RAW FILE

APRICOT 2025
PETALING JAYA, MALASIA

FEBRUARY 27, 2025
APNIC ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING
SAPPHIRE ROOM
2:30 P.M. MYT

>> KENNY HUANG: Okay, good afternoon. Welcome to the third section of the AGM.
>> Recording in progress.
>> KENNY HUANG: Okay, thank you. First, I'd like to invite Oanh Nguyen to give the NIR SIG report. Is she here? Okay, thank you.
>> OANH NGUYEN: Okay, good afternoon, everyone. I'm Oanh Nguyen from NIR SIG and we are updating regarding to the NIR SIG report at our meeting. The total of the National Internet Registries is the same information relating to the operations, policies, and process of National Internet Registries with the aim of promoting close cooperation both among NIRs and APNIC as well.
There are some key points from the presentation from CNNIC. The total members from CNNIC is more than 1,230 members. And also, they had a great number of Internet IPv6 users with more than 800 million Internet users using IPv6. And also, they have a large IPv6 deployment in China, and also, they have to help (?) and another IPv6 technology innovation competition as well.
And from JPNIC, they also increased the number of holders with a total of more than 500 members and also more than 800 ASN holders as well. They have transfer cases and also in APNIC have a good opportunity to promote RPKI and raised the number of ROA, 70% of ROA, and also they have a lot of activity to promote OV in Japan, but also they are on set to support in our region as well.
There is a lot of activity from JPNIC to support their community for during OPM meeting, and as NOCNOG. From IRINN India, they have more than 4,000, yeah, 4,494 members, and also, they have new assigned numbers to their members, more than 200 new assigned AS numbers in this year. Yeah, in 2024. Also, they have some good activity to promote IPv6 as well. They have a great number of IPv6, nearly 80% IPv6 users in India. And also, they have other IT to support the community via Internet governance internship and workshops, Academy as well.
In Vietnam, Vietnam looks towards IPv6 only. They have planned to this year start to look for work for IPv6 only in the

next seven years. There are a lot of activity regarding to IPv6 workshops, routing security, and some key points from VNNIC is the focus on the student. They have many, many seminars for students for next generation. And also in Vietnam, VNNIC was local host of APTLD 86, and there are many inter-cooperation meetings with the international organizations as well.

From IDNIC, yeah, they keep increasing the number of members, and also, they have more than 4,700 members, and also, they assign new AS numbers to their members. And other key points, APJII Honeypot project, detect attack sources, analysis, to detect in India. And also, they have many (?) regarding to IPv6, BGP, and routing security as well.

From Taiwan, TWNIC had 340 members, and also, they had great activity for support their members, finished the validation process. They will be content as well. And with two OPMs and six workshops focused on IPv6, IoT, RPKI, network security, and the ROA and ROV in Taiwan is so good.

The last thing I think is the very important thing. We have raised at the meeting that we reviewed what happened among NIRs in the last five years. As you know, every NIR, we had the same function regarding to national Internet registry. So, in the last five years, every NIR has some focus on delegation, OPM/Internet conference, RPKI, IPv6 training as well, and Internet governance, technical platform are some of the key points from NIR.

And we think about in the future, yeah. As you know, we just have some challenges for NIR, but also for regulatory, like APNIC as well. We think that resources (?) and we believe IPv4 and AS number may be something nearly enough for each organization; it's the country. Some delegations, the number of delegations reduced last five years. Starting from the NIRs. So, we saw a lot of things regarding challenges. We believe that IPv4 is how to (?) maybe in three years, in our region, in APNIC region. So, I think that is a challenge for NIR would not have more resources to delegate to our members and committee as well. Technology ROV, we feel ROV is not easy to deploy for all of the AS operators. And also, another technology, like AI, IoT, (?) only and the cloud, anything we think about the new technology, it's challenging not only for the NIR, but also the registry as well. And I think it's a fight for everyone here. People, next generation, at the opening meeting, the opening session, we talked about the next generation, so we would love to support the next generation to become a good leader of Internet in the future. So, we believe that it's not easy, the policy.

So, we officially about the fee, so something regarding to the IPv4 is also something regarding to the AS number fee. We officially took the third AS number. However, another reason, they took for the third AS number. So, I'm not sure about in the future. Maybe in our region, change the fee. We think about these challenges.

So, another is user privacy, yeah. Privacy is under the proposal, but I think of privacy, we think a lot, we call it very important for the person, for everyone, for many things regarding to the privacy.

Abuse, security, and I gave us the concept, green Internet, that I hope that the Internet is better, faster, smarter, and hopefully, that is the challenge for all of us. And we give the three questions. The first delegation is the main function of NIRs and APNIC as well. The second, yeah, we would like to find out IP members, AS holder, community need. And the last one, we

would love to know if NIR and APNIC should do in the next five years, the strategy. It's hard to answer the three questions right now, but I would like to raise a question for everyone, and also, we hope that the topic will be, because it's an NIR CEO meeting, in the meeting (?) and that's all. Thank you very much.

>> KENNY HUANG: Okay, thank you, Oanh. Next, I'd like to invite Bertrand to give us the Policy SIG and security process. Bertrand, thank you.

>> BERTRAND CHERRIER: Thank you, chair. Good afternoon. Bertrand Cherrier for the Policy SIG report. The Policy SIG Charter. The Policy SIG charter is here to develop policies related to management and use of Internet number resources within the Asia-Pacific region. These include policies for resource allocation, recovery, transfer, registration, whois, reverse DNS, RPKI, and all the related services.

For this Open Policy Meeting, we had two proposals about WHOIS: Prop-162 about WHOIS Privacy and it was thought of eliminating the organization contact details in the APNIC database. People with legitimate need for these contact details can use a service provider by APNIC to obtain them.

The second proposal, proposal 163, was about Whois transparency and efficiency through referral server implementation. So, the implementation, the resource inquiries are automatically directed to the appropriate IR database and IR location can be easily accessed using the article system and downstream location, data can be accessible, enhancing transparency and traceability.

The outcome. Prop-162 did not reach consensus during the OPM, but we had very good talk. And with all the feedback received, the author asked for the prop to be sent back to the mailing list for a next version at APNIC 60.

Prop-163. We did not call for consensus because the author requested directly for the proposal to go back to the mailing list. So, we won't be doing consensus call during this member meeting. And that's it for me! Thank you.

I'm not trying to pronounce it, because I know I will crash it. So.

>> KENNY HUANG: Thank you. Please remain on the stage. Next one, still your report, Joint SIG Report presented by Bertrand.

>> BERTRAND CHERRIER: So, we had a Joint SIG session. It was to discuss proposal change of the APNIC SIG Guidelines. And the objective of this session was to prevent those who have not participated in the SIG area, they are nominated for, from being elected to a position or do not have a demonstrable skill set from nominating for any available chair or co-chair position. The other objective is to provide equitable opportunities for individuals to be elected to chair positions and to prevent the same company or corporate group from holding more than two positions across SIGs and NRO and NC combined.

The discussions we had made sure that we were not in agreement with everyone, and so, all the feedback is going to be used for the next version. And we might actually align ourselves with the EC terms and restrictions. It might be easier to have a common line for this, but that's for another talk.

So, now, the proposal is going to the mailing lists, all of them, so that everyone can read it, and we hope to have a lot of feedback so we can come up with a final version for APNIC 60.

And... ooh, oh well. Well, that's it for me. Thank you very much.

>> KENNY HUANG: Okay, Bertrand. We haven't gone to the open mic, so just wait for a moment. Thank you. Next, I'd like to invite Herve to give us ICP-2 version 2 report. I think that probably will be most critical, most compelling global policy from member community after INI transition. Welcome.

>> HERVE CLEMENT: Hello, everybody. I am Herve Clement, the Chair of the ASO AC. (?) one of the vice chairs will join me quickly for the following of the presentation, ICP-2. Two years ago, I think a few clever people know what existence, so what is ICP-2 Internet coordination policies, one regarding the chair, one regarding DNS alternative server. We are talking about ICP-2, back of history. ICP-2, it was adopted before, after recommendation of the ASO AC in 2001. Before that, there was a creation of the RIPE NCC, the APNIC, and the ARIN. After that, after 2001, on these documents, ICP-2 -- this document, ICP-2, what it is, it defines only the criteria for the creation of original Internet registry and what criteria original Internet registry has to follow. It was in 2001, as I said. I just said what is ICP-2.

So, you have a list of an example of criteria that can be used that original registry is to follow for its creation. And you have the link to this specific document.

This document in 2002, the LACNIC has been created for Middle and South America, and in 2005, the AFRINIC. 25 years ago, a little less. These documents still exist, but has to be updated. And for other reasons, the NRO EC -- so, the NRO EC is a group of the CEOs of the region, asked us, the ASO AC, members of the different communities, part of this council, to work on strengthening this document.

As I said, IPC-2 is 25 years old. Of course, the Internet has changed since, and you all know about that. The relationship between the RIRs and ICANN has little changed as well. And this document, the ICP-2 needs to be more explicit, and Nick will comment further to that. So, just to be clear about the real ongoing responsibilities because we have to follow the Internet registerry's ongoing responsibilities. And it is de-recognition of RIR that can no longer follow this criteria. Just in case. So, that's the reason why the NRO EC, once again, asked us for two tasks.

The first one. So, to review this document so it can be applicable for the life and the ongoing life of the Internet registry with potentially registration. And task 2 is to strengthen or update the criteria, because one more time, life has changed.

There is a timeline for that. And after that and after my very short introduction, I'll let Nick continue and to go over this document, which he's not technical, but precise one. Thank you, Nick.

>> NICK: Thank you, Herve. I'll just back up and say one thing about this, is that the ICP-2 project has gotten a lot of billing -- the revision to ICP-2, that is -- but perhaps less talked about, less noticed is the implementation procedures. So, as Herve indicated, the NRO EC asked the ASO AC to review a document that it had created to essentially operationalize ICP-2. Although ICP-2, as currently written, speaks to the criteria for establishing new RIRs, we believe -- and the NRO EC believes -- that implicit in that document is the ongoing obligations of an RIR to abide by the criteria under which it was recognized. And so, the implementation procedures put some additional details around that. And although there isn't as much

discussion or a consultation on that, the implementation procedures that the NRO provided and the ASO AC's feedback on those can be found at that link. And we encourage you to review it, if it is of interest to you.

Okay. Back to the timeline. So, as indicated, the NRO EC already provided the implementation procedures, and the ASO AC provided that feedback, which can be found at that link. I'm repeating myself, but that's okay.

Now we get to the project of revising ICP-2, the main document. So, the way that we decided to approach this was not to simply throw a brand-new, written-from-scratch document at you and invite you to comment on it, because you know, we could have a comment on anything from the placement of a comma to, "I don't like the way that this particular provision is operationalized or this procedure happens." We didn't want to do that. We wanted to keep the discussion high level. So we came up with a set of what we thought were the 24 most-important principles that, at least in our opinion -- and of course, we want your opinion -- should be included in the new version of ICP-2.

So, we created a principles document. And I'm going to go over some of them right now. No doubt, you've already seen this. Certainly, you've seen it if you've participated in the consultation. But even if not, we encourage you to take a look at it. I won't read all the principles, but I'll just talk about a few that might be of interest.

We organized them into several high-level categories. In the governance category, for example -- and I've highlighted orange some of the ones I might talk about -- we have a very clear indication of how exactly an RIR is approved, a new RIR is approved, or in the event that it becomes necessary, an existing RIR is de-recognized. And we provided a sort of detailed hierarchy of authority here that the proposal to do either a new RIR or to derecognize an existing RIR must originate from the RIRs upon majority vote, and then ICANN approves. So, that's an important distinction from the current version of ICP-2. We encourage your feedback on that, among other principles.

Under the RIR ecosystem, not much new. A lot of this is carrying forward the existing ICP-2 language, the existing ICP-2 principles. We have an RIR lifecycle section, which is more explicit than the current version of ICP-2. It recognizes that there are essentially three life states of an RIR. An RIR can be recognized. That's very clearly in the current version of ICP-2. An RIR must ensure that it abides by those same criteria going forward. It has operational requirements. And although we think that that is implicit in the current version of ICP-2, we want it to be very explicit in the new version of ICP-2.

And then, derecognition. Again, we wanted that to be very explicit in this new document.

Recognition, pretty much a carry-forward from the existing criteria. There has to be, obviously, community support and a community commitment to support the RIR financially and in governance.

Operation principles. This is what an RIR must do going forward, continually after it's recognized. Many of these are simply the same criteria under which an RIR, that an RIR must satisfy, in order to be recognized, but now they rest a bit more under the operation umbrella.

And here are some more operational principles, but there are just a couple that, again, I thought we might highlight as

interesting. One: To ensure that an RIR is continuing to abide by its obligations, and basically, ensuring the stability of a numbering system, both within its regions and globally. We anticipate a regular audit procedure. And then, you can see at the bottom, there is a general, you could regard as a catch-all. We need to make sure that that RIR is not doing anything that would threaten the stability of the global RIR system.

Derecognition. Derecognition sounds extreme. It is. But we wanted to make clear that it really is a last resort. The purpose of ICP-2 is not to create a trigger that the slightest deviation from ongoing principles is going to be a cause for derecognition. Quite the opposite. The intention is to rehabilitate an RIR if an RIR begins experiencing problems. To that end, we included a remedial bias principle that not only -- and it's fleshed out more, as you will see in the full draft -- not only has a bias, a presumption in favor of rehabilitating an RIR, but even an obligation on other RIRs to help, to assist that RIR to get back on its feet.

So, those are the principles, 24 of them. You can find them on the consultation. You can find them on the ASO AC website, on the NRO website. Now let's talk about how we go about converting this into a full draft, a full document, a full, new ICP-2, although it might not go by that name.

So, we published a consultation on the ICP-2 Principles document. We got a lot of responses. We'll show you some of the numbers from those responses. In fact, I think I'll show them to you in just a minute. We got a lot of good responses. We spent a lot of time analyzing it. We read every single response. We read and considered every single response. We categorized them into consistent themes that we were seeing, and we talked about those themes, and we're continuing to talk about those themes because we want to make sure that we're not missing something, that we're not going in a direction that doesn't make sense.

Then, with a lot of help from the RIR Communications team, we put together a summary of the feedback that we received, and we published it this week. You can find it here, QR code or a link. And I'll just give you a little bit of flavor of it.

It provides our methodology. As you can see -- I know that the font is small, and I'm sorry about that -- we got a lot of responses, and APNIC was the far and away winner in terms of volume of responses, which we appreciated. We do acknowledge that some scrubbing did need to occur because we suspected there was some automated responses that had the indisia of being computer-generated, but we provided all the data. We provided our assumed scrubbed responses and the raw data. We didn't want to hide anything. And this page within the report simply provides our methodology.

Then, for each principle, you can see the principle is listed. It's described in full language at the top of the page, and it provides a summary of some of the comments that were received. Now, you can look and you can get the raw responses. You can read every single response, if you like. But if you don't have the time for that, we would understand that, you can look at our summary of the main themes, the types of responses, the types of comments we got, and you can read some sample comments on the top-right corner.

We also provided -- and if you participated in the consultation, you know that the way that we sought feedback was for each principle, we listed the principle, then we said, "Do you agree? Strongly disagree? Disagree? Neutral? Agree? Strongly

agree?" You provided numerical input and you had a text field to riff and say, here are my thoughts in general on that, and we read all those freeform responses. You can see at the bottom-right, a bar chart, numerical representation of the numerical responses.

Here's another one. I won't read it, but this is, for example, the feedback we got on the derecognition principle.

And at the end of the report, we provided some general comments on themes that we saw. Again, we read every response. We've talked about it. We're continuing to talk about it, and we do appreciate a lot of the thoughtful feedback that we got.

So, that's the report. What's next? Now we have to write the document. Principles were nice, but we have to actually write a full document. And we are in the process of doing that right now. We're taking into account the feedback we received. We're reserving the right to get smarter as we go, think about things we hadn't thought of before, to discard ideas that didn't make sense. We thought they would at the time. And once we're done with that, sometime in Q2-Q3, we're going to provide the full document. You'll all see it. Not just that, we'll conduct a full public consultation on it, similar -- although probably different in the format -- to the consultation that we provided on the Principles document. You'll all have a chance to read it and you'll all have a chance to provide your comments, and we encourage you to do so.

Based on that feedback, we will revise it. We'll revise the document to reflect a lot of the insights that we'll gain from that consultation, and we'll publish it again. And we're not anticipating at this time that we're going to conduct a second consultation on the revised draft. We might, but we're not anticipating at this point. But we do know that we're going to provide it, and then we're going to discuss it in all the RIR meetings. There's going to be a full cycle of RIR meetings, including ICANN and including the equivalent that AFRINIC is going to have in terms of its mailing lists and mechanisms for discussion, and we're going to get feedback on the second draft of it.

Then, barring any further updates, there will be some tweaking and the like. And ideally, we'll be providing the final document to the NRO and to ICANN for beginning, at least, of the approval and adoption process at the end of this year.

So, that is the timeline. We're trying to be as clear about our process as possible. And we really want to know. We have some questions for you. We're going to invite you to ask questions of us. But I'll start. We'd love to hear from you in the mics. And one of the questions we would like to answer, either at the mics, or if you want to contact us separately, is, if you participated in the consultation, do you have feedback on it, not just on the principles themselves, not just on the document, not just on the project, but on the consultation? Was it a good way to gauge feedback? Were there flaws? Are there things that we could improve?

If you did not participate, why? Is it because of time constraints? Obviously, we're all busy. Was the consultation not helpful? Did it not provide an adequate mechanism to provide feedback? Did we not provide enough information?

So, those are questions for you, but we invite you to ask questions of us, including right now. Any question, really. But in case you're shy, we'll even give you a free one that you can use. And that is, for example -- here's a question you can ask

us: How does the work to produce the revised ICP-2 document differ from how a policy proposal is handled in our region?

So, that's all I have to say. I think we're going to open it up for questions now.

>> KENNY HUANG: Okay, thank you very much. I think that's a tremendous work from the ASO -- sorry, more than ASO -- we have the entire legal team from ICANN, legal team, a lot of legal effort as well. And the floor is open.

>> AUDIENCE: This is Gauro (?) speaking for myself. I will reserve my comments on the process. I'm kind of disappointed that we are here all week, and in the last 90 minutes, we are talking about this. I have a question for both APNIC and ASO. Why was this not discussed as soon as the report was published, like earlier this week? Why were more community not invited to consultation for a more longer, you know, more thoughtful discussion about it? It's a big disappointment for me because I was looking forward to having a broader conversation about ICP-2 at this meeting.

>> NICK: I have a good answer and a bad answer. I'll give them in that order, I suppose. Or I don't know if it's a good answer, but it's an answer. And that is that, initially -- let me put it this way -- we have had multiple occasions where the ASO AC, sometimes including the RAO legal and the communications team will come together and have work sessions. And given the complexity of the work, we might meet for four days, five days, internationally, in person. A lot of work goes into these. A lot of time is spent. They're just long work sessions.

Some of the time, what we'll do, or ideally what we'll do is we'll time those with existing meetings, whether it's an ICANN meeting in Puerto Rico, whether it's an APNIC meeting in Kyoto, which is another work session we had. Best way to think about that, even if it's not a satisfying answer, is that we used the meeting more as a vehicle for us to all come together to do a lot of work, and not all of that work was appropriate for an open session. So, I think the intent from the beginning was not necessarily to have a bunch of public sessions during APNIC. So, that's the answer.

Now let me give you the sort of mea culpa on it, is that I think we realized as we were having the meetings this week that we didn't need to do that, that there were some of the discussions that we had, maybe a third of them, that really could have been open to the public and that could have had input. At that point, we had some robust discussions as to whether it made sense to open them up and change what was already on the public calendar about that, and the decision was made not to try to change things up. I'm sorry if that's not satisfying, but I'll admit we didn't handle the situation as well as we could have.

>> GAURAB UPADHAYA: Thank you for the answer. What is the APNIC answer on this? You owe that to the community on this. I would also like to hear from the APNIC Secretariat on why they didn't have better planning on this.

>> KENNY HUANG: Okay, probably later the secretary can respond. I'll just a little bit. Basically, the entire ICP-2 team, clueing ASO and the legal team from ICANN and RIR, basically, they had very, very intensive meeting online and offline. So, for the housekeeping and logistics, public (?) to respond. I believe they still have a lot of meetings this week.

>> Still not happy with that because the community should have had a discussion and that is on the EC to provide to this

community. You can't say legal or ASO didn't have time. So, I'm still waiting for an answer. I don't know if anybody can answer. I don't want a legal answer. I want an answer why the community was not involved in this process.

>> JEREMY HARRISON: Jeremy Harrison, General Counsel of APNIC, trying to provide a non-legal answer. So, I mean, in terms of the review document, it was only published this Monday, which is obviously after the schedule was confirmed. The other part is, we're trying to ensure there's balance across the communities, in terms of how they consulted and engaged. To run a complete session at APNIC on this would require the same at the other RIR meetings that are happening in this quarter. The challenge is there that the ASO AC is obviously working on the draft document, and they do have a consultation process planned. And as Nick mentioned, the second half of the year RIR meetings will involve far more substantive consultation.

>> I still see that as a cop-out.

>> KENNY HUANG: Okay, thanks. Thanks for the response. Actually, I intend to agree with Gaurab. But I think basically because we have a lot of work to do, and besides the consultation, a lot of consultation can be done online, and there are several stages of consultation. So, I think that a lot of ICP-2 members are here. And I think you have -- we have an opportunity to discuss with them, some are here. Sorry, I agree with you.

>> Give me a minute. Back to the substance of the ICP-2. What you said there. I think a lot of people, like the pre-consultation education was missing. I think that was what was the big feedback --

>> NICK: Preconsultation?

>> Yeah, because a lot of people, talking in Wellington about ICP-2, even folks who have been around for a while don't remember. Like, 2001 was a long time ago. And that could have been done better to get more or better answers to the consultation, because people are like, what is this, right? And that could have definitely been done a lot better.

>> NICK: That's fair.

>> GAURAB: Even better. I remember ICP-1 and I remember that all day -- primer a lot more useful. A.

The second comment on this is, why is this so narrow? Right? And there might be reasons for that, and I think that could be more better articulated.

>> NICK: Can you unpack that? What do you mean, why is it narrow?

>> GAURAB: You know, I look at the principles, and it is about recognition, data recognition and all that. There is nothing about collaboration.

>> NICK: About collaboration?

>> Between the RIRs. Like 25 years ago, there was collaboration or certain parts of collaborations were recorded into this, because look at all of the inter-RIR transfers that happened. And you know, the database is all messy. We had proposal earlier this week about, you know, RIR Whois, and the collaboration part there is something I thought was missing from the process. And maybe there is a next step, or maybe the NRO EC did not give that in the guidelines or the request, but that is a question for the CEOs. I will not bring that here. But as ASO is elected by the community, you are not just accountable to the NRO, or the CEOs, right? And from a community perspective, that is a key item missing. So, if it is not possible in this cycle,

or maybe, you know, that is for the ASO to really think that we need to codify some of the inter-RIR collaborations that already happened. But that is happening because, you know, we said it's a good thing, right? But some of those do need to be collaborated for the same reasons why you're updating ICP-2.

>> NICK: Thank you for the feedback.

>> KENNY HUANG: Okay, thank you for the feedback. Probably we can accommodate some (?) in the next meeting for outreach regarding to ICP-2. Kevin, you are next.

>> KEVIN: I wanted to comment, Kevin Bloomberg, some of the things Gaurab said. We will be having informational webinars. We had them before. Some cases were well attended and in some cases, they were not, but that is absolutely well-received feedback. There's an FAQ now live. Please, if you have questions, let us get those questions so we can get them out to everybody as FAQ responses.

The other two key points are, we are working within the constraint of what we've been asked to do by the NRO EC. It is not an everything under the sun document. We have very specific requirements that we've been tasked with that we are doing.

The second thing is, we are 12 volunteers right now. We are not staff. We are not paid. We are giving up ridiculous amounts of time. We're happy to do it. We feel accomplished by it, but we are working under the constraint of being volunteers within our communities. We weren't around when ICP-2 was around, in case anybody was asking.

There are logistical issues between trying to coordinate all of this work to meet up with the RIRs themselves, so there's a lot of logistical components. Last year, we had a meeting at the LACNIC offices in Mont video, where we weren't attached to anything. We just felt it was easier to be here. It was cheaper, which is, you know, budget is always a concern. It was cheaper to be here. But we could have just as easily been in a hotel room, locked in, like we were in Montevideo. It just happened to be easier.

At the same time, if you look at our timeline, there was no discussion right now. It was more an update. We had the discussion with the first level of questionnaire, and we've read the community very well, I think, in that we will have a lot more discussion when the draft comes out.

>> KENNY HUANG: Thank you, Kevin. And I really appreciate the effort entire ICP-2 has been spent. I would like to take this one that will be online question, then go back to Nguyen and then that will be the last one.

>> This is on behalf of Ying-Chu Chen. And she said she hopes to bring the ICP-2 document into discussion in the APRIGF communities this year.

>> KENNY HUANG: Yes, of course, that's welcome, but someone else needs to propose it to APIGF. Thank you. You are next.

>> LU HAN: Hello. A couple comments. First of all, I think the community does need to be further engaged. As a person here for a whole week, and there are a lot of AC members here, I haven't even been approached one time to talk about ICP-2 by any of your guys. I know that I've tried to talk to them, and it's all I'm voluntarily. And I talked to a few more people and nobody seems to be mentioning or discussing ICP-2 revision, which is probably very important, the biggest event for a long time along these corridor discussions. And we've been noticed the very last minute of this meeting and discuss it, and I do think it warrants a very thorough discussion before moving

forward. That's the first thing.

Second thing. I read the summary report, and many of the arguments or many of the principles, quote/unquote, which was put forward was strongly disagreed by the community. And then, I saw that there is comments on the computer-generated response, but I don't know about your guys, but most of my speech and the public email today are computer generated on the input of me because I just couldn't write a good English. The charge (?) writes a million times better in the clear intent put into it. I used to have a whole team of people do it for me, but now I just have ChatGPT do it for me. And I can say that with many of the community members, especially not in the North American region. In every other region, the primary population, the speaking language is not English. And consultation, while it does not specifically mention need to input in English, but it does strongly imply reading English and puts the English answer there. So, I could understand the larger percentage of the community might computer generate their answer based on input they put into the AI tools, which I think those could be a valid feedback, should be taken into account, not simply discounted because using AI tools, that's written by an AI. Because AI doesn't submit the form itself. A human does.

And every response came with a name, job, and their company affiliation, which means they are an actual human. Every human's opinion is valid, even if a human uses a tool to write their opinion, which is completely valid, right? You guys are not teachers in school room trying to teach the entire community, aren't you? We should allow people to utilize whatever tool, especially you strongly imply to provide a response in one very specific language a large percentage of population on this planet doesn't speak.

>> Understood.

>> And you are doing a document which potentially implies this very tool we use to connect the globe. It's a heavy burden. We should respect that.

And on that front, I have a question. What are we going to do? Are we really going to be moving forward with this aggressive timeline, looking at the things, especially on the argument that a lot of principles wasn't particularly agreed with the community? Are we looking for a solution where it's actually practical workable? And certain comments and principles were put in there, for example, hands off. The (?) recognize and need to be fully cooperated with ICANN. It's like, okay, well, we're going to catch a bad criminal. He needs to be fully cooperated with the policeman so we can catch him. That doesn't work.

You know, the ICP-2 at this point, putting some of the principles putting in practice could be very dangerous and a lack of community input. At the end of the day, there is also an operational reality here I'm not sure many of the community members here were aware. Five RIR operators entirely independent. It has independent back-end system. It has independent billing system. It has independent private database of its members. They are not cross data-sharing. There is no data scope provided anywhere in the world. So, if one RIR actually fails, the visibility and operational practicalality to take over the entire membership from there and keep the number unique and without dispute, especially in line of IPv4 today was $200 billion, yes, allow the possibility. So, this is a heavy burden. This is very important to everybody's job here, and I

want you guys to take it very seriously.

Let's discuss more and sort of a solution. And what's your response on most of the principles were disagreed by the community? Thank you.

>> KENNY HUANG: Thank you very much.

>> NICK: Thank you for the feedback. I won't respond on the merits to some of the principles that you raise, simply because that's not in scope for this discussion, but we do value your feedback. It's being recorded. We'll take it under advisement.

With respect to what we assume are the computer-generated responses, to be clear, it is not that a given response was looked at and said, you know, that's just the English pattern of that individual response indicates that it is a computer-generated response. Rather -- and I would defer to the Communications team, which uses a specific tool -- it was a situation where looking alt a set of responses that were all essentially identical with slight variations and wording. It was a statistical likelihood of being computer generated across a number of respondents. We do not make the ultimate judgment that they were computer generated. We provide the raw data with everything, and we invite the community to form its own judgments on that. We have simply provided two sets of responses, one grouping according to the statistical likelihood of what appeared to be computer-generated responses, and one that is the raw data. And again, we do not make a judgment on that. Thank you.

>> Just a quick one. A follow-up comment that is, because every comment are provided with a name, profession, and job, it's a human being who's making those comments, who are supporting that idea. People could share similar ideas. That should not be discounted. It's just should be treated as a larger voice, instead of, because they are similar and all those English seems written by AI, so let's forget about them.

>> NICK: Okay.

>> LU HENG: If that's the case, then we're not respecting the community enough. Thank you.

>> NICK: Thank you.

>> KENNY HUANG: Thank you. All of the information are well taken. Just one more amendment. Because basically, data policy development, they are several stages of PDP process. Some of the process requires very intensive communication with the stakeholder, with the community. And some of the states probably require more effort to look in more data analysis, try to compile to get better result. During this week, I know they have spent a lot of time to compile all the data together, so probably doesn't have time to talk to the stakeholders, talk to the member, but I believe next time, probably we could pay more attention to see whether we can accommodate more time slot to allow ICP-2 to have communication within RIR week. Last one, sorry.

>> ANDRE: One comment on the previous discussion. None of the responses was ignored. I think what the proper word to use here is the word consolidated for the ease of analysis and the ease of reading of the clean report. Every response was rated. At the same time, I have to say that the group chose the quality analysis rather than quantitative analysis. The results of the question you were not devoting on the principles, partly because we also discovered that while the number indicated that people agree, there was some concerns and disagreements in the comment session, and opposite for some of the responses that people

disagreed, they were actually found in agreement and they wanted to clarify implementation of this principle, for instance.

So, the group has chosen qualitative analysis, and none of this was ignored. So, every voice was heard, every voice was carefully considered and analyzed.

Then, I would like to ask Gaurab, and this is to better understand and to avoid frustration in the community in the future in other area communities as well. Gaurab, you said there was sort of not enough time to provide input and discuss, you expected this to come earlier. But the questionnaire was open for several weeks and there was an opportunity for the community to provide feedback. That's what we are looking for.

There will be an opportunity when the feedback is incorporated in the draft document, as Nick explained, an opportunity for the community to discuss and comment, and there will be more of the discussion thing. The question was really put up to frame the input, the collection of input. So, if we don't have time, we can take it offline, but I would like to really know, and maybe in the hallway, Gaurab, you can explain to me better so we cannot make the same mistake in the future. Thank you.

>> GAURAB: Speaking for myself. I heard both Andrei and Kevin and I can see the ASO reasons. I am still disappointed with the APNIC Secretariat, because this is a very relevant topic that the community should have been discussing, and that was my disappointment here, like there was a report that came out on Monday. It is a very relevant topic. Whether the report was there or not, there could have been conversation around this topic earlier in the week, for the community in the region. I'm not even asking why the ASO didn't put up the session. I was asking the secretariat why they did not have something on the agenda for this week. If that explains, you know -- I was going to tell Kevin the same thing, wherever he is, in the hallway. And Andrei, there is the answer. That is why I said, the secretariat can't cop out of this, because this is the largest gathering of community members in the region for the whole year. The third-quarter September meeting is a quarter of the number of people at this meeting. So, not using this opportunity to have discussions, have more education, that was my big disappointment of this. Thank you.

>> KENNY HUANG: Okay, agree with you. Next time, we definitely will pay more attention regarding to we have sufficient time slot allocated for community members, and also ICP-2 for communication. Are there any other questions? Sorry, you can go downstage. Thank you.

>> NICK: Thank you.

(Applause)

>> KENNY HUANG: So, is there any other question with the few minutes? Hearing none, can I invite you to give a big hand to all the ICP-2 team, including ASO AC, team from ICANN and legal team. Give a big hand to them. Okay, thank you for your great contribution.

Now, moving to the next. VNNIC 60. That will be presented by APNIC, who is going to give the introduction. Thank you.

>> NGUYEN TRUONG GIANG: Hello, everyone. My name is Nguyen from VNNIC, Vietnam Internet Network Information Center. We are under management by the Internet resource in Vietnam. We are under the Ministry of Science and Technology. The duty of VNNIC, we are management and location in Internet association in Vietnam, and IP address in Vietnam. We are also managing and

operating in critical infrastructure in Vietnam, in both Internet system, nation Internet system, in Vietnam.

The reason VNNIC, it's Internet for all. So, we are bringing more information about our community and develop substantive Internet infrastructure in Vietnam. APNIC meeting when we held in Vietnam, VNNIC welcomed all APNIC participants in (?) city in Vietnam. We would be host in (?) city, a beautiful place in Vietnam. It is located in Xiao Center, Vietnam. APNIC (?) will be held in (?). Have closer information about the place, watching a nice video. Welcome to Vietnam. Thank you.

(Music)

>> Vietnam is a Southeast Asian country located at the eastern tip of the Indochina peninsula. Coming to Vietnam, you'll be amazed with the diverse natural scene in one country. With 54 ethnic groups, Vietnam has a diverse and rich culture across the length of the country. With many world culture heritage recognized by UNESCO. Vietnamese people are simple, amiable, hospitable, and always welcome friends from the globe to visit our country.

Da Nang, the most worth-living city in Vietnam, is located in the South Central Coast region of Vietnam. Da Nang city is blessed with various types of natural terrain, mainly beautiful beaches, mountains, and rivers. Thanks to that, Da Nang offers various beautiful tourist attractions, the Golden Bridge, a symbol of Da Nang tourism. Hoi an ancient town UNESCO heritage sites.

With a wide variety of traditional food and ancient buildings.

(Music)

Besides longstanding cultural relics, Da Nang is also known as a dynamic and youthful city.

(Music)

The city also welcomes many exciting and spectacular events. As well as serves as a social-economic center of the region with various of industrial aspects.

Coming to Da Nang, you'll be amazed by the collection of flavorful, diverse, and mouth-watering local food. Furama Resort offers multi-cultural experience with a mixture of three continents. The resort is the ideal venue to host important events. A well-appointed convention palace can accommodate up to 3,000 people in style. Connected to International Convention Palace to make it the largest of its kind in Vietnam.

>> Welcome to Vietnam.

>> Welcome to Vietnam!

>> NGUYEN TRUONG GIANG: Welcome to Vietnam. Thank you.

>> KENNY HUANG: Okay, thank you very much, and thank you Vietnam for hosting the next APNIC 60 meeting. And so, you know the schedule, you know the location. You can try to schedule your trip for APNIC 60.

So, moving to the next will be APNIC EC election results. Can I invite Tom to come to the stage?

>> TOMMI CHEN: Good afternoon. I have the results here in this race in the conduct of the election. Now, before I announce the results, there are some procedural things here. So, the delegates should be a bit patient. They're lucky that I decided not to spend five minutes on story-telling this time.

Okay. I've also been advised very skrut nously from RIPE

and ARIN that they witnessed the vote downloading process and there were no issues to report. So, could I ask one of them to please step up to the mic to confirm this? Okay.

>> Hello, everyone. (?) from RIPE NCC. I confirm that, indeed, the scrutineers witnessed the download of the votes and the results were sent, indeed, to the elections chair, and there were no abnormalities or any issues observed. Thank you.

>> TOMMI CHEN: Thank you. Okay, it went well, so here it goes. I will read them, ranking of the number of votes.

Yoshinobu Matsuzaki, 3,056 votes.

Anlei Hu, 2,936.

Roopinder Perhar, 2,740.

And Kenny Huang 2,720.

Bertrand Cherrier, 530.

Rob Thomas, 397.

The total number of votes is 12,379. In my days, it was around 300, now it's 12,000, so that's very good. So, that leads me to congratulate the four candidates who succeeded today: Yoshinobu Matsuzaki, Anlei Hu, Roopinder Singh and Kenny Huang. Okay, congratulations, and that's it. Thank you.

>> KENNY HUANG: Thank you very much. Thank you, Tommi. And also, congratulations for all elected EC and also thanks for all participants EC candidates. I think your participation was very encouraging and I also encourage everyone to participate in all kind of service and provide service in the APNIC.

So, the last one, I'd like to move to Jia Rong for vote of thanks and close. The question was not answered during the open mic, so I switch it back to open mic for one minute.

>> JIA RONG LOW: Sorry, Gaurab, I was trying to get you a better response. Where is he? I don't see. Okay. Thank you. So, there are two parts to this.

Coming back to the topic, you know, whether the secretariat should have put in a session specifically for consultation on the ICP-2 topic. Okay, what I understand is that, which was kind of already mentioned, but the ASO AC convening here together, there was a lot of work they had to do with the drafting, without which then it's very hard to do a consultation. So, without knowing how much progress it can make, it was very hard. So, it's kind of like a moving part.

Then, what we settled on was, build in time where we can for updates. So, we had a short update in the Global Report session, and the other one, we settled on specifically for this day.

Now, in terms of whether we could have done it better, I will take responsibility as head of the organization. We will look into it and see how we can improve the programme as we go. But the ICP-2 topic is and will be a key topic, and it will be a key area that the Secretariat will support. So, we will definitely support ASO AC's work, as well as their consultations and also communications with the community regarding this issue. You know, we have to have a very robust community consultation process for this issue, so we will put in every effort to make sure that we work with the community, we get the responses from the community.

Now, I have one other point to make is, where we are right now is, in some ways, kind of like an in-between point. So, the ASO AC is doing as best as they can to -- (microphone breaking up) -- sorry, they are doing the best they can to collect input. And in some ways, I see it as taking the APNIC process. You need an author to put a draft on the mailing list. That's what we are

doing now. So, to in some ways imply that they are not consulting when they are doing, just putting together the first draft, I think we in some ways are not recognizing the amount of effort they are putting in to do that. And it's a very much more complex issue where they are using the first round from the questionnaire, the feedback, to put together a first draft. Let's also, you know, try our best to appreciate and understand that complexity in that work to come up with a first draft so all of us then can really participate in the consultation.

And also that, you know, in terms of the next steps, we will make sure that we be as robust as possible and be as consultative as possible, build in all the consultation together. And then, we will, again, I'm very confident that ASO AC will take into account everybody's feedback and work on the best draft possible. So, let's have confidence in each other, confidence in how we've always been making policy, you know, and help one another this way. So, I'd like to seek your support and common understanding, work with each other, and there's going to be a lot of work for us, but I'm confident in this leadership with Nick and to the ASO AC, and I am confident with our community that, you know, in some ways, this is the first time we are doing it, in some ways, but we've done a lot of this together. So, let's show the world that we rise up together. Thank you.

>> One more time. I will be very short. Thank you very much.

>> KENNY HUANG: Don't worry, we still have time, so you can keep going.

>> Okay, okay. Thank you very much for your words. I'm pretty sure that, and I confirm that everything that was said will be taken into account. We absolutely understand the frustration that can be here during this meeting. We are in balance between the hard work we have to do and with the support of the communication team and the legal as well.

We are a community of volunteers, as Kevin explained just before. We try really to do our best in a more objective way, be sure that, because for the document finally, on the final document to be adopted, with we need to have the legitimaty and support of the community, of course. And we will improve that. One more time, we learn by working. We will do our best to, even if we try to have the voice of the community, but to have it more and more discussion with it, it's something so we will work on. And for us, it's very exciting, so to see what comes from the community. Because even if we don't create something, but even if we propose something, it is always very interesting to see if finally if we think of something, it answers to the request or to the understanding of the community. So, we will face a very, very exciting time.

And thank you, everybody, for the time when answering the document, when reading the document, and when going to the mic here to ask your question, so thank you for that.

>> KENNY HUANG: Thank you. And your work are volunteer, but your contribution actually are invaluable. Thank you very much. So, any question? We have time. Sorry, that's my mistake. Right now is second open mic. Any other question, please go to the mic. Okay. Oh. Rajesh.

>> RAJESH CHHARIA: Thank you, Kenny. Rajesh Chharia from ISPAI. I am talking on behalf of all of the affiliates of the RIR. Especially I am talking of the island. We are not getting the same privilege what the APNIC member is getting directly,

not in voting, not in attending the APNIC meeting. What I feel is that when the NIR is the part of APNIC, then at least the NIR member should also be allowed to attend the APNIC meeting in the same way, like the APNIC members are attending. And they should also have some voting right so that they should also have the say into the APNIC policy and other things. Thank you.

>> KENNY HUANG: Thank you. Thank you for your input. I think your input is well received. So, any other question? Hearing none, I pass over to Jia Rong.

>> JIA RONG LOW: Thank you. Okay, this is the hardest part because I am standing between you and shopping. Okay. So, please bear with me, and please also join me to thank the special people we have to thank.

So, first of all, big thank you to our AGM sponsors. I have something to give out. All right, so, please join me to thank CNNIC. And JPNIC. And last but not least, TWNIC for sponsoring the AGM.

(Applause)

No one from TWNIC?

Okay, then also to thank all our community leaders, Policy SIG Chair and Co-chairs, Bertrand, Shaila, Ching-Keng, who cannot join us, and Oanh Nguyen and Zhen Yu, Joy Chan and Bikram Shresta, Routing Security SIG Acting Chair Taiji, and behalf of the APNIC community, let's also thank Jocelyn for your leadership and support to the Routing Security SIG. Please.

(Applause)

And also, extremely important, Electoral Committee. Let's thank Donna Austin, who is our chair, Jonathan Brewer, our secretariat, Amrita, Rupesh, Tugso. Thank you very much for helping to make the elections to happen. Thank you.

And also, APNIC EC Election Chair Dr. Tommi, APNIC EC Election Scrutineer, Athina and Michael, and all APNIC EC election nominees and participants and congratulations to the EC members.

Also, all speakers and moderators, APNIC EC, staff, RIR colleagues and guests, and everyone who attended in person and remotely.

(Applause)

And also for the 2025 Fellowship program. Everyone knows about this program. It's a six-month program culminating in APNIC 60. We are opening for applications early March, and it comprises a series of things, a completion of a series of technical and leadership webinars, completion of an APNIC Academy course stream, introduction to the community mentorship program in an area of interest, and participation at APNIC 60 in Da Nang, including networking. Applications will close on Friday, 28th of March, 23:55, so it's 11:55 UTC+ 10. The link is there. Please, share with your friends, your network, and encourage them to apply for the fellowship.

Now, we also are going to launch the Policy Fellowship. It's a pilot program. We will be selecting up to four participants on an invitation basis. And the reason for that is to keep it small and to pilot it first. Then there will be focused research on APNIC PDP, including one-on-one mentoring from Policy SIG leaders, and the duration will be between 18 to 24 months. So, heads-up for this one. Hope to have your support, especially from community leaders. I spoke to you earlier about we may need a bit more of your time for mentoring, for speaking with community members.

So, last but not least, we thank you again, everyone, for

participating, and I look forward to seeing you at APNIC 60 in
Da Nang. I used to live in Vietnam for three years, so I'm very
excited to go back to Da Nang again, and I hope that I can
welcome you there. So, I look forward to seeing all of you and
to APNIC 60. Thank you.
    (Applause)
    >> KENNY HUANG: Okay. Thank you, Jia Rong. And right now,
we enter into the close of the session. And before I end this
session, I would also like to take this opportunity to thank
again the entire organizers, including the APNOG team, APNIC,
and team members, and also all your participation. I think
that's very grateful. And a lot of response and feedback were
received today, and thank you for your feedback. Definitely some
of them we will take into consideration. And also, as Jia Rong
just mentioned, we're going to have, bylaw reform consultation
that will be announced soon and please pay attention to the
bylaw reform consultation. And especially a lot of people they
pay attention to ICP-2. You can see the web page and check the
QR code to find out more information about ICP-2 and more way to
participant about how you can give feedback to ICP-2. And they
were not only happening in the APNIC region. They are going
around the globe, including the different regions, including in
RIPE, including discussion in ARIN, and also have discussion in
the ICANN forum as well, so please, pay attention, and welcome
to join, if they have any discussion or any forum or any
webinar. Please, if you're available, you're welcome to join the
discussion as well.
    Okay, before I end the session, I think that's pretty
much --
    Oh, we always have one thing we forget, it is a selfie. So,
I pass over to Achie.
    >> Thank you, Kenny. I will ask the AC to go with me here
at the back.
    (Music)

(Session concluded at 3:54 p.m. MYT)

This text is being provided in a realtime format. Communication
Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in
order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a
totally verbatim record of the proceedings.