness to their designated regions.
- Comments noted that it is critical that there need to be provisions that ensure a functional RIR will be available in all geographic areas.
- Comments emphasized the need to maintain a small number of RIRs to facilitate technical coordination, and others expressed concerns about artificial limitations on the number of potential RIRs.

Sample Comments

“The Governance Document published for public comments has added a new regulation of coordination limitation with an intent to ensure that the total number of RIRs in the Internet Number Registry System shall remain ‘small’. This was never envisaged in the existing Criteria for establishing RIR published in 2001. Introducing such restrictive and subjective policy should be avoided as it may cause impediment to capacity building of developing and underserved regions including the global south.”

“The governance document is silent on regions that were assigned to a Regional Internet Registry (RIR) without their input. These assignments, often based on historical, geopolitical, or economic factors, may no longer reflect current realities or preferences. This omission risks perpetuating misalignments and excluding affected communities from meaningful participation in RIR governance.”

“Mandate periodic reviews of regional alignments to ensure their continued relevance, fairness, and responsiveness to community needs.”

ARTICLE 2: Internet Number Registry System

2.6 Sub-Regional Registries

“This section clarifies that the terms of this document only apply to organizations that receive number resources directly from the IANA Functions Operator, and that the document does not limit the ability of an RIR to establish and sub-delegate its number resources, provided that any such sub-delegation does not excuse the RIR from its obligations under this Document.”

- There should be clear guidance to ensure accountability at the sub-regional registry level as well.
- Some comments encouraged the adoption of clear, transparent delegation agreements with sub-regional bodies that include public interest protections and mechanisms for end-user input.

2.7 Official Language

“English is the official language of the Internet Number Registry System”

- Comments on this section were in support, with suggestions noting that:
 - Translations should be provided regionally in the major languages.
 - Consideration should be made for language barriers, and with steps taken to improve inclusivity in public comment engagements.

Sample Comments

“Recommendation: Encourage RIRs to adopt clear, transparent delegation agreements with sub-regional bodies that include public interest protections and mechanisms for end-user input.”

Sample Comments

“While this is practical for global coordination, it did raise some community questions. We suggest maintaining this for the authoritative text, but also committing to translations of the document in all RIR regions’ major languages for informational purposes. This will improve inclusivity.”

“English is set as the official language of the Internet Numbers Registry System. While practical for coordination, it can disadvantage non-English-speaking communities.”

ARTICLE 3: Recognition

3.1 Criteria for Recognition

This section outlines the criteria that a Candidate RIR must demonstrate in its application and to the satisfaction of the existing RIRs and ICANN.

- Some comments appreciated the inclusion of community support, capability, and impact as recognition criteria.
- Comments remarked on the vagueness of the criteria and asked for clarity on metrics and specific processes to ensure that evaluations take place in a consistent manner
- Comments highlighted the importance of ICANN's independent verification of community support to avoid misleading claims.
- Transparency through publication of evaluation summaries was recommended to build trust in the process.
- Clarification was also requested on how proposals to modify existing service regions would be evaluated.

3.2 Effect of Recognition

This section outlines the ongoing responsibilities of a Recognized RIR.

- Some comments called for clearer post-recognition procedures to ensure a smooth transition, accountability and service continuity.
- Some comments promoted accountability by recommending that the recognized RIR submit periodic status reports during the transition.

Sample Comments

“While ‘Resource Holder Support’ and ‘Community Support’ are listed as recognition criteria, the document could elaborate on the specific mechanisms for demonstrating this support to ensure consistent evaluation.”

“When it comes to the determination of community support for the establishment of the Candidate RIR, ICANN should be able to independently verify this support.”

“The process by which a Candidate RIR may propose changing the existing Service Regions, and how any such proposal would be evaluated, should be clarified, as it would represent a significant change to the existing RIR system that could have impacts throughout the DNS and internet.”

Sample Comments

“To ensure accountability and service continuity, both existing and newly recognized RIRs should enter into a formal Service Level Agreement (SLA) with ICANN and the ASO Address Council.”

“The ASO AC should consider how any kind of phased approach to the Effects of Recognition becoming official would impact other RIRs and the Internet Numbers Registry System as a whole.”

ARTICLE 4: Ongoing Commitments

4.1 Operational Requirements

This section outlines the ongoing responsibilities of a Recognized RIR.

- Regarding 4.1.a Independence, there were comments around greater transparency of RIR board activities, with evidence of board decisions and community reviews of annual financial reports, setting standard audit time frames, and publishing board meeting minutes.
- There was a recommendation to clarify what “financially stable and independent” means in practice, with guidance on indicators like reserve levels, funding sources, and independence from undue influence. A similar comment recommended adoption of a mandatory performance evaluation matrix, developed regionally, that would be submitted annually to ICANN.
- There was a comment relating to 4.1.b Not-for-profit, that the jurisdiction in which an RIR is located or a Candidate RIR intends to be located does not have to be jurisdiction-specific. A similar comment noted that the document should allow for an RIR to change location as long as it is in its service region.
- There were comments relating to clarification of operational requirements, including specifications or suitable references for terms such as “good corporate governance,” “timely and accessible,” and “continuity and redundancy procedures”; a suggestion for RIRs to establish an Escrow System to assure continuity; and incorporation of Emergency Back-End Registry Operator (EBERO) framework tailored for the numbering community — a Numbering-EBERO — patterned on ICANN’s proven gTLD model.

- In reference to 4.1.i Impartiality, there was a comment that the word “neutrality” must be maintained, as originally used.
- There was a comment to explicitly provide for diversity in the governance framework.
- A respondent suggested considering outer space as a region

Sample Comments

“Without doubt, broad support is important, but how this support is measured or validated remains unclear. Perhaps we should consider a principle that ensures mechanisms for validating community support.”

“It can be very difficult to determine 'support' and/or 'consensus' amongst resource holders in practice, and indeed this appears to exclude the role of governments in the process. ICP-1 relating to ccTLDs takes a more liberal approach to stakeholder communities.”

“Each RIR must share the core set of basic information (data) to ensure that, in the event of an emergency or exceptional circumstance, another entity can assume operations without depending on the good will and cooperation of the directors/employees of the derecognized RIR.”

ARTICLE 4: Ongoing Commitments

4.2 Audit

“An RIR must participate in and cooperate with periodic or ad hoc audits, conducted by an external and independent auditor appointed by ICANN, to ensure that it continues to comply with this Document. A summary report after any audit will be made available to the Numbering Community.”

- Some comments supported external audits and called for broader scope, stronger enforcement, and more community involvement to ensure accountability.
- A concern was the lack of a member-initiated audit process. As only RIRs can currently request audits, several comments proposed allowing a portion of members (e.g., 25%) to trigger an independent review.
- Comments suggested conducting regular audits with public reports.
- To clarify expectations, some suggested specifying the audit scope (financial, procedural, policy compliance).
- Comments emphasized transparency, recommending anonymized audit summaries and public feedback channels.

Sample Comments

“No Member-Led Audit Mechanism. Only RIRs can initiate an audit of another RIR. This excludes the Numbering Community and members from escalating legitimate concerns, especially in cases of abuse or corruption.”

“While regular external audits are a welcome addition, we propose requiring the publication of anonymized summary reports post-audit and offering public comment opportunities to strengthen accountability.”

“This is an excellent addition for accountability. We suggest clarifying what ‘regular’ means in practice so that each RIR conducts such reviews on a comparable schedule. Defining the expected scope of these audits (financial, procedural, policy compliance, etc.) would also bolster clarity. This will ensure the ongoing obligation is uniformly understood and that any RIR’s community can readily verify that audits are being conducted as intended.”

ARTICLE 5: Derecognition

5.1 Possibility of Derecognition

“Subject to Section 5.2, an RIR may be Derecognized pursuant to the procedures set forth in Section 2.3 if it does not continue to meet all the requirements specified in this Document.”

- There were some comments noting the lack of clear provisions to ensure service continuity after derecognition, warning this could risk regional stability and infrastructure resilience.
- Some comments recommended adding continuity mechanisms, such as an obligation to ensure service for affected resource holders, a transitional framework for temporary stewardship, or a stakeholder-led process to guide regional transition.
- Some comments suggested that ICANN should be able to take control of an RIR if it obstructs transition or acts harmfully, to protect the registry system’s integrity.

Sample Comments

“The document suggests derecognition as the only remedy for non-compliance, without defining intermediate steps like warnings, conditional operations, or reform requirements.”

“The absence of a predefined transitional or fallback mechanism poses operational risks for resource holders in the affected region and may jeopardize Internet infrastructure stability at a regional level.”

“I believe that the RIR Governance Document should accommodate for the emergency seizure of an RIR's services by ICANN, in the event an RIR becomes uncooperative or does not have the legal ground to facilitate a derecognition. My reason for this view is if an RIR is going to be derecognised and the RIR becomes uncooperative with the transition of the RIR functions or the RIR takes actions which can be considered malicious, then there needs to be a mechanism that allows for operational control to be seized to prevent further disruption or detriment to the wider Internet community.”

ARTICLE 5: Derecognition

5.2 Rehabilitation

“In the event that an RIR is non-compliant under this Document, there shall be a presumption in favor of helping such RIR to remedy such non-compliance over other potential responses, and the non-compliant RIR shall be given a reasonable opportunity to cure any such non-compliance. To that end, ICANN and all other RIRs shall provide reasonable support, if requested, to assist the RIR in curing any failure to comply with this Document. A non-compliant RIR shall be Derecognized only as a last resort and where the harms to the Numbering Community and/or to the Internet Number Registry System outweigh the benefits of continuing to forebear the RIR’s non-compliance.”

- Comments expressed support for the rehabilitation process but requested:
 - Including more detail and clarification of the rehabilitation process, including early warnings.
 - Including a “force majeure and external factors without control” event as an exception to the RIR’s obligations.
 - Clarifying and providing examples of what “reasonable support” is for rehabilitation is.

Sample Comments

“Clarify ‘Reasonable Support’ in Rehabilitation (Section 5.2): We strongly endorse the language in Section 5.2 that other RIRs and ICANN will provide ‘all reasonable support’ to help a non-compliant RIR come back into compliance. To avoid any ambiguity, it could be helpful to add examples of what ‘reasonable support’ entails – for instance, does it include seconding staff or technical expertise, providing financial loans or guarantees, temporarily sharing infrastructure, etc.?”

“Remediation Process Clarity: The draft establishes a much-needed remediation process (Rehabilitation) whereby aiding a non-compliant RIR is the preferred first response, with derecognition as a last resort. We fully support this approach. To enhance clarity, the document could outline the steps of remediation in a bit more detail – for example: after an issue is identified, a formal notice to the RIR in question, a timeline for the RIR to formulate a remediation plan, periodic progress check-ins, and how/when the assisting parties (other RIRs/ICANN) will determine if the issue has been resolved or further action is needed. Including such procedural outlines (even if high-level) would make the obligations and expectations during Rehabilitation more explicit. It would also assure stakeholders that there is a predictable path from identifying a problem to either its resolution or, if absolutely needed, derecognition.”

ARTICLE 5: Derecognition

5.3 Effect of Derecognition

This section defines the responsibilities of an RIR upon derecognition.

- Service continuity was seen as one of the most important requirements. There were comments on explicitly defining the process for continuity of service, ensuring data integrity, protection for end users, and a thorough evaluation of the interim authority process in the event of derecognition.
- There were also comments to add specificity to the derecognition process, including the operational and technical implications as a result of derecognition.

Sample Comments

“It is not clear how smooth transfer of services and operations of the Derecognized RIR would be ensured, in case of a conflict. It is important to explicitly state that the RIR services and operations within the affected region will be sustained without disruption throughout the Derecognition process.”

“I am really worried about if we derecognise a registry, how we really do the hand over. I understand that is probably not part of this document and there is operational implications afterwards but I really think we need to have something about that in the document and my last point, a few weeks ago, I discovered and I raised this conversation in two registries actually that individuals without economical activity cannot get resources while in the other three, AfriNIC, APNIC and RIPE NCC, they can get resources... I am starting to think that maybe there are other basic rights to say somehow like this one, that are not really part of the PDP, it must be part of the fundamentals of being a registry, maybe we need to consider a basic set of let's say features to become a registry or to remain as a recognised registry. Thank you.”

“...Incorporating protections for end users and number resource holders during transitions. The framework must ensure service continuity, data integrity, and interim authority designation through an open process. The roles and responsibilities of the successor or interim entity must be clearly defined.”

ARTICLE 6: Approval

6.1 Approval

“This Document may be amended with the unanimous agreement of ICANN and the RIRs, after consulting their respective communities.”

- Comments suggested that ICANN should develop a transparent process for consulting the community on any future amendments.

Sample Comments

“Following the ratification of this Document, ICANN should develop a transparent process for how it will consult with the ICANN community on any future amendments to the Document.”

6.2 Rectification

This section defines the amount of time allowed for an RIR to take action to become compliant with any new requirements following an amendment to the RIR Governance Document.

- Comments recommended adding grace periods and compliance checks to ensure fairness.

Sample Comments

“Following the ratification of this Document, ICANN should develop a transparent process for how it will consult with the ICANN community on any future amendments to the Document.”

6.3 Periodic Review

This section defines the term and timing for the NRO and ICANN to review the RIR Governance Document.

- Some comments questioned whether a 10-year review cycle is appropriate, suggesting that the time frame may be too long given the rapid pace of technological change.

Sample Comments

“Given that the review will be conducted every 10 years and considering how quickly technology evolves, shouldn't the time between periodic reviews be reduced?”

General Comments

Some of the feedback received was more general and did not correlate to a specific article of the draft RIR Governance Document. Some additional comments suggested the following:

- The current model assumes good faith by all parties; this assumption of acting in good faith is being questioned.
- There needs to be greater clarity on decision-making criteria and which criteria should apply to each decision point.
- There are currently regional differences; we need to consider a basic set of features that are common to all registries or to be recognised as a registry (e.g. whether a natural person can be a member).
- The prescriptive language could lead a casual reader to assume that there are new obligations being imposed from outside the regional bottom-up, community-driven process.
- It's challenging to reconcile the historic view of the community grounding with the language of the document.
- The document would benefit from a more robust preamble that clearly defines the goals of the document and principles of the RIR system.
- Several comments asked for more details on the processes that will be used to implement the RIR Governance Document.
- Some comments asked to include the portability of Internet Number Resources between the RIRs (i.e. freedom to choose at which RIR where the resources are registered) as a fundamental right of resource holders.
- There was a suggestion to make the ability for natural persons to request Internet Number Resources a requirement across all RIRs.
- There were suggestions to integrate the foundational principles of the multistakeholder model, and embed core principles of openness and human rights in the document.
- There were suggestions to set up a dispute resolution mechanism among RIRs and ICANN.
- There was a suggestion to include capacity building as one of the functions of the RIRs.

Conclusion and Next Steps

This summary of the community input received through the consultation on the draft “RIR Governance Document” is provided as an overview for the community in the spirit of maintaining transparency in the revision process of this critical document.

The summary shows a sample of the comments received; all comments received are available in the various RIR mailing list archives listed on the NRO website and in the various session transcripts and recordings.

We hope this summary will give readers a sense of the range and depth of the feedback received, and we would like to reiterate that all comments received have been read and reviewed, even if they have not been referred to in this summary.

Over the coming weeks, the NRO NC will be revising the draft RIR Governance Document with consideration to the feedback received through all consultative inputs. A draft version of the updated document will then be shared for further community discussion and feedback in a consultation that will be open during community meetings in the third and fourth quarters of this year.

We extend our thanks to all respondents for their insights and effort in responding to the consultation on the first draft. We look forward to continuing to engage with the RIR and ICANN communities in the process of reviewing and updating the RIR Governance Document.

The NRO NC

31 July 2025

**Each RIR has three representatives on the NRO NC.
The NRO NC consists of:**

- Maemura Akinori (APNIC)
- Nicole Chan (APNIC)
- Di Ma (APNIC)
- Amy Potter (ARIN)
- Nick Nugent (ARIN)
- Kevin Blumberg (ARIN)
- Ricardo Patara (LACNIC)
- Esteban Lescano (LACNIC)
- Jorge Villa (LACNIC)
- Hervé Clément (RIPE NCC)
- Constanze Bürger (RIPE NCC)
- Andrei Robachevsky (RIPE NCC)

Follow updates on ICP-2 via the NRO website:

<https://www.nro.net/policy/internet-coordination-policy-2/>

Appendix

RIR Mailing List Archives

AFRINIC

Mailing List Discussions:

<https://lists.afrinic.net/mailman/listinfo/icp2-review>

Mailing List Archives:

<https://lists.afrinic.net/mailman/listinfo/icp2-review>

LACNIC

Mailing List Discussions:

<https://suscripcion-lista-icp2.lacnic.net/en>

Mailing List Archives:

<https://mail.lacnic.net/pipermail/consulta-icp2/>

APNIC

Mailing List Discussions:

<https://orbit.apnic.net/mailling-list/icp-2review@apnic.net/>

Mailing List Archives:

<https://orbit.apnic.net/mailling-list/icp-2review@apnic.net/>

RIPE NCC

Mailing List Discussions:

<https://mailman.ripe.net/mailman3/lists/ripe-list.ripe.net/>

Mailing List Archives:

<https://mailman.ripe.net/archives/list/ripe-list@ripe.net/>

ARIN

Mailing List Discussions:

https://lists.arin.net/mailman/listinfo/icp2_review

Mailing List Archives:

https://lists.arin.net/pipermail/icp2_review/

Session Archives

All presentations given by the NRO NC at RIR, ICANN and other meetings are archived on the NRO website.

<https://www.nro.net/policy/internet-coordination-policy-2/community-engagement/>

ICANN Public Comment

The submissions received through ICANN’s Public Comment process are available on the ICANN website.

<https://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/proceeding/governance-document-for-the-recognition-maintenance-and-derecognition-of-rirs-14-04-2025>

Thank You

www.nro.net

