Dear all,

After extensive consideration and following the comments received during the past Public Forum, I would first like to make some general comments and submit a proposal for LAC-2018-1.

First, I would like to address the comments received on whether or not the Policy List or the Public Forum are the places to discuss this type of proposal. Personally, I believe those who think these are not the right places for this debate might be wrong. Why do I believe this? First, because no ICANN document anticipates a forum for discussing this type of proposals (for example, the creation of a new RIR.) Second, because ICANN ICP-2 (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/new-rirs-criteria-2012-02-25-en) is written in such a way that, at least to me, does not seem to contribute anything to the debate, as it lacks a procedure and all it anticipated was the end of the process for the creation of AFRINIC and LACNIC. In my opinion, it is time to review ICP-2, as it refers to certain things that may no longer be valid and barely lays the foundations for the creation of a new RIR.

Section 2 of ICP-2 refers to the need for a new RIR to demonstrate that it has the broad support of the LIRs (and emphasizes that this also implies the support of a substantial majority of the ISPs in the region) in order for ICANN to consider the creation of a new RIR. Nowhere is a procedure or process specified or even mentioned for this type of discussion of community support. Therefore, the Policy Discussion List seems to be the right place to have this kind of debate and exchange of opinions (otherwise, where else would we have this conversation?).

I think it is necessary to have this discussion and to analyze every point of view. A Global Internet Registry (GIR) may not be necessary today, yet I am convinced that at some point a GIR will be needed to maintain a reasonable administrative order for the resources assigned outside of the current five regions or to entities having presence in more than one region.

There is also the issue  – and this is no small matter – that IPv6 is changing or will significantly change the rate at which current RIRs assign resources and that, from an administrative point of view and given the global nature of the Internet, it should at least be possible to analyze the implementation of a “single window” for certain cases involving entities with global operations and/or possibly outside the five existing regions (in the future).

On the other hand, after reading ICANN documents on this matter (namely ICP-2), I believe it is necessary to review these processes, as it does not seem very reasonable for a governance model such as the one used for the Internet (bottom-up, multistakeholder, self-regulated and self-governed) to establish criteria that have to be met, but does not establish a clear procedure or mechanism for the discussion of these issues... especially because I would not like an external body bringing up this issue and end up using it as an argument for the weakness of the current Internet governance model.

I believe that if there are things in need of improvement we should go ahead and improve them, or at least discuss whether there is room for improvement... In this case, I believe there is much room for improvement.

For example, reading the introduction of ICP-2, it feels like the document was written when there were only three RIRs but with the idea that they would end up being five. It specifies that “It is realistic to assume that new RIRs will be established in the future to serve some of the regions” and already mentions the regions as being precisely five. My question is: why does it divide America in two when typically other institutions consider the Americas as a single region?

From a continental point of view, none of the models historically or currently suggested (four, five, six or seven continents; in Uruguay we mostly adhere to the traditional five-continent model) coincides with the current division of RIRs. Therefore, in my opinion, the division is merely administrative and has a rather high degree of subjectivity. I agree with the current division because it works, but I cannot say that it would not work better with three or six... simply because I believe it is an administrative issue that must respond to the needs and realities of Internet growth. Thus, the topic should at least be analyzed and debated, precisely to guarantee the current version's validity at any given time.

Finally, I believe that it is best to disregard proposal LAC-2018-1 and eventually discuss this topic (but not in the form of a proposal, at least not for the time being) on the lists of the different RIRs, not only to analyze potential opportunities for improving this process but also to assess, from as many points of view as possible, the pros and cons of creating a GIR, whether now or in the near future.

For my part, I will try to find the way to propose a review of ICP-2 to ICANN and the possibility of establishing a procedure and a global space to debate this type of issues, which ICP-2 itself notes must originate from the Community, be broadly discussed and eventually receive the Community’s support.

Sincerely,

Nicolas Antoniello