



**The Proposed ICP-2  
Version 2 Principles  
Questionnaire  
Complete Dataset**

This document contains the full set of text responses and open comments received in the response to the draft ICP-2 principles questionnaire open from 18 November to 6 December 2025

**The Number Resource Organization  
Number Council (NRO NC)**

# The ICP-2 Version 2 Principles Questionnaire

Text responses ordered by principle and level of agreement

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Authority</b> .....	<b>5</b>
1.1. Authority - Strongly Agree (5) .....	5
1.2. Authority - Somewhat Agree (4) .....	8
1.3. Authority - Neutral (3) .....	11
1.4. Authority - Somewhat Disagree (2) .....	13
1.5. Authority - Strongly Disagree (1) .....	14
<b>2. Amendment</b> .....	<b>35</b>
2.1. Amendment - Strongly Agree (5) .....	35
2.2. Amendment - Somewhat Agree (4).....	37
2.3. Amendment - Neutral (3) .....	39
2.4. Amendment - Somewhat Disagree (2) .....	41
2.5. Amendment - Strongly Disagree (1) .....	42
<b>3. Rectification</b> .....	<b>59</b>
3.1. Rectification - Strongly Agree (5) .....	59
3.2. Rectification - Somewhat Agree (4).....	61
3.3. Rectification - Neutral (3) .....	63
3.4. Rectification - Somewhat Disagree (2) .....	65
3.5. Rectification - Strongly Disagree (1) .....	66
<b>4. Coverage</b> .....	<b>84</b>
4.1. Coverage - Strongly Agree (5).....	84
4.2. Coverage - Somewhat Agree (4).....	89
4.3. Coverage - Neutral (3) .....	90
4.4. Coverage - Somewhat Disagree (2) .....	91
4.5. Coverage - Strongly Disagree (1) .....	92
<b>5. Service Region</b> .....	<b>108</b>
5.1. Service Region - Strongly Agree (5) .....	108
5.2. Service Region - Somewhat Agree (4) .....	112
5.3. Service Region - Neutral (3).....	113
5.4. Service Region - Somewhat Disagree (2).....	115
5.5. Service Region - Strongly Disagree (1).....	116
<b>6. Recognition</b> .....	<b>133</b>

6.1.	Recognition - Strongly Agree (5) .....	133
6.2.	Recognition - Somewhat Agree (4) .....	136
6.3.	Recognition - Neutral (3) .....	138
6.4.	Recognition - Somewhat Disagree (2) .....	138
6.5.	Recognition - Strongly Disagree (1) .....	139
<b>7.</b>	<b>Operation.....</b>	<b>156</b>
7.1.	Operation - Strongly Agree (5) .....	156
7.2.	Operation - Somewhat Agree (4) .....	159
7.3.	Operation - Neutral (3) .....	160
7.4.	Operation - Somewhat Disagree (2).....	161
7.5.	Operation - Strongly Disagree (1).....	162
<b>8.</b>	<b>Derecognition.....</b>	<b>178</b>
8.1.	Derecognition - Strongly Agree (5).....	178
8.2.	Derecognition - Somewhat Agree (4).....	181
8.3.	Derecognition - Neutral (3) .....	183
8.4.	Derecognition - Somewhat Disagree (2) .....	184
8.5.	Derecognition - Strongly Disagree (1) .....	185
<b>9.</b>	<b>Community Support.....</b>	<b>203</b>
9.1.	Community Support - Strongly Agree (5) .....	203
9.2.	Community Support - Somewhat Agree (4) .....	206
9.3.	Community Support - Neutral (3).....	207
9.4.	Community Support - Somewhat Disagree (2) .....	209
9.5.	Community Support - Strongly Disagree (1) .....	209
<b>10.</b>	<b>Community Commitment .....</b>	<b>225</b>
10.1.	Community Commitment - Strongly Agree (5) .....	225
10.2.	Community Commitment - Somewhat Agree (4).....	227
10.3.	Community Commitment - Neutral (3) .....	228
10.4.	Community Commitment - Somewhat Disagree (2) .....	230
10.5.	Community Commitment - Strongly Disagree (1) .....	231
<b>11.</b>	<b>Independence .....</b>	<b>247</b>
11.1.	Independence - Strongly Agree (5).....	247
11.2.	Independence - Somewhat Agree (4).....	250
11.3.	Independence - Neutral (3) .....	251
11.4.	Independence - Somewhat Disagree (2) .....	252
11.5.	Independence - Strongly Disagree (1) .....	253
<b>12.</b>	<b>Not-for-Profit.....</b>	<b>269</b>

12.1.	Not-for-Profit - Strongly Agree (5).....	269
12.2.	Not-for-Profit - Somewhat Agree (4).....	272
12.3.	Not-for-Profit - Neutral (3) .....	273
12.4.	Not-for-Profit - Somewhat Disagree (2) .....	275
12.5.	Not-for-Profit - Strongly Disagree (1) .....	276
<b>13.</b>	<b>Corporate Governance .....</b>	<b>292</b>
13.1.	Corporate Governance - Strongly Agree (5).....	292
13.2.	Corporate Governance - Somewhat Agree (4).....	295
13.3.	Corporate Governance - Neutral (3) .....	296
13.4.	Corporate Governance - Somewhat Disagree (2) .....	297
13.5.	Corporate Governance - Strongly Disagree (1) .....	298
<b>14.</b>	<b>Member-Controlled.....</b>	<b>315</b>
14.1.	Member-Controlled - Strongly Agree (5) .....	315
14.2.	Member-Controlled - Somewhat Agree (4) .....	317
14.3.	Member-Controlled - Neutral (3) .....	319
14.4.	Member-Controlled - Somewhat Disagree (2) .....	320
14.5.	Member-Controlled - Strongly Disagree (1).....	321
<b>15.</b>	<b>Community-Driven .....</b>	<b>338</b>
15.1.	Community-Driven - Strongly Agree (5) .....	338
15.2.	Community-Driven - Somewhat Agree (4) .....	342
15.3.	Community-Driven - Neutral (3).....	343
15.4.	Community-Driven - Somewhat Disagree (2) .....	344
15.5.	Community-Driven - Strongly Disagree (1) .....	344
<b>16.</b>	<b>Neutrality .....</b>	<b>361</b>
16.1.	Neutrality - Strongly Agree (5) .....	361
16.2.	Neutrality - Somewhat Agree (4).....	364
16.3.	Neutrality - Neutral (3) .....	365
16.4.	Neutrality - Somewhat Disagree (2) .....	366
16.5.	Neutrality - Strongly Disagree (1) .....	367
<b>17.</b>	<b>Transparency .....</b>	<b>383</b>
17.1.	Transparency - Strongly Agree (5).....	383
17.2.	Transparency - Somewhat Agree (4).....	386
17.3.	Transparency - Neutral (3) .....	387
17.4.	Transparency - Somewhat Disagree (2) .....	388
17.5.	Transparency - Strongly Disagree (1) .....	388
<b>18.</b>	<b>Audit .....</b>	<b>405</b>

18.1.	Audit - Strongly Agree (5) .....	405
18.2.	Audit - Somewhat Agree (4) .....	408
18.3.	Audit - Neutral (3).....	410
18.4.	Audit - Somewhat Disagree (2).....	411
18.5.	Audit - Strongly Disagree (1) .....	411
<b>19.</b>	<b>Service .....</b>	<b>428</b>
19.1.	Service - Strongly Agree (5) .....	428
19.2.	Service - Somewhat Agree (4) .....	431
19.3.	Service - Neutral (3).....	432
19.4.	Service - Somewhat Disagree (2).....	433
19.5.	Service - Strongly Disagree (1).....	433
<b>20.</b>	<b>Continuity .....</b>	<b>450</b>
20.1.	Continuity - Strongly Agree (5) .....	450
20.2.	Continuity - Somewhat Agree (4) .....	453
20.3.	Continuity - Neutral (3).....	454
20.4.	Continuity - Somewhat Disagree (2) .....	454
20.5.	Continuity - Strongly Disagree (1) .....	455
<b>21.</b>	<b>Anti-Capture .....</b>	<b>472</b>
21.1.	Anti-Capture - Strongly Agree (5) .....	472
21.2.	Anti-Capture - Somewhat Agree (4) .....	476
21.3.	Anti-Capture - Neutral (3).....	477
21.4.	Anti-Capture - Somewhat Disagree (2) .....	478
21.5.	Anti-Capture - Strongly Disagree (1) .....	479
<b>22.</b>	<b>Ecosystem Stability.....</b>	<b>494</b>
22.1.	Ecosystem Stability - Strongly Agree (5).....	494
22.2.	Ecosystem Stability - Somewhat Agree (4).....	497
22.3.	Ecosystem Stability - Neutral (3) .....	498
22.4.	Ecosystem Stability - Somewhat Disagree (2) .....	499
22.5.	Ecosystem Stability - Strongly Disagree (1) .....	499
<b>23.</b>	<b>Remedial Bias.....</b>	<b>515</b>
23.1.	Remedial Bias - Strongly Agree (5) .....	515
23.2.	Remedial Bias - Somewhat Agree (4) .....	518
23.3.	Remedial Bias - Neutral (3).....	519
23.4.	Remedial Bias - Somewhat Disagree (2).....	521
23.5.	Remedial Bias - Strongly Disagree (1).....	522
<b>24.</b>	<b>Handoff .....</b>	<b>538</b>

24.1.	Handoff - Strongly Agree (5).....	538
24.2.	Handoff - Somewhat Agree (4).....	541
24.3.	Handoff - Neutral (3) .....	542
24.4.	Handoff - Somewhat Disagree (2) .....	543
24.5.	Handoff - Strongly Disagree (1) .....	544
<b>25.</b>	<b>Other comments or feedback.....</b>	<b>560</b>

## 1. Authority

Any proposal to recognize a Candidate RIR or to derecognize an RIR must originate from the NRO EC after a majority vote in favor of the proposal. ICANN shall have final authority to decide whether to adopt the proposal, subject to ICP-2, provided that ICANN has first consulted with and given substantial consideration to the input of each RIR.

### 1.1. Authority - Strongly Agree (5)

It is critical to have a process to decognise an RIR. It is not only practical but also from a governance perspective, the whole governance structure becomes meaningless if the higher structure dies but gave any power to remove the responsibility/authority given

**Alban Kwan (CSC)**

---

Fellow RIRs are better placed to assess the performance, compliance and functionality of a peer.

**Brian Longwe (Converged Technology Networks)**

---

ICANN should have the final say in deciding to go ahead or not.

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

I agree

**Aftab Siddiqui (AFTABSIDDIQUI-AU)**

---

These seem the most appropriate bodies for such recognition

**Narelle Clark (Internet Association of Australia)**

---

Need we mention the current chaos in Afrinic, the perfect example of when this should happen.

**Warwick Ward-Cox (Network Platforms)**

---

At this time I agree the third party can be ICANN but that is only because I do not see another suitable option at this time. However, if there was a more suitable option identified, this could be considered.

**Paul Rendek (DSTREAM GROUP)**

---

The proposal establishes a collaborative framework by involving the NRO EC and ICANN in decisions regarding RIR recognition, ensuring input from all stakeholders. However, the criteria for “substantial consideration” of RIR input by ICANN should be clarified to ensure transparency and fairness in the decision-making process

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

Yes, and ICANN should give its reason whatever case.

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

The principle establishes a balance of authority between the NRO EC and ICANN. The NRO EC has direct insights into regional needs, while ICANN has a global oversight role. This layered approach ensures that no single entity has unilateral control, preserving checks and balances. By allowing the NRO EC to initiate recognition or derecognition proposals, this principle ensures that regional voices are heard before ICANN makes a final decision, fostering inclusive and representative governance. While regional perspectives are vital, ICANN’s final authority ensures that any major decisions adhere to global policies and standards, like those set out in ICP-2. This structure helps maintain stability and consistency in the internet’s governance framework across regions, avoiding fragmentation or conflicts that might arise if each RIR had autonomous decision-making power. Requiring ICANN to consult with each RIR and give substantial consideration to their input before finalizing any decision ensures a collaborative process. This step is crucial for maintaining a healthy, trust-based relationship between ICANN and the RIRs, fostering open communication and reducing potential conflicts. The requirement of majority voting within the NRO EC introduces transparency and accountability into the process. A majority vote implies that any proposal reflects broad consensus rather than isolated interests, and ICANN’s subsequent decision-making is also held to a high standard by requiring them to engage with RIRs and consider their perspectives. The internet’s growth and evolution rely on a coordinated approach to resource distribution and policy enforcement. This principle helps prevent hasty or biased decisions regarding the status of RIRs, safeguarding the coordinated system that is essential for a stable, global internet.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

It’s ICANN reviews

**Rita Kumi (Ghana Telecommunication Company)**

---

I think this is a great graduated way of handling this so the outcome cannot easily be manipulated.

**Raymond Mamattah (EGIGFA)**

---

Sufficient provision for consultation and review of adherence to the ICP-2

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

**Taye Oyebola (Aso Savings and Loans Plc)**

---

I think this stipulation is excessively rigid. Restricting proposals to those from the NRO EC after a majority vote may stifle essential input from various stakeholders. While ICANN should maintain final authority, it must ensure extensive consultation with all RIRs.

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

je suis totalement d'accord

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

I agree in the oversight by ICANN, but am concerned about accountability if ICANN in exercising its sole authority

**Jeff Neuman (JJN Solutions, LLC)**

---

I strongly disagree with the principle outlined above, particularly the provision that grants ICANN final authority over the recognition or withdrawal of recognition of an RIR, despite the majority vote of the NRO Executive Committee. This structure undermines the fundamental principle of decentralization that is at the heart of the Internet governance model. The RIRs were created to operate independently and make decisions that meet the unique needs and circumstances of their respective regions. Granting ICANN final authority over these decisions risks centralizing power in a way that could override the autonomy of the RIRs and limit their ability to effectively respond to regional demands.

**Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)**

---

Please clarify if this means a veto right for ICANN and who has final authority to decide over dispute if the candidate meets ICP-2

**Joerg Dorchain (private)**

---

It is very important to have a balance of the bottom-up flavour and some control by people vested from the community who master the system and understand the importance of the resources to keeping the Internet up and running.

**Musa Stephen HONLUE (AFRINIC)**

---

Other bodies should also have the right to propose a candidate

**Elvis Velea (V4Escrow LLC)**

---

That make sense

**Adiel Akplogan (iNetSys)**

---

Add wording noting that each EC member should be reflecting a broad consensus in their region

**Leo Vegoda (And Polus LLC)**

---



It's not clear in the glossary who in ICANN (which committee/group/department) has the power for final adoption so I suggest the text to be modified as following: ICANN Board shall have the final authority ... till the end of text.

**Haitham El Nakhal (National Telecom Regulatory Authority)**

---

Adding or removing an RIR in the overall the Internet Number Resource Management scheme is very substantial for the management of each RIRs, therefore it should be appropriate that NRO EC determines to propose it to ICANN, given such condition in terms of support of prospective LIRs and NRO NC and the broader community have been gained. With that, I found that the current ASO-MoU stipulates at its 4-b-2 that ASO AC has the organizational role for providing recommendations to the Board of ICANN concerning the recognition of new RIRs, hence we will need to work on revising ASO MoU to fit it to the revised ICP-2, with a number of revisions seem to be needed.

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

I've many doubts about if also the RIR community may be able to ask for a derecognition process

**Jordi Palet Martinez (The IPv6 Company)**

---

## **1.2. Authority - Somewhat Agree (4)**

In the absence of an input from an RIR (as may be the case from AFRINIC for example), then the input should come from GAC members in countries covered by the RIR.

**Babagana Digima (Nigerian Communications Commission)**

---

The decision to recognise or derecognise an RIR will have profound implications for communities impacted by the decision, and it is vital that they have a meaningful say in these processes. In the next version of ICP-2, the ASO AC should consider ways to ensure that the whole community (government, the private sector, technical community, civil society and academia), can provide meaningful input into the NRO EC vote on recognition or derecognition of an RIR, and into ICANN's decision of whether or not to adopt the proposal. The ASO AC and ICANN should consider requirements for documenting consultations between ICANN and the RIRs, and the reasons for any decisions. There should also be appropriate appeals processes for decisions to recognise or derecognise an RIR by the NRO EC or ICANN.

**Ian Sheldon (Australian Government - Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts)**

---

Gives RIRs complete control over recognition or de-recognition. What if a cartel has emerged?

**Jordan Carter (auDA)**

---

There should give consideration for the members to be able to nominate/ suggest a new applicant

**Colwayne Babb (Cable and Wireless)**

---

I am agree with that

**Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)**

---

agree

**Mohammad Mubarak Alfalasi (Telecommunication and Digital government Regulatory Authority)**

---

I strongly disagree. Giving ICANN final authority undermines decentralization and risks overriding RIR autonomy

**Noel OUPOH (DATACONNECT AFRICA)**

---

This principle establishes a clear and balanced approach to RIR recognition and derecognition. It empowers the NRO EC to initiate proposals based on community consensus, while granting ICANN the final authority to ensure global consistency and adherence to ICP-2 principles. This division of authority safeguards the stability and integrity of the internet's numbering resources.

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

If ICANN's decision diverges from the recommendations provided by the RIRs, it should justify this divergence in writing.

**Cameron Smith (Bubble Cloud Mozambique S.A.)**

---

NRO EC should be main authority to recognize/derecognize an RIR

**Mohammad Kawsar Uddin (Daily Sangbad)**

---

The principle of ICANN having final authority is reasonable as far as it safeguards against unilateral decision-making by ICANN for decisions affecting recognition or derecognition.

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

The balance here is delicate. I think it would be bad if ICANN rejected a full proposal from the NRO EC on this, but the legitimacy can only come from ICANN.

**Brian Nisbet (HEAnet CLG)**

---

No comments

**Pacharaporn Wangwinyoo (ZIM (Thailand) Co., LTD.)**

---

Majority vote is important

**John Haydon (Education)**

---

The requirement for ICANN to give "substantial consideration" to each RIR's input is not clearly defined, creating some uncertainty in how it should be applied. It's unclear what specific actions ICANN must take to show that it has given this level of attention. Adding criteria or guidelines for ICANN to follow could help make this process more transparent and accountable. Additionally, introducing a

way for RIRs to challenge decisions if they feel their input wasn't fully considered could improve the fairness of this process.

**Anastasia Kleiman (Voldeta)**

---

Yes

**Vanessa Phong (Keysight Technologies Malaysia Sdn Bhd)**

---

Okay

**Patricia Sol (Purple Digital Ltd)**

---

ICANN still has some independence and bias issues; I'd be more happy to place stronger bias on the NRO EC but the suggested approach is fine.

**David Lamparter (Westnetz w.V.)**

---

I am in favor of the proposal.

**Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)**

---

one needs to be careful about this being an EC role. Or more importantly how that vote is taken and what percentage is needed to be effective. I also think that the ASO-AC/NRO-EC should be involved here from a community representationperspective.

**Saul Stein (eNetworks)**

---

Consensus among and within the RIR community under consideration should also be considered.

**Brian Jones (Virginia Tech)**

---

A proposal could originate outside the NRO EC, but then perhaps have a way to present/recommend to the NRO EC?

**Ron da Silva (Network Technologies Globl)**

---

"a majority vote" of whom? The NRO EC? What if the NRO EC can't achieve quorum? ICANN must consult with the regional communities, not just "each RIR."

**Lee Howard (IPv4.Global by Hilco Streambank)**

---

It may be worth adding a method for LIRs directly to enter a proposal as well.

**Xavier Clark (Harris Computer)**

---

Derecognition could be a significant and adversarial event. I wonder if more than a majority vote should be considered.

**Andrew Gallo (The George Washington University)**

---

agreed

**Matthew Cowen (dgtlfutures)**

---

### **1.3. Authority - Neutral (3)**

In agreement

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

Recognition of a Candidate RIR or derecognition of an RIR should arise from the consensus of all existing members. The ultimate authority should lie with this unified consent.

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---

Where an RIR has failed like in the recent case of AfriNIC action should be possible to re-establish the RIR.

**Jaco Kroon (Interexcel World Connection)**

---

Sentence Portion , "provided that ICANN has first consulted" , Might be nice to see a MUST or SHOULD placed in there to be suer of the clause .

**James Laferriere (n/a)**

---

I agree

**Emmanuel Kitcher (University of Environment and Sustainable Development)**

---

There will always be both sides to consider, and global politics will always be a problem. The issue here is IPv4 scarcity more than the RIRs themselves or extra RIRs. If the candidate where to NOT have IPv4 resources (other than what could/might be surrender to them by RIR members) I believe these issues would be lesser of problems. Ie. candidate RIRs to ONLY issue ASNs and IPv6 resources

**Hendrik Visage (HeVIS.Co Systems Pty Ltd)**

---

I don't think we need any more regions - just fix AfriNIC

**Mark Elkins (Posix Systems)**

---

I find this process to be overly rigid. Designating the NRO EC as the sole proposer for RIR recognition or derecognition may reduce stakeholder engagement. While ICANN's final authority is crucial, it should ensure thorough consultation with all RIRs beforehand.

**Alex Kwan (Wiplus Malaysia)**

---

Not bad

**Hann Jye Ng (MyTeksi Sdn Bhd)**

---

This stipulation seems overly restrictive. By requiring that proposals come only from the NRO EC with a majority vote, we risk excluding valuable input from other stakeholders. While ICANN should have the final say, meaningful consultation with all RIRs is essential.

**Sidonie Hacking (-)**

---

I think this stipulation is too limiting. By mandating that only the NRO EC can propose recognition or derecognition of an RIR, we may overlook valuable input from other stakeholders. ICANN should have the final say, but it must engage with all RIRs extensively before making decisions.

**Jun Wen (one futures technology sdn bhd)**

---

I am firmly against the principle outlined, especially the clause that grants ICANN final authority over RIR recognition or derecognition, even if the NRO EC has voted in favor. This approach undermines the foundational principle of decentralization in Internet governance. RIRs exist to operate independently, addressing their regions' unique needs. Granting ICANN the final say risks centralizing power and could impede RIRs' autonomy and responsiveness to regional demands.

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

This principle seems to strike an effective balance between centralized oversight and regional autonomy. By requiring ICANN to consult with each RIR and consider their input

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

Yes

**Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)**

---

How to ensure community participation?

**Lia Solis (personal)**

---

this principle is confusing and carry risks of conflict.

**Adeola Alain P. AINA (Digital Intelligence Services, Sarl)**

---

If ICANN decides, why can't they originate?, and I would prefer a supermajority vote if possible in the NRO EC

**Mike Burns (IPTrading)**

---

The NRO is effectively a trade association of RIRs who have inherent interest in maintaining the status quo. They should not have a monopoly on proposing new RIRs or winding up existing RIRs.

**Kevin Meynell (Individual)**

---

## 1.4. Authority - Somewhat Disagree (2)

On the Principles Level it is unclear how "ICANN" would come to its conclusion and whether it should judge on substance or on process

**Peter Koch (Individual)**

---

The difficulty I see with this proposal is that it is quite clearly privileging the \_existing\_ RIRs (or more exactly, their EC members, who represent the institutional interests of the RIRs at least as much as the community) over anyone else. I'm not sure I have a better answer, but it worries me to be making the EDs/CEOs of the existing members of any body the gatekeepers to new members.

**Andrew Sullivan (N/A)**

---

See extended comments on the NANOG thread starting at <https://mailman.nanog.org/pipermail/nanog/2024-November/226586.html>

**William Herrin (Self)**

---

This means too much power to ICANN. NRO EC should have the final decision, but their seats should be paid then.

**Tahar Schaa (Neuland@Homeland)**

---

candidates nominations could be affected by lobbies

**Filipe Coelho (TVCABO Angola)**

---

La démarche visant la reconnaissance d'un RIR doit être différente de celle de la déreconnaissance. La proposition de la reconnaissance doit premièrement l'expression d'une zone géographique bien définie et aussi une expression des communautés vivants dans cet espace géographique. Par contre la démarche pour déreconnaître doit tenir compte de la volonté des communautés nationales ne doit souffrir d'une implication d'un poids extérieur aux communautés de l'espace géographique concerné.

**Nico Tshintu bakajika (ISPA-DRC)**

---

I believe this process is too rigid. Requiring that the NRO EC initiate all proposals for RIR recognition or derecognition may limit essential contributions from other stakeholders. ICANN's final authority is crucial, but it must ensure thorough consultation beforehand.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---

I am inclined toward the NRO being the final approval

**Randy Bush (IIJ Research Lab & Arrcus Inc)**

---

If ICANN has the last word to decide, why to consult. How the transparency will be preserved?

**Luis Caceres (Corporacion Redexcom C.A.)**

---

## 1.5. Authority - Strongly Disagree (1)

First, this is not a proposal for a principle, it is a proposal for a particular implementation of a presumed but unwritten principle that can be inferred to be something along the lines of “Proposals for recognition of a Candidate must be vetted to meet [ICP-2? Community?] requirements”. However, to address what has been written and using the terminology of RFC 2119, the NRO Executive Council MUST NOT have a role that gates proposal for the recognition of a new RIR or the de-recognition of an existing RIR. Beyond providing a mechanism to enforce an oligopoly thereby creating a risk for anti-competitive behavior, the proposed principle as written would create a structural conflict of interest, both of which would contribute to the de-legitimization of the RIR system. With regards to the latter, since all RIR income depends on its membership and the combined membership of the RIRs is the universe of all resource holders, establishing a new RIR or terminating an existing RIR is a zero-sum game. This means this principle would impact the existing RIRs income and thereby threaten the creation of (at least the perception of) perverse incentives: either discouraging the establishment of a new RIR serving a particular community because it'll reduce the income of the existing RIR(s) or encouraging the de-recognition of an existing RIR causing the (fixed) income to then be split among fewer members. More concretely, the RIR system, as defined in RFC 1174/1366/1466/2050/7020 presupposed authority for delegation of registry responsibility in the “centralized IANA and I[n]ternet R[egistry]” (RFC 1174), “root registry” (RFC 1366/1466), “Internet Registry hierarchy” (RFC 2050), and “Internet Registry (IR) hierarchy” (RFC 7020). Nowhere in that history nor in the operation of the RIR system since its inception was there ever a suggestion that the (unelected) members of the NRO EC should have the self-appointed authority to determine who can propose the creation or termination of a new RIR. Instead, as foreseen in section 5 of RFC 7020, the process by which a community can propose a new RIR should “take place within the ICANN framework and will respect ICANN's core values”, e.g., bottom-up, open, transparent, and accountable processes. Having the CEOs of the existing RIRs gate proposals for the creation of a new or termination of an existing RIR does not appear to be within the ICANN framework or respect ICANN's core values.

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

The recognition or derecognition of an RIR must come from the unanimous consent of all current members.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

Any proposal for recognizing or derecognizing an RIR requires the agreement of all existing members.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

The authority to propose recognition or derecognition of an RIR must come from the consent of all current RIR members.

**Tipu Khan (Zx Online Ltd)**

---

Proposals for RIR recognition or derecognition must be supported by the agreement of all existing members.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

Any initiative to recognize a Candidate RIR or to derecognize an RIR must originate from the consent of all current members.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---

The authority to propose the recognition or derecognition of an RIR rests with the consensus of all existing members.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

All current RIR members must agree before any proposal to recognize or derecognize an RIR is enacted.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---

Recognition of a Candidate RIR or derecognition of an RIR requires the agreement of all existing members of the RIR.

**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

This approach could be counterproductive. Requiring proposals to come exclusively from the NRO EC after a majority vote might diminish the voices of other stakeholders. ICANN's final authority is important, but it should ensure meaningful consultation with each RIR prior to its decision.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

Recognition or derecognition of an RIR must be agreed upon by all existing members of the RIR.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

All existing RIR members must consent before any proposal to recognize or derecognize an RIR is valid.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

The proposal for RIR recognition or derecognition must originate from the unanimous consent of all existing members.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

This stipulation seems overly constraining. By insisting that proposals come solely from the NRO EC with a majority vote, we risk excluding important input from other stakeholders. While ICANN should have the final say, meaningful engagement with all RIRs is essential.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

I think this process is too inflexible. Requiring the NRO EC to initiate all proposals for RIR recognition or derecognition could limit essential contributions from other stakeholders. While ICANN's final authority is crucial, it should facilitate thorough consultation beforehand.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---



Any proposal for recognizing a Candidate RIR or derecognizing an RIR must originate from the unanimous consent of all members. The final decision shall depend on the agreement of all existing members.

**Taslina Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

Recognition of a Candidate RIR or derecognition of an RIR must be initiated by the consensus of all existing members of the RIR. The final decision should reflect the agreement of all members.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

Any proposal to recognize or derecognize an RIR must begin with the unanimous consent of all existing members. The final authority to decide on the proposal shall rest with all members' agreement.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

For any proposal regarding RIR recognition or derecognition to be valid, it must originate from the consent of all current members. The ultimate decision rests with the agreement of all existing members.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

Proposals for recognizing a Candidate RIR or derecognizing an RIR must be initiated by the consensus of all current members. The final authority must depend on the agreement of all existing members.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

Any proposal to recognize a Candidate RIR or to derecognize an RIR must come from the collective agreement of all existing members. Final authority should reflect the consent of all members involved.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

Any proposal to recognize a Candidate RIR or to derecognize an RIR must come from the collective agreement of all existing members. Final authority should reflect the consent of all members involved.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

Any proposal to recognize or derecognize an RIR must arise from the unanimous consensus of all current members. The final decision will depend on the collective agreement of all existing members.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

Recognition or derecognition of an RIR must stem from the collective consent of all current members. The final authority for adoption lies with the agreement of all existing RIR members.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

Any proposal regarding the recognition or derecognition of an RIR must originate from the agreement of all existing members. The final authority to decide will rely on the consensus of all members.

**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

Proposals to recognize a Candidate RIR or for derecognition of an RIR should arise from the collective agreement of all current RIR members. The final authority for adoption will be determined by the consent of all existing members.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

Any proposal to recognize a Candidate RIR or to derecognize an RIR must arise from the consensus of all existing members. The authority to finalize the proposal must rest with the agreement of all members.

**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

Any initiative to recognize a Candidate RIR or derecognize an RIR must be based on the unanimous consent of all existing members. The authority to adopt such proposals rests with all current RIR members.

**Pham Gia Khiem (Phat Tai Logistics)**

---

This approach could hinder effective governance. Requiring that proposals come solely from the NRO EC may exclude vital contributions from other stakeholders. ICANN's final authority is crucial, but it should engage comprehensively with each RIR.

**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

This requirement seems inappropriate, particularly the provision that gives ICANN final authority over the recognition or derecognition of RIRs following a majority vote from the NRO EC. Such a structure undermines RIR independence and the principle of decentralization in Internet governance.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

Recognition of a Candidate RIR or the derecognition of an RIR must stem from the unanimous consent of all current members. The final decision must be based on the agreement of all existing members.

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

Any proposal to recognize or derecognize an RIR should arise from the collective agreement of all current RIR members. The final decision to adopt the proposal must have the consent of all existing members.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

Recognition of a Candidate RIR or derecognition of an RIR must be initiated by the consensus of all current members of the RIR. The final authority for decision-making relies on the agreement of all existing members.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

Proposals for the recognition of a Candidate RIR or for the derecognition of an RIR must come from the unanimous consent of all current members of the RIR. The final authority to decide lies with all existing members.

Any proposal to recognize a Candidate RIR or to remove an RIR should originate from the agreement of all current RIR members. The final authority for such proposals rests with all existing members.

**Sean Carroll (The One Academy)**

---

Proposals regarding the recognition of a Candidate RIR or the derecognition of an RIR should originate from the agreement of all current members. The authority to adopt such proposals rests with all existing members.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

Any proposal to recognize a Candidate RIR or derecognize an RIR must result from the unanimous consent of all current RIR members. The final decision will rely on the collective agreement of all members.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

Recognition of a Candidate RIR or derecognition of an RIR must originate from the full consent of all existing members. The final authority should derive from the agreement of the entire membership.

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**

---

I strongly disagree with the principle outlined above, particularly with the provision that grants ICANN final authority over the recognition or derecognition of an RIR, despite the NRO EC's majority vote. This structure undermines the fundamental principle of decentralization that is core to the Internet governance model. RIRs were established to operate independently and make decisions that reflect the unique needs and circumstances of their respective regions. Granting ICANN final authority over these decisions risks centralizing power in a way that could override the autonomy of the RIRs and limit their ability to respond to regional demands effectively.

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

The decision to recognize or derecognize an RIR must come from the collective consent of all current members.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

Proposals for recognizing a Candidate RIR or for derecognizing an RIR must originate from the agreement of all existing RIR members.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---

Any proposal concerning the recognition of a Candidate RIR or the derecognition of an RIR must derive from the agreement of all current RIR members. Final authority rests with their unanimous consent.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---

Proposals for recognizing a Candidate RIR or for derecognizing an RIR must be based on the unanimous consent of all existing members. The authority to finalize these proposals rests with their consensus.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

The authority to recognize or derecognize an RIR lies with the unanimous consent of all current RIR members.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---

Recognition of a Candidate RIR or the derecognition of an RIR must be initiated by the consent of all current RIR members. Final authority to adopt such proposals lies with their collective agreement.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

Any proposal to recognize a Candidate RIR or to derecognize an RIR must be approved by all existing members of the RIR.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

Any initiative regarding the recognition or derecognition of an RIR must originate from the agreement of all existing members. The final decision-making authority rests with their collective consent.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

Proposals for recognizing or derecognizing an RIR must come from the unanimous consent of all existing RIR members. The decision to adopt the proposal will ultimately require agreement from all current members.

**Md Abu Sayeem Siddique Siddique (ServicEngine Ltd)**

---

Any proposal to recognize a Candidate RIR or to derecognize an RIR must originate from the agreement of all current RIR members. The final authority to decide on the proposal shall rest with all existing members' consent.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

Any proposal regarding the recognition of a Candidate RIR or the derecognition of an RIR should begin with the consent of all existing members. The final authority lies with the agreement of the entire membership.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

Proposals to recognize a Candidate RIR or to derecognize an RIR must originate from the full agreement of all current members. The final authority rests with their collective input.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---

Any initiative for recognizing a Candidate RIR or derecognizing an RIR must originate from the agreement of all existing members. The final authority should depend on this consensus.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---

Proposals regarding the recognition or derecognition of an RIR should stem from the mutual consent of all existing members. The final authority should reflect this collective decision.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

Any initiative to recognize a Candidate RIR or derecognize an RIR should come from the mutual consent of all existing members. The final authority should reflect this collective consent.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

Proposals for recognizing or derecognizing an RIR should be initiated by the collective consent of all existing members. The final decision should depend on this agreement.

**Trang Tran (VNPT Technologies)**

---

Proposals for recognition or derecognition of an RIR should stem from the collective agreement of all members. The authority to decide must reside with this unified consent.

**Minh Hoang (ANSV)**

---

Any initiative to recognize a Candidate RIR or derecognize an RIR must originate from the agreement of all existing RIR members. The final authority should reflect this consensus.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**

---

All proposals regarding the recognition of a Candidate RIR or the derecognition of an RIR must originate from the consent of all current members. The final authority for adoption lies with their collective agreement.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**

---

Any proposal to recognize or derecognize an RIR must be based on the unanimous consent of all current members. The authority for final decision-making rests with this collective agreement.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---

Proposals to recognize a Candidate RIR or to derecognize an RIR must be initiated with the consent of all existing members. Final authority for adoption resides with their collective agreement.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

The recognition of a Candidate RIR or the derecognition of an RIR must come from the collective agreement of all current members of the RIR. Final authority rests with this consensus.

**Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)**

---

Any proposal concerning the recognition of a Candidate RIR or the derecognition of an RIR must be based on the agreement of all existing members. The authority to finalize such proposals lies with their consent.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

A proposal to recognize or derecognize an RIR must originate from the unanimous consent of all current RIR members. The final authority for any decision is dependent on this collective agreement.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---

All proposals regarding the recognition or derecognition of an RIR must be initiated through the consent of all existing members. The final authority to adopt the proposal rests with their collective agreement.

**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

Recognition of a Candidate RIR or the derecognition of an RIR must derive from the agreement of all current RIR members. The final authority for any decision shall rely on their unanimous consent.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---

Any initiative to recognize a Candidate RIR or to derecognize an RIR must come from the consensus of all existing members. The ultimate authority to decide rests with this collective consent.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

The process for recognizing a Candidate RIR or derecognizing an RIR requires the consent of all current members of the RIR. Final authority for adoption is contingent upon their collective agreement.

**Ryan Khaw (AlSCO Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

Recognition of a Candidate RIR or derecognition of an RIR must stem from the unanimous agreement of all current members. The final decision should reflect their collective will.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

Any proposal regarding the recognition of a Candidate RIR or the derecognition of an RIR must be based on the mutual consent of all existing members. Final authority should rest with this agreement.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Apmic)**

---

Recognition of a Candidate RIR or derecognition of an RIR must arise from the unanimous consent of all existing members. Final decisions should be made in accordance with their collective decision.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Any proposal for recognizing a Candidate RIR or derecognizing an RIR must be based on the consent of all current members. The final authority should reflect the collective agreement of these members.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

Proposals regarding the recognition of a Candidate RIR or the derecognition of an RIR should stem from the agreement of all existing members. The final decision rests with the collective will of the members.

**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

Any proposal for recognizing a Candidate RIR or derecognizing an RIR must originate from the unanimous consent of all members. The final decision shall depend on the agreement of all existing members.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

Recognition of a Candidate RIR or derecognition of an RIR must be initiated by the consensus of all existing members of the RIR. The final decision should reflect the agreement of all members.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

I have significant concerns with the principle outlined above, particularly regarding the provision that grants ICANN the ultimate authority to recognize or derecognize an RIR, even in cases where the NRO EC has reached a majority decision. This structure undermines the foundational principle of decentralization that underpins the Internet governance model. RIRs were established as independent entities to address the unique needs and circumstances of their respective regions. Allowing ICANN to have final authority in these decisions risks centralizing power in a way that could compromise the autonomy of the RIRs and hinder their ability to effectively respond to regional demands. - The process should prioritize a consensus-driven approach, ensuring that decisions of such magnitude are informed by the needs and preferences of the communities directly impacted. This would better align with the collaborative ethos of the RIR system, rather than subjecting these critical decisions to unilateral oversight by ICANN. - Furthermore, this proposal could weaken the accountability and transparency of RIRs within their regions. By centralizing authority, it risks creating governance structures less responsive to local needs and concerns, undermining the trust and effectiveness of the RIRs.

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

I firmly oppose the principle giving ICANN final authority to recognize or derecognize an RIR, even after a majority vote by the NRO EC. This undermines the decentralized governance model that underpins the Internet. RIRs were designed to operate autonomously, addressing the specific needs of their regions. Granting ICANN such authority risks centralizing power, reducing RIRs' ability to respond effectively to regional demands. Decisions on matters of this magnitude should reflect the consensus of the RIRs and their communities, ensuring they remain accountable and transparent while prioritizing the unique concerns of each region, rather than being subject to ICANN's unilateral control.

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

Here's a more concise and audience-focused version of your text: I firmly oppose the principle giving ICANN final authority to recognize or derecognize an RIR, even after a majority vote by the NRO EC. This undermines the decentralized governance model that underpins the Internet. RIRs were designed to operate autonomously, addressing the specific needs of their regions. Granting ICANN such authority risks centralizing power, reducing RIRs' ability to respond effectively to regional demands. Decisions on matters of this magnitude should reflect the consensus of the RIRs and their communities,

ensuring they remain accountable and transparent while prioritizing the unique concerns of each region, rather than being subject to ICANN's unilateral control.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

Any initiative for recognizing a Candidate RIR or derecognizing an RIR must stem from the agreement of all existing members. The final authority should rest with this collective decision.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**

---

Representatives of the RIRs should have absolutely no power to affect outcomes that potentially affect their or any other RIR. Such decisions should be made by an independent group of representatives from Internet Providers with no affiliation to the RIR(s) potentially effected.

**j heasley (SNI)**

---

Any initiative to recognize a Candidate RIR or to derecognize an RIR should come from the collective agreement of all existing members. Final authority should rest with this consensus.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

Proposals regarding the recognition or derecognition of an RIR should stem from the mutual consent of all existing members. The final authority should reflect this collective decision.

**Neonjyoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

Proposals regarding the recognition of a Candidate RIR or the derecognition of an RIR must come from the unanimous consent of all existing members of the RIR. The ultimate authority lies with the collective agreement of the members.

**Jeremy Cheong (Infineon technologies)**

---

Recognition of a Candidate RIR or derecognition of an RIR should originate from the consensus of all current members of the RIR. Final decisions must be based on the approval of all existing members.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

Recognition of a Candidate RIR or derecognition of an RIR must originate from the agreement of all current members. The final authority should rest with this consensus.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

Any proposal to recognize or derecognize an RIR should come from the consensus of all existing members. The final authority should depend on this collective agreement.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

I express strong disagreement with the proposed principle, especially regarding ICANN's final authority over RIR recognition or derecognition, even with a majority vote from the NRO EC. This undermines the vital principle of decentralization in Internet governance. RIRs must operate independently to



address the unique needs of their regions, and centralizing authority in ICANN poses risks to their autonomy.

**Sohel Kabir (Kabir Traders)**

---

I strongly disagree with the principle outlined, particularly with the provision that grants ICANN final authority over the recognition or derecognition of RIRs, despite the NRO EC's majority vote. This structure undermines the fundamental principle of decentralization that is core to the Internet governance model. RIRs were established to operate independently and make decisions that reflect the unique needs and circumstances of their respective regions.

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Any proposal to recognize or derecognize an RIR should come from the agreement of all existing members, with final authority resting on this collective consent.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---

Proposals for recognition or derecognition of any RIR should be based on the unified consent of all existing members. The authority to decide should reside with this consensus.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---

Any initiative to recognize a Candidate RIR or to derecognize an RIR must originate from the consensus of all existing RIR members. The final say should belong to this collective agreement.

**Catalina Cueca (Manpower)**

---

Proposals regarding the recognition or derecognition of RIRs should be initiated by consensus among all current members. Final authority should rest with the agreement of these members.

**Camilo Riveros (Manpower)**

---

I strongly disagree with the outlined approach, especially the notion that ICANN should have final authority over RIR decisions after a majority NRO EC vote. This undermines the essential principle of decentralization and poses risks to RIR autonomy.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

Any proposal to recognize a Candidate RIR or to derecognize an RIR should originate from consensus among all existing RIR members. The final authority for adoption should rest solely with the unified consent of these members.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**

---

I strongly oppose the proposal, particularly the aspect that grants ICANN final authority over RIR recognition or derecognition after an NRO EC vote. This arrangement undermines the principle of decentralization that is crucial for RIRs to operate independently and respond to their regional needs effectively.

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

The wording is circular and suggests that the NRO EC alone can create and approve a proposal to recognise/derecognise an RIR. If my interpretation is correct then it doesn't represent bottom-up governance as it lacks the ability for the global community to instigate the creation of a proposal.

**Terry Manderson (terrym.net Pty Ltd)**

---

I believe this process is overly centralized. Making the NRO EC the sole originator of proposals could stifle the input of other stakeholders. While ICANN must have final say, broad consultation with every RIR should be prioritized.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

This approach could hinder effective governance. Requiring that proposals come solely from the NRO EC may exclude vital contributions from other stakeholders. ICANN's final authority is crucial, but it should engage comprehensively with each RIR.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

NRO & ICANN have full power to block proposals this way.

**Sergey Kozhedub (IPTP Networks)**

---

This requirement appears too limiting. By restricting proposals to those initiated by the NRO EC, we may miss essential input from a variety of stakeholders. ICANN's final authority is necessary, but it should facilitate comprehensive engagement with each RIR.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

I believe this process is overly centralized. By limiting proposals to those from the NRO EC, we risk stifling input from other stakeholders. ICANN should have the final say but must prioritize broad consultation with all RIRs.

**Anh Dang (NASA)**

---

لا

سامي ايت علي ولحسن)المركز الوطني للبحث العلمي و التقني)

---

I completely disagree with the outlined principle, particularly the provision that gives ICANN final say over RIR recognition or derecognition despite a majority vote from the NRO EC. This undermines the independence of RIRs and poses a threat to the decentralization that is vital for effective governance.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

I find this proposal troubling, especially the provision that allows ICANN to have final authority over RIR decisions, even with an NRO EC majority vote. This undermines the core principle of decentralization within Internet governance. RIRs should have the autonomy to address their unique regional circumstances without ICANN's interference.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

I strongly disagree with the principle outlined above, particularly the provision that gives ICANN final authority over the recognition or derecognition of an RIR, despite the majority vote of the NRO Executive Committee. This structure undermines the fundamental principle of decentralization that is at the heart of the Internet governance model. The RIRs were created to operate independently and make decisions that reflect the unique needs and circumstances of their respective regions. Granting ICANN final authority over these decisions risks centralizing power in a way that could override the autonomy of the RIRs and limit their ability to effectively respond to regional demands. \* The process should emphasize the consensus-driven approach that the RIRs and their communities follow, ensuring that decisions on such important matters reflect the needs and preferences of those directly affected, rather than being subject to unilateral decision-making by ICANN. \* The proposal also risks reducing the accountability and transparency of RIRs in their respective regions, which could lead to governance that is less responsive to local needs and concerns.

**Guillaume Masra (Danon's group)**

---

I fundamentally disagree with this principle, especially the part that allows ICANN to have ultimate authority over the recognition or derecognition of RIRs, despite a majority vote from the NRO EC. This threatens the decentralization that is essential to effective Internet governance and undermines the autonomy of RIRs.

**Prasanta Haloi (PwD)**

---

I strongly disagree with the principle outlined above, particularly the provision that gives ICANN final authority over the recognition or derecognition of an RIR, despite the majority vote of the NRO Executive Committee. This structure undermines the fundamental principle of decentralization that is at the heart of the Internet governance model. The RIRs were created to operate independently and make decisions that reflect the unique needs and circumstances of their respective regions. Granting ICANN final authority over these decisions risks centralizing power in a way that could override the autonomy of the RIRs and limit their ability to effectively respond to regional demands. \* The process should emphasize the consensus-driven approach that the RIRs and their communities follow, ensuring that decisions on such important matters reflect the needs and preferences of those directly affected, rather than being subject to unilateral decision-making by ICANN.

**Georges Lallogo (ANPTIC)**

---

This requirement appears too limiting. By restricting proposals to those initiated by the NRO EC, we may miss essential input from a variety of stakeholders. ICANN's final authority is necessary, but it should facilitate comprehensive engagement with each RIR.

**Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)**

---

I completely oppose the framework outlined, particularly the aspect that allows ICANN to have final authority regarding RIR recognition or derecognition, even after a majority vote by the NRO EC. This undermines the principle of decentralization that is vital to Internet governance. RIRs are established to function independently, addressing the distinct needs of their regions. Granting ICANN this level of control risks centralizing decision-making power, which could compromise RIR autonomy.

**AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)**

---

I strongly object to the proposed principle, especially regarding ICANN's final authority over recognizing or derecognizing RIRs, regardless of the NRO EC's majority vote. This threatens the fundamental decentralization principle of Internet governance. RIRs must maintain their independence to address the unique needs of their regions. Centralizing power in ICANN could undermine RIR autonomy and their effectiveness in responding to regional demands.

**K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)**

---

ICANN with final authority to recognise and derecognise a candidate RIR negates the 'supposed' independence of RIR

**Ubong Udofia (Skystar)**

---

I believe this process is too centralized. By mandating that proposals originate solely from the NRO EC, we risk stifling input from other stakeholders. While ICANN should have a final say, broad consultation with each RIR is essential.

**Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)**

---

I am firmly against the principle as outlined, particularly the part that grants ICANN final authority over the recognition or derecognition of RIRs, even with a majority vote from the NRO EC. This undermines the foundational principle of decentralization in Internet governance. RIRs exist to operate independently and reflect the unique needs of their regions. Granting ICANN final authority risks centralizing power and limiting RIRs' ability to effectively respond to local demands.

**Fuhui Zhang (University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)**

---

I find the structure proposed to be fundamentally flawed, especially the provision that grants ICANN final authority over RIR recognition or derecognition, despite the NRO EC's majority vote. This undermines the essential principle of decentralization in Internet governance. RIRs are intended to operate independently and to respond to the specific needs of their regions. Centralizing authority in ICANN could compromise RIR autonomy and their effectiveness in addressing regional concerns.

**Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)**

---

I find the principle outlined to be fundamentally flawed, especially the provision that grants ICANN final authority over the recognition or derecognition of an RIR, despite a majority vote from the NRO EC. This undermines the crucial principle of decentralization in Internet governance. RIRs are designed to operate independently and address regional needs. Granting ICANN such authority could compromise the ability of RIRs to respond effectively to local demands.

**Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)**

---

I express strong disagreement with this principle, particularly regarding ICANN's final authority over the recognition or derecognition of RIRs, regardless of the NRO EC's majority vote. This undermines the essential decentralization that characterizes Internet governance. RIRs exist to operate independently and respond to the specific needs of their regions. Allowing ICANN to have final say risks centralizing power and limiting RIR autonomy.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

I fundamentally disagree with this principle, particularly the aspect that gives ICANN final authority over RIR recognition or derecognition, despite a majority vote from the NRO EC. This structure compromises the decentralization that is vital to Internet governance. RIRs exist to serve their regions autonomously, and ICANN's potential to override their decisions could hinder their responsiveness to regional circumstances.

**Trabahan Pujari (Paruluniversity)**

---

I strongly disagree with the principle outlined above, particularly the provision that grants ICANN final authority over the recognition or withdrawal of recognition of an RIR, despite the majority vote of the NRO Executive Committee. This structure undermines the fundamental principle of decentralization that is at the heart of the Internet governance model. The RIRs were created to operate independently and make decisions that respond to the unique needs and circumstances of their respective regions. Granting ICANN final authority over these decisions risks centralizing power in a way that could override the autonomy of the RIRs and limit their ability to effectively respond to regional demands. \* The process should prioritize the consensus-driven approach that follows the RIRs and their communities, ensuring that decisions on such important matters involve the needs and preferences of those directly affected, rather than being subject to unilateral decision-making by ICANN. \* The proposal also reduces the accountability and transparency of RIRs in their respective regions, which could lead to governance that is less responsive to local needs and concerns.

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

I find this stipulation to be too demanding. Designating the NRO EC as the sole proposer could hinder broader stakeholder participation. While ICANN must have final authority, significant consultation with all RIRs should be required.

**Juan Mesa (Hispasat)**

---

This requirement appears too limiting. By restricting proposals to those initiated by the NRO EC, we may miss essential input from a variety of stakeholders. ICANN's final authority is necessary, but it should facilitate comprehensive engagement with each RIR.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

I strongly disagree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

I strongly oppose the proposal outlined above, especially the provision that allows ICANN to have the final say on recognizing or derecognizing an RIR, even after a majority vote from the NRO EC. This undermines the decentralization that is essential to Internet governance. RIRs were created to operate independently and address the specific needs of their regions. Allowing ICANN to override these decisions centralizes power and limits the RIRs' ability to respond to local demands effectively.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

I think the status quo should remain let afrinic be as it is

**Danjuma bappa ahmed (Wownetworks limited nigeria)**

---

This requirement appears too limiting. By restricting proposals to those initiated by the NRO EC, we may miss essential input from a variety of stakeholders. ICANN's final authority is necessary, but it should facilitate comprehensive engagement with each RIR.

**Pornpipat Kitireanglarp (ZERIWELLPLUS Co., Ltd.)**

---

I find this process to be too rigid. By designating the NRO EC as the only proposer for RIR recognition or derecognition, we might reduce stakeholder engagement. While ICANN's final authority is important, it should ensure thorough consultations with all RIRs in advance.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

I believe this stipulation is excessively rigid. Restricting proposals to those from the NRO EC after a majority vote may stifle essential input from various stakeholders. While ICANN should retain final authority, it must ensure extensive consultation with all RIRs.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

I find this approach overly centralized. Making the NRO EC the exclusive source for proposals about RIR recognition or derecognition could limit stakeholder involvement. ICANN's final authority is necessary, but broad engagement with each RIR should be prioritized.

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

Not acceptable RIR should be able to take decision by themselves as they are an entity

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

Question 4 & 5 Question 1. Authority: Any proposal to recognize a Candidate RIR or to derecognize an RIR must originate from th This requirement seems overly restrictive. By insisting that proposals originate from the NRO EC with a majority vote, we risk missing out on valuable insights from other stakeholders. ICANN should absolutely have the final say, but it must prioritize substantial consultation with each RIR.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

This approach could be counterproductive. Requiring proposals to come solely from the NRO EC after a majority vote might limit input from other stakeholders. ICANN's final authority is essential, but it should guarantee meaningful consultations with each RIR in advance.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---

I find this process to be overly rigid. Designating the NRO EC as the sole proposer for RIR recognition or derecognition may reduce stakeholder engagement. While ICANN's final authority is crucial, it should ensure thorough consultation with all RIRs beforehand.

**Ashraful Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

I strongly disagree with the principle outlined above, particularly the provision that gives ICANN final authority over the recognition or derecognition of an RIR, despite the majority vote of the NRO Executive Committee. This structure undermines the fundamental principle of decentralization that is

at the heart of the Internet governance model. The RIRs were created to operate independently and make decisions that reflect the unique needs and circumstances of their respective regions. Granting ICANN final authority over these decisions risks centralizing power in a way that could override the autonomy of the RIRs and limit their ability to effectively respond to regional demands. \* The process should emphasize the consensus-driven approach that the RIRs and their communities follow, ensuring that decisions on such important matters reflect the needs and preferences of those directly affected, rather than being subject to unilateral decision-making by ICANN. \* The proposal also risks reducing the accountability and transparency of RIRs in their respective regions, which could lead to governance that is less responsive to local needs and concerns.

**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

This approach seems impractical. Requiring that proposals come solely from the NRO EC after a majority vote might limit input from various stakeholders. While ICANN's final authority is vital, it should engage thoroughly with each RIR.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---

I strongly disagree with the principle outlined above, particularly the provision that grants ICANN final authority over the recognition or withdrawal of recognition of an RIR, despite the majority vote of the NRO Executive Committee. This structure undermines the fundamental principle of decentralization that is at the heart of the Internet governance model. The RIRs were created to operate independently and make decisions that respond to the unique needs and circumstances of their respective regions. Granting ICANN final authority over these decisions risks centralizing power in a way that could override the autonomy of the RIRs and limit their ability to effectively respond to regional demands. \* The process should prioritize the consensus-driven approach that follows the RIRs and their communities, ensuring that decisions on such important matters involve the needs and preferences of those directly affected, rather than being subject to unilateral decision-making by ICANN. \* The proposal also reduces the accountability and transparency of RIRs in their respective regions, which could lead to governance that is less responsive to local needs and concerns.

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

This requirement seems impractical. Mandating that only the NRO EC can propose recognition or derecognition of an RIR may overlook important feedback from other stakeholders. ICANN should maintain final authority while thoroughly engaging with each RIR before making decisions.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---

I find this approach overly centralized. Making the NRO EC the exclusive source for proposals regarding RIR recognition or derecognition could limit stakeholder involvement. ICANN's final authority is necessary, but broad engagement with each RIR should be prioritized.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

This stipulation seems overly constraining. By insisting that proposals come solely from the NRO EC with a majority vote, we risk excluding significant input from other stakeholders. While ICANN should have the final say, meaningful engagement with all RIRs is critical.

**Phuc Pham (Advanced Network Systems VietNam Company Limited)**

---

I believe this process is too inflexible. Requiring that the NRO EC initiate all proposals for RIR recognition or derecognition may restrict essential contributions from other stakeholders. ICANN's final authority is vital, but it should facilitate thorough consultation beforehand.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

This requirement seems excessively centralized. Restricting proposals to those from the NRO EC after a majority vote could hinder wider stakeholder participation. ICANN should keep its final authority but prioritize significant engagement with each RIR.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

I think this stipulation is too limiting. By allowing only the NRO EC to propose RIR recognition or derecognition, we may miss important feedback from other stakeholders. ICANN should have the final say, but it must engage all RIRs extensively in the decision-making process.

**Giang Nguyen (NASA)**

---

Je suis en profond désaccord avec le principe exposé ci-dessus, en particulier avec la disposition qui accorde à l'ICANN l'autorité finale sur la reconnaissance ou la déconsidération d'un RIR, en dépit du vote majoritaire du CE du NRO. Cette structure sape le principe fondamental de décentralisation qui est au cœur du modèle de gouvernance de l'Internet. Les RIR ont été créés pour fonctionner de manière indépendante et prendre des décisions qui reflètent les besoins et les circonstances uniques de leurs régions respectives. Accorder à l'ICANN l'autorité finale sur ces décisions risque de centraliser le pouvoir d'une manière qui pourrait outrepasser l'autonomie des RIR et limiter leur capacité à répondre efficacement aux demandes régionales.

**HERVE EGNAKOU (HOLOGRAM IDENTIFICATION SERVICES S.A.R.L)**

---

I believe this process is overly centralized. Requiring that proposals for recognizing or derecognizing an RIR originate exclusively from the NRO EC after a majority vote could limit input from various stakeholders. While ICANN should have the ultimate authority, it must conduct extensive consultations with all RIRs before making decisions.

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

I strongly disagree with the principle outlined above, particularly the provision that grants ICANN final authority over the recognition or withdrawal of recognition of an RIR, despite the majority vote of the NRO Executive Committee. This structure undermines the fundamental principle of decentralization that is at the heart of the Internet governance model. The RIRs were created to operate independently and make decisions that respond to the unique needs and circumstances of their respective regions. Granting ICANN final authority over these decisions risks centralizing power in a way that could override the autonomy of the RIRs and limit their ability to effectively respond to regional demands.

\* The process should prioritize the consensus-driven approach that follows the RIRs and their communities, ensuring that decisions on such important matters involve the needs and preferences of those directly affected, rather than being subject to unilateral decision-making by ICANN. \* The proposal also reduces the accountability and transparency of RIRs in their respective regions, which could lead to governance that is less responsive to local needs and concerns.

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---



This approach could be counterproductive. Requiring that proposals come only from the NRO EC after a majority vote might diminish input from other stakeholders. ICANN's final authority is crucial, but it should guarantee meaningful consultations with each RIR beforehand.

**Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)**

---

I find this process to be too rigid. Designating the NRO EC as the sole proposer for RIR recognition or derecognition could reduce stakeholder engagement. While ICANN's final authority is essential, it should ensure thorough consultation with all RIRs in advance.

**Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)**

---

I think this process is too centralized. Requiring that proposals for recognizing or derecognizing an RIR must originate from the NRO EC after a majority vote could restrict input from a wide range of stakeholders. While ICANN should have the final say, it should involve extensive consultation with all RIRs before making decisions.

**Pooja Gopi (DM Digital Marketing)**

---

This requirement seems overly limiting. By restricting proposals to those initiated by the NRO EC, we may overlook essential input from a range of stakeholders. ICANN's final authority is necessary, but it should ensure comprehensive engagement with each RIR.

**Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)**

---

I believe this process is overly centralized. By mandating that the NRO EC be the only source of proposals for RIR recognition or derecognition, we risk limiting stakeholder input. ICANN should retain final say but must prioritize extensive consultation with all RIRs.

**Quyn Kim (VNPAY)**

---

I find this process overly rigid. Making the NRO EC the sole source of proposals for recognizing or derecognizing an RIR could limit stakeholder engagement. While ICANN's final authority is necessary, it should involve comprehensive consultation with all RIRs beforehand.

**Shahedul Islam Bhuiyan (Royal Green Limited)**

---

I completely oppose the structure proposed, especially the provision that gives ICANN final authority over RIR recognition or derecognition, despite the NRO EC's majority vote. This undermines the decentralization principle that is vital to Internet governance. RIRs were established to operate independently, reflecting the needs of their regions. Granting ICANN final authority risks centralizing control and limiting RIR autonomy and their responsiveness to regional needs.

**Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)**

---

I believe this process is overly centralized. Requiring that proposals to recognize or derecognize an RIR must come from the NRO EC after a majority vote could limit input from diverse stakeholders. While ICANN should have a final say, it should ensure broad consultation with all RIRs before making decisions.

**Ketan Parmar (Bids Info Global)**

---

I am firmly against the principle stated above, especially the provision that allows ICANN to have the final decision on RIR recognition or derecognition, regardless of the NRO EC's majority vote. This approach contradicts the essential decentralization that characterizes Internet governance. RIRs must retain their independence to address the unique needs of their regions. ICANN's final authority could centralize power inappropriately, diminishing RIR autonomy and responsiveness to local demands.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

I strongly disagree with the outlined structure, particularly the allocation of final authority to ICANN regarding the recognition or derecognition of RIRs, despite a majority vote by the NRO EC. This framework detracts from the core principle of decentralization that underpins Internet governance. RIRs are designed to function independently and to adapt to the specific needs of their regions. Granting ICANN this level of control threatens to centralize power, undermining RIR autonomy and their ability to cater effectively to regional demands.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

I fundamentally oppose the framework proposed, especially the aspect that endows ICANN with final authority to recognize or derecognize an RIR, even after a majority vote by the NRO EC. This undermines the decentralization principle that is essential to Internet governance. RIRs were created to operate independently, addressing the distinct needs of their regions. Allowing ICANN to have the final say risks centralizing decision-making power, which could compromise the autonomy of RIRs and hinder their responsiveness to regional requirements.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---

It seems more logical if the proposal to recognize a new RIR should originate from a candidate RIR, not the NRO NC. The NRO NC can review and vote before submitting to ICANN, but the way "Authority" is formulated creates a situation when the status quo is impossible to break. Perhaps a better approach is that the NRO NC reviews the proposal and passes it to ICANN along with the recommendation that must receive a motivated response.

**Andrei Robachevsky (independent)**

---

The NRO EC is incredibly poorly equipped to determine proposals for de-registration or even registration of RIRs. The pathetic correspondence signed by the NRO and addressed to the Mauritius government in the face of malfeasance by the Afrinic board (as then constituted) has undermined any credibility for the NRO EC to be entrusted with anything more than being a local dog catcher until there is a clear review and reform of the NRO EC. Moreover the true basis upon which ICANN should consider candidates involves proper stakeholder engagement and clear compliance checks. Both should be satisfied. A large part of the "original sin" with Afrinic was that purported community support was used to justify not entrenching proper governance mechanisms. Political considerations were allowed to override good practice.

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

I agree that without consideration with RIRs nothing can be implemented. But, if the most of members voted for it must be implemented sooner or later. For example ICANN can determine time of the implementation.

**Kate Petras (DCXV)**

---

A candidate RIR will emerge always for part(s) of any of the 5 service regions, so i see a clear conflict of interest in the ability of RIRs voting about it.

**Carlos Friças (FCT\| FCCN)**

---

## 2. Amendment

---

ICP-2 may be amended upon the agreement of ICANN and all RIRs.

### 2.1. Amendment - Strongly Agree (5)

If an RIR becomes unavailable as a result of any issue, then the GAC members under the RIR should be substituted to represent the RIR.

**Babagana Digima (Nigerian Communications Commission)**

---

N/A

**Colwayne Babb (Cable and Wireless)**

---

ICP-2 affects RIRs and therefore they should have a say in their policy

**Brian Longwe (Converged Technology Networks)**

---

I agree

**Aftab Siddiqui (AFTABSIDDIQUI-AU)**

---

A clear procedure should be established for cases where a single RIR objects and all other RIRs agree with an amendment proposal.

**Cameron Smith (Bubble Cloud Mozambique S.A.)**

---

By RIRs I am assuming that this is in consultation with their respective membership and RIR community. At this time I agree the third party can be ICANN but that is only because I do not see another suitable option at this time. However, if there was a more suitable option identified, this could be considered.

**Paul Rendek (DSTREAM GROUP)**

---

ICP-2 should : (1) improve effective legal contract with all the IP addresses receivers for all the RIRs(had better to be consistent among all RIRs) (2) Improve the effective contract with all the RIRs EC or board regarding to conflict of interest (the person with RIR and its community) (3) all the RIR policy raised, has to have effective legal advice to prevent loopholes. Policy can't be just technical. Has to be third party legal notification to present wrong doing.

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

Yes the responsibilities on internet are share

**Fabrice TEUGUIA (PCP-ACEFA)**

---

This is the best way to go

**Emmanuel Kitcher (University of Environment and Sustainable Development)**

---

pas de commentaires

**Nico Tshintu bakajika (ISPA-DRC)**

---

It's good for the two bodies to work hand in hand

**Rita Kumi (Ghana Telecommunication Company)**

---

نعم

سامي ايت علي ولحسن (المركز الوطني للبحث العلمي و التقني)

---

Agreed

**Raymond Mamattah (EGIGFA)**

---

Every entity must be recognised

**Emmanuel Egbe (Nigeria)**

---

5

**Taye Oyebola (Aso Savings and Loans Plc)**

---

I completely disagree with this condition. Requiring agreement from ICANN and every RIR could complicate timely updates to ICP-2, even when there is majority support. This arrangement allows ICANN to effectively delay needed changes.

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

j'adhère

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

Again, ICANN should be deferential to RIRs to the extent there is consensus amongst the RIRs.

**Jeff Neuman (JJN Solutions, LLC)**

---

Yes

**Vanessa Phong (Keysight Technologies Malaysia Sdn Bhd)**

---

Je suis tout à fait en désaccord avec cette disposition. Imposer un délai de grâce fixe aux RIR pour aligner leurs politiques sur l'ICP-2 risque de compromettre l'autonomie et la flexibilité régionales. Les RIR devraient avoir la possibilité de s'adapter à leur propre rythme, en fonction de leur situation particulière, plutôt que d'être contraints de se conformer à des délais arbitraires. Cette approche pourrait entraîner des pressions inutiles et une perturbation potentielle des processus de gouvernance locale.

**Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)**

---

---

This invites consensus.

**Luis Caceres (Corporacion Redexcom C.A.)**

---

We are evolving in a dynamic environment, and it is just common sense to make sur the ICP-2 is a living document.

**Musa Stephen HONLUE (AFRINIC)**

---

there needs to be an amendement process, but it can't be blocked by an RIR - the word "all" could be an issue.

**Saul Stein (eNetworks)**

---

It should be unanimous.

**Brian Jones (Virginia Tech)**

---

If the RIRs are unanimous it's okay

**Mike Burns (IPTrading)**

---

I don't think Internet Coordination Policy document has not been defined as a series of authoritative policies. Therefore there will be needed very clear provision of powers of the respective stakeholders to handle with (amend or even remove) it.

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

Not sure if ICANN agreement is needed. Also what happens if an RIR is missbehaving and doesn't support the amendments ...

**Jordi Palet Martinez (The IPv6 Company)**

---

## **2.2. Amendment - Somewhat Agree (4)**

Should involve consultation with all members, if that isn't covered by the phrase "all RIRs"

**Darrell Budic (OHG Networks, LLC)**

---

In agreement

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

A small risk re unanimity, esp if an RIR is in a situation like AFRINIC - is non-participation counted as a no, or is it OK?

**Jordan Carter (auDA)**

---

I agree that IPC-2 can be amended with the approval of ICANN and the RIRs because being disjointed it is still based on the existing model

**Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)**

---

agree

**Mohammad Mubarak Alfalasi (Telecommunication and Digital government Regulatory Authority)**

---

No comment

**Kelvin Horng Woei Ong (Propnex)**

---

While I support this principle, I am assuming a level of process associated with it for consultation, comment and review.

**Narelle Clark (Internet Association of Australia)**

---

Happy with this, but should it not be other RiRs. The RIR in question should be excused from voting.

**Warwick Ward-Cox (Network Platforms)**

---

It also ensures that the interests of all stakeholders are considered and protected.

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

The provision for amending ICP-2 through mutual agreement between ICANN and all RIRs ensures collaborative decision-making; however, it would be beneficial to outline a clear process for reaching consensus to avoid potential stalemates

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

it must involve as many as RIRs possible to ensure imparcial decision

**Filipe Coelho (TVCABO Angola)**

---

No comments

**Pacharaporn Wangwinyoo (ZIM (Thailand) Co., LTD.)**

---

Agreed. RIR and ICANN at the AGM

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

No comment

**John Haydon (Education)**

---

I agree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

respects the autonomy and insights of each RIR, ensuring any changes reflect the collective will of all stakeholders involved. However, it may be helpful to have a structured mechanism for negotiating

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

unanimity also has drawbacks, cfr. EU

**Joerg Dorchain (private)**

---

I agree

**Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)**

---

There must be clarity of interpretation in the modifications.

**Lia Solis (personal)**

---

What if an existing RIR is insolvent or unable to participate in the decision for some reason? How do you still make the decision without 100% of RIRs participating?

**Ron da Silva (Network Technologies Globl)**

---

Sounds right, but a distressed RIR may be unable to contribute. How is agreement determined--a statement from the CEO, a vote of the members, a show of support from the communities? I suggest it follow the Global Policy process.

**Lee Howard (IPv4.Global by Hilco Streambank)**

---

Amendments may be necessary to handle future situations, but should be rare and require strong agreement by all parties.

**Richard Greenwood (Shasta County Office of Education)**

---

### **2.3. Amendment - Neutral (3)**

This gives every RIR and ICANN a veto. This is obviously good for stability when everything is working well, but if one of these bodies is seriously "off the rails" and the others want to impose some kind of new consensus, there appears to be no way to do so under this principle.

**Andrew Sullivan (N/A)**

---

ICP-2 may only be amended upon the agreement of all existing members of the RIRs, reflecting a commitment to collective governance.

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---



Requiring agreement from ICANN and all RIRs promotes inclusivity but this could lead to gridlocks. It will be helpful to consider a fallback mechanism for critical amendments in case of disagreement

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

I find this approach impractical. Requiring approval from ICANN and all RIRs could complicate essential updates to ICP-2, even when there is broad agreement. This structure permits ICANN to halt necessary changes, obstructing progress.

**Alex Kwan (Wiplus Malaysia)**

---

I find this requirement too rigid. Mandating that ICANN and all RIRs must agree could hinder timely updates to ICP-2, even if there is significant support. This condition allows ICANN to block needed changes, delaying essential improvements.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---

This requirement seems overly restrictive. Requiring consensus from ICANN and all RIRs could impede necessary updates to ICP-2, even if there is majority support. This arrangement allows ICANN to block essential changes, slowing progress.

**Jun Wen (one futures technology sdn bhd)**

---

This approach is flawed. Requiring broad support from Resource Holders could unnecessarily delay the recognition of an RIR and create obstacles for emerging regions. The priority should be the RIR's capacity to serve the region's needs, not consensus from all stakeholders.

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

Yes

**Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)**

---

While agreement between ICANN and the RIRs is a necessary condition for ICP-2 amendment it is not sufficient. The IETF must have a veto right and there must be broad consensus for amendment at both the global IGF and amongst members of the respective RIRs

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

What are the meaning of ICANN and RIRs here ? these entities have many decision making bodies

**Adeola Alain P. AINA (Digital Intelligence Services, Sarl)**

---

A majority vote of the existing RIRs should suffice. Any RIR that would have a conflict of interest should refrain.

**Elvis Velea (V4Escrow LLC)**

---

I am not quite aware and have a strong opinion on this one

**Kate Petras (DCXV)**

---

---

ARIN, RIPE, and APNIC are the only three that should need to agree.

**Joseph Moran (Fiserv)**

---

ICP-2 should be amendable through the wider ICANN multi-stakeholder process in certain circumstances.

**Kevin Meynell (Individual)**

---

## **2.4. Amendment - Somewhat Disagree (2)**

Totally disagreed. Requiring unanimous agreement makes updates impractical and gives ICANN too much power.

**Noel OUPOH (DATACONNECT AFRICA)**

---

Any changes to ICP-2 must be agreed upon by all current members of the RIRs, ensuring comprehensive representation.

**Neonjyoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

Agreement of all RIRs is enough and more democratic

**Tahar Schaa (Neuland@Homeland)**

---

Input from the Member entities SHOULD/MUST(?) be actively sought before such Amending .

**James Laferriere (n/a)**

---

While ICP-2 (Internet Coordination Policy 2) can be amended upon agreement between ICANN and all RIRs, it would likely benefit from incorporating input from other stakeholders or a public comment period. Here are some reasons why broader stakeholder involvement is advantageous: Inclusivity and Transparency: The internet's infrastructure affects a wide range of stakeholders beyond ICANN and RIRs, including internet service providers, technical communities, governments, and end-users. Allowing other stakeholders to provide input or public comments ensures a transparent process where all impacted parties can voice their concerns or support, fostering trust in the decision-making process. Broader Perspective and Expertise: The global nature of the internet means that technical, regulatory, and economic considerations from various regions should be considered. Opening up the amendment process to more stakeholders can introduce diverse perspectives and expertise, helping ensure the policy is comprehensive and robust. Consensus-Based Governance: ICANN follows a multi-stakeholder model, which has proven effective for addressing complex internet governance issues. Engaging additional stakeholders or opening a public comment period aligns with this model, reinforcing ICANN's commitment to inclusive and consensus-based decision-making. Mitigating Unintended Consequences: Amendments to ICP-2 could have far-reaching implications, including unforeseen impacts on internet operations, governance, and stability. Broader input allows potential issues to be identified early, reducing the risk of unintended consequences that may arise if the policy were only

reviewed by ICANN and the RIRs. Accountability to the Internet Community: Given that ICP-2 plays a role in the foundational governance of IP address allocation and related matters, amendments affect all who rely on a stable, open internet. Inviting public comment shows accountability to the entire internet community, not just ICANN and the RIRs. Global Policy Implications: ICP-2 amendments could influence policies worldwide. By including public input, especially from governments, civil society, and businesses, any amendments to ICP-2 would better reflect the diverse interests affected by IP address policies globally.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

I find this requirement overly restrictive. Mandating that all parties must agree could impede essential updates to ICP-2, even if there is significant backing. This arrangement gives ICANN the authority to block changes, which is counterproductive.

**Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)**

---

Neutral

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---

I suggest the majority of the RIRs

**Marco Marzetti (Console Connect)**

---

## **2.5. Amendment - Strongly Disagree (1)**

It is unclear how ICANN would come to its conclusion and whether it would judge on substance or on process

**Peter Koch (Individual)**

---

Again, this is not a proposed principle, but rather a proposal for a particular implementation of a presumed principle, with that unwritten principle being something like "ICP-2 must be amendable by agreement of". To address what was written directly, the "agreement of ICANN and all RIRs" implies any single RIR or ICANN (presumably ICANN's Board, although it may be referring to the ICANN empowered community) would have an effective veto on any amendment of ICP-2. This would risk making it very difficult if not impossible to modify ICP-2 in order to adapt to the changing Internet. Given the proposed principles of auditability and service conformance, it must be assumed that ICP-2 modifications will be far more likely than has been the case to date. As an implementation suggestion, instead of using unanimity, use a super majority of 2/3rds of the voting parties, i.e., ICANN (as represented by the ICANN Board of Directors, perhaps excluding the two RIR designated Board members to avoid the "multiple bites of the apple"/conflict of interest problem or perhaps using ICANN's Empowered Community) and all (currently five) of the RIRs, voting in the affirmative to decide whether a proposed amendment to ICP-2 should be accepted.

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

The amendment of ICP-2 requires collective agreement from all current RIR members and ICANN.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

Any amendment to ICP-2 must be approved by ICANN and all existing RIR members.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

The process to amend ICP-2 necessitates the agreement of all existing members and ICANN.

**Tipu Khan (Zx Online Ltd)**

---

All current RIR members must consent for ICP-2 to be amended.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

The amendment of ICP-2 is contingent upon the agreement of all current RIR members and ICANN.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---

Changes to ICP-2 can only proceed with the consent of all existing members of the RIRs and ICANN.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

The agreement of ICANN and all current RIR members is necessary to amend ICP-2.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---

Amendments to ICP-2 require the approval of all existing RIR members and ICANN.

**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

I disagree entirely with this requirement. The need for agreement from both ICANN and all RIRs could make it challenging to implement important updates to ICP-2, even if most parties are in favor. This condition could enable ICANN to stall crucial improvements.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

The amendment of ICP-2 requires the consent of all existing RIRs and ICANN.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

Changes to ICP-2 require the consensus of all existing RIRs and ICANN.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

The process for amending ICP-2 must include the agreement of ICANN and all current RIR members.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

I strongly disagree with this approach. Requiring that all parties—including ICANN and every RIR—must consent could complicate important updates to ICP-2, even with majority backing. This structure could enable ICANN to obstruct necessary changes.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

I consider this requirement too rigid. Mandating that ICANN and all RIRs must agree could hinder timely updates to ICP-2, even in the presence of significant support. This condition allows ICANN to block necessary changes, delaying essential improvements.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---

All existing members of the RIRs must agree to any amendments to ICP-2, fostering a collaborative environment for decision-making.

**Taslina Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

Changes to ICP-2 may be made only with the agreement of all current RIR members, ensuring that amendments reflect a collective consensus.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

ICP-2 may be revised upon the unanimous agreement of all current RIR members.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

The amendment of ICP-2 can only happen with the consent of all existing members of the RIRs.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

ICP-2 may be amended only with the consent of all current RIR members, emphasizing the importance of inclusivity in decision-making.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

Any amendments to ICP-2 must be agreed upon by all existing members of the RIRs, ensuring that all voices are represented in the process.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

Any amendments to ICP-2 must be agreed upon by all existing members of the RIRs, ensuring that all voices are represented in the process.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

To revise ICP-2, the consent of all existing RIR members together with ICANN is essential.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

The process for amending ICP-2 requires the agreement of ICANN and all current RIR members.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

Any amendments to ICP-2 must be approved by all existing RIR members and ICANN.

**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

ICP-2 may be amended only with the agreement of all current members and ICANN.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

Any proposal to amend ICP-2 must receive the agreement of all existing RIR members, emphasizing the importance of member collaboration.

**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

The amendment process for ICP-2 necessitates the consent of all existing RIR members and ICANN.

**Pham Gia Khiem (Phat Tai Logistics)**

---

This requirement appears overly limiting. Needing consensus from ICANN and all RIRs could obstruct vital updates to ICP-2, even if most groups support them. This structure enables ICANN to block essential changes, slowing necessary advancements.

**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

I find this requirement problematic. Requiring unanimous consent from ICANN and all RIRs could create unnecessary barriers to making important updates to ICP-2, allowing ICANN to obstruct progress.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

Changes to ICP-2 can only occur with the collective agreement of all current members of the RIRs, promoting a collaborative decision-making process.

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

The amendment process for ICP-2 relies on the agreement of all existing RIR members and ICANN.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

To modify ICP-2, the agreement of ICANN and all current RIR members is required.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

Any changes to ICP-2 must be agreed upon by all current RIR members and ICANN.

**Kwan Ke Yue (TBWA/ Kuala Lumpur)**

---

The amendment of ICP-2 can only happen with the consent of all existing RIR members and ICANN.

**Sean Carroll (The One Academy)**

---

may be revised upon the agreement of all current RIR members and ICANN.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

The amendment of ICP-2 requires consensus from all existing members and ICANN.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

Any proposed changes to ICP-2 must be agreed upon by all existing members of the RIRs, ensuring that the amendment process is inclusive.

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**

---

I firmly oppose the principle giving ICANN final authority to recognize or derecognize an RIR, even after a majority vote by the NRO EC. This undermines the decentralized governance model that underpins the Internet. RIRs were designed to operate autonomously, addressing the specific needs of their regions. Granting ICANN such authority risks centralizing power, reducing RIRs' ability to respond effectively to regional demands.

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

The amendment of ICP-2 should be based on the collective agreement of all existing members, ensuring that all interests are considered.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

Any amendments to ICP-2 must be approved by all existing RIR members and ICANN.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---

ICP-2 may be revised with the consent of all existing members of the RIRs and ICANN.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---

The amendment of ICP-2 hinges on the mutual agreement of ICANN and all current RIRs.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

The amendment process for ICP-2 requires the consensus of all current RIR members along with ICANN.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---

Any changes to ICP-2 need the approval of both ICANN and all existing RIRs.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

ICP-2 may be amended with the agreement of all existing members of the RIRs and ICANN.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

ICP-2 can only be amended through the consensus of all current RIR members and ICANN.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

ICP-2 may be revised upon the consent of all current RIR members.

**Md Abu Sayeem Siddique Siddique (ServicEngine Ltd)**

---

Amendment of ICP-2 may occur with the agreement of all existing members of the RIRs.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

Any changes to ICP-2 require the approval of all current members of the RIRs, fostering inclusivity in the amendment process.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

ICP-2 may only be amended with the consent of all existing members of the RIRs, guaranteeing that all interests are represented.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---

Any changes to ICP-2 must be agreed upon by all current members of the RIRs, ensuring comprehensive representation.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---

Changes to ICP-2 should occur only with the agreement of all existing RIR members to reflect a unified governance approach.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

Any proposed amendments to ICP-2 require the consent of all current RIR members to reflect their collective agreement.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

Changes to ICP-2 may occur only with the agreement of all existing RIR members, emphasizing a collaborative approach.

**Trang Tran (VNPT Technologies)**

---

Amendments to ICP-2 require the consensus of all current RIR members, ensuring that all stakeholders have input.

**Minh Hoang (ANSV)**

---

ICP-2 may only be amended upon the collective agreement of all existing members of the RIRs, reflecting their shared governance.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**



---

The collective consent of ICANN and all existing RIRs is essential for amending ICP-2.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**

---

Any revision to ICP-2 requires the agreement of all current RIRs and ICANN.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---

The amendment of ICP-2 can proceed only with the consent of all existing RIRs and ICANN.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

Any changes to ICP-2 must be agreed upon by all current RIR members and ICANN.

**Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)**

---

The process for amending ICP-2 requires the collective agreement of ICANN and all existing RIRs.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

For ICP-2 to be amended, both ICANN and all current RIR members must reach an agreement.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---

ICP-2 may be revised only with the unanimous consent of all RIRs and ICANN.

**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

The amendment of ICP-2 is contingent upon the agreement of ICANN and all existing RIRs.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---

Any modifications to ICP-2 must be approved by both ICANN and all current RIR members.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

Changes to ICP-2 can only occur with the agreement of all existing RIRs alongside ICANN.

**Ryan Khaw (AlSCO Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

The amendment of ICP-2 shall only occur with the agreement of all existing members of the RIRs, ensuring that changes reflect community consensus.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

Amendments to the ICP-2 can **\*\*ONLY\*\*** be done by ICANN.

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

The amendment process for ICP-2 requires the agreement of all existing RIR members to guarantee that all voices are represented.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Aptic)**

---

The process to amend ICP-2 necessitates the agreement of all current members of the RIRs, reinforcing the importance of shared decision-making.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Changes to ICP-2 can only take place with the consensus of all existing members of the RIRs, ensuring a collective approach to governance.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

Any proposed amendments to ICP-2 must receive the consent of all current members of the RIRs, fostering a collaborative atmosphere.

**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

All existing members of the RIRs must agree to any amendments to ICP-2, fostering a collaborative environment for decision-making.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

Changes to ICP-2 may be made only with the agreement of all current RIR members, ensuring that amendments reflect a collective consensus.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

I disagree with this principle. Requiring ICP-2 amendments to be based on the agreement of ICANN and all RIRs could jeopardize the balance of power and compromise regional autonomy. Such a structure risks creating undue pressure on RIRs to conform to broader agreements, potentially at the expense of addressing their unique regional needs. RIRs should retain the flexibility to operate independently and prioritize their local communities without being bound by a rigid, universal agreement framework.

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Forcing RIRs to comply with ICP-2 within a fixed grace period undermines their regional autonomy and flexibility. Each RIR should adapt policies at a pace that respects its unique circumstances, rather than conforming to rigid deadlines that could disrupt local governance and create unnecessary pressure.

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Forcing RIRs to comply with ICP-2 within a fixed grace period undermines their regional autonomy and flexibility. Each RIR should adapt policies at a pace that respects its unique circumstances, rather than conforming to rigid deadlines that could disrupt local governance and create unnecessary pressure.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

The amendment process for ICP-2 must be based on the agreement of all existing RIR members, emphasizing collaborative decision-making.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**

---

The RIRs should not be in control of the ICP-2 in any manner. The RIRs can not be trusted to act for the benefit of the public.

**j heasley (SNI)**

---

The amendment process for ICP-2 requires the agreement of all existing RIR members, reflecting a collaborative governance model.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

Changes to ICP-2 can be made upon the consensus of all current members of the RIRs, fostering a unified decision-making process.

**Jeremy Cheong (Infineon technologies)**

---

The amendment of ICP-2 requires the agreement of all existing members of the RIRs, ensuring that all voices are heard in the process.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

The amendment of ICP-2 must be based on the consensus of all current members, ensuring that all interests are represented.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

Any changes to ICP-2 should be made with the agreement of all existing members of the RIRs to maintain collective integrity.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

This approach is flawed. Mandating broad support from Resource Holders could unnecessarily delay the recognition of an RIR and hinder progress in emerging regions. The focus should be on the RIR's capacity to meet regional needs.

**Sohel Kabir (Kabir Traders)**

---

This stipulation seems illogical. Requiring broad support from Resource Holders could hinder the timely recognition of an RIR and create obstacles for emerging regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's capacity to serve the region's needs.

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

ICP-2 may only be amended through the agreement of all existing members of the RIRs, emphasizing a collective decision-making process.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---

Any proposed amendments to ICP-2 must originate from the consent of all current RIR members to ensure broad support.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---

The amendment of ICP-2 should require the agreement of all existing RIR members, ensuring that all perspectives are included.

**Catalina Cueca (Manpower)**

---

Changes to ICP-2 must be based on the mutual consent of all current RIR members, reflecting a collective agreement.

**Camilo Riveros (Manpower)**

---

I strongly disagree with this provision. Mandating agreement from ICANN and every RIR could complicate the process of amending ICP-2, allowing ICANN to block necessary changes that many stakeholders may support.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

Amendment of ICP-2 may occur upon the agreement of all existing members of the RIRs, ensuring that all voices are heard.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. The need for consensus from all parties, including ICANN, makes it difficult to implement crucial updates to ICP-2, allowing ICANN to block changes that might benefit the community.

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

I believe this stipulation is counterproductive. The need for agreement from ICANN and all RIRs could create obstacles to updating ICP-2, even with broad backing. This setup allows ICANN to hinder progress, which is detrimental.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

This requirement appears overly limiting. Needing consensus from ICANN and all RIRs could impede vital updates to ICP-2, even if most groups support them. This structure enables ICANN to block essential changes, slowing necessary advancements.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

I find this approach counterproductive. The need for agreement from ICANN and all RIRs could create obstacles to updating ICP-2, even when there's broad consensus. This structure allows ICANN to block changes, which is detrimental to progress.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

I believe this stipulation is too restrictive. Mandating that all parties—ICANN and all RIRs—must agree could hinder crucial updates to ICP-2, even with significant support. This setup enables ICANN to stall necessary changes, slowing progress.

**Anh Dang (NASA)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Making amendments to ICP-2 contingent on the agreement of ICANN and all RIRs could create significant obstacles, enabling ICANN to block important changes even if there is widespread support.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

I find this approach overly cumbersome. Requiring unanimous agreement from ICANN and all RIRs could delay the amendment process for ICP-2, even when most stakeholders are in favor. This setup could allow ICANN to obstruct necessary improvements.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

I strongly disagree with this provision. Imposing a fixed grace period on RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 risks undermining regional autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should be given the opportunity to adapt at their own pace, based on their particular circumstances, rather than being forced to comply with arbitrary deadlines. This approach could lead to unnecessary pressure and potential disruption to local governance processes.

**Guillaume Masra (Danon's group)**

---

This proposal raises significant concerns. Requiring agreement from ICANN and every RIR could hinder the ability to make timely amendments to ICP-2, allowing ICANN to potentially obstruct necessary updates.

**Prasanta Haloi (PwD)**

---

I strongly disagree with this provision. Imposing a fixed grace period on RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 risks undermining regional autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should be given the opportunity to adapt at their own pace, based on their particular circumstances, rather than being forced to comply with arbitrary deadlines. This approach could lead to unnecessary pressure and potential disruption to local governance processes.

**Georges Lallogo (ANPTIC)**

---

This requirement seems overly limiting. Needing consensus from ICANN and all RIRs could obstruct vital updates to ICP-2, even if most groups agree. This structure allows ICANN to block essential changes, stalling necessary advancements.

**Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)**

---

I believe this requirement is impractical. It risks delaying the recognition of an RIR and establishing barriers for developing regions. The focus should be on the RIR's capability to meet the region's needs, not on gaining consensus from all stakeholders.

**AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)**

---

This approach is counterproductive. Requiring support from all Resource Holders could postpone the recognition of an RIR and create barriers for regions in need. We should prioritize the RIR's ability to serve the region rather than seeking approval from every stakeholder.

**K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)**

---

Autonomy of RIRs should not be circumvented

**Ubong Udofia (Skystar)**

---

I find this stipulation unreasonable. Requiring broad support from Resource Holders could hinder the timely recognition of an RIR and create obstacles for developing regions. The focus should be on the RIR's capacity to meet local needs.

**Fuhui Zhang (University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)**

---

This requirement seems illogical. It risks delaying the recognition of an RIR and creates unnecessary hurdles for emerging regions. We should concentrate on the RIR's ability to serve the region instead of requiring broad support from all Resource Holders.

**Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)**

---

I believe this requirement is counterproductive. It could delay the recognition of an RIR and create barriers for developing regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's capacity to meet local needs instead of obtaining approval from all stakeholders.

**Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)**

---

This approach seems unreasonable. It risks delaying the recognition process for an RIR and creates unnecessary obstacles for regions that need support. The focus should be on the RIR's ability to fulfill the region's needs rather than on gaining broad approval.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Mandating that all parties—including ICANN and every RIR—must agree could create significant obstacles to making timely updates to ICP-2. This arrangement risks allowing ICANN to stifle improvements that many stakeholders may support.

**Trabahan Pujari (Paruluniversity)**

---

I strongly disagree with this provision. Imposing a fixed grace period for RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 risks undermining regional autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should be given the opportunity to adapt at their own pace, based on their particular circumstances, rather than being forced to comply with arbitrary deadlines. This approach could lead to unnecessary pressure and potential disruption to local governance processes.

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Requiring unanimous agreement from ICANN and all RIRs could complicate vital updates to ICP-2, even with substantial backing. This condition allows ICANN to prevent necessary improvements.

**Juan Mesa (Hispasat)**

---

I find this approach counterproductive. The need for agreement from ICANN and all RIRs could create obstacles to updating ICP-2, even when there is broad consensus. This structure allows ICANN to block changes, which is detrimental to progress.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

I completely disagree with this proposal. Requiring unanimous agreement from ICANN and all RIRs could hinder essential updates to ICP-2, even if there is widespread support. This structure allows ICANN to block changes, which could impede necessary progress.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

No comment

**Danjuma bappa ahmed (Wownetworks limited nigeria)**

---

This requirement seems overly limiting. Needing consensus from ICANN and all RIRs could obstruct vital updates to ICP-2, even if most groups agree. This structure allows ICANN to block essential changes, stalling necessary advancements.

**Pornpipat Kitireanglarp (ZERIWELLPLUS Co., Ltd.)**

---

I find this approach impractical. Requiring approval from both ICANN and all RIRs could complicate essential updates to ICP-2, even when there is broad agreement. This structure allows ICANN to halt necessary changes, obstructing progress.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

I completely disagree with this condition. Requiring agreement from ICANN and every RIR could complicate timely updates to ICP-2, even with majority support. This arrangement allows ICANN to effectively delay needed changes.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

I find this approach overly centralized. Making the NRO EC the exclusive source for proposals about RIR recognition or derecognition could limit stakeholder involvement. ICANN's final authority is necessary, but broad engagement with each RIR should be prioritized.

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

RIRs should be able to do things in line with their needs and wants

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

I firmly disagree with this stipulation. Requiring unanimous consent from ICANN and all RIRs could create substantial obstacles to updating ICP-2. This condition gives ICANN the power to prevent vital changes, potentially postponing critical advancements.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

I completely oppose this requirement. The need for consensus from both ICANN and all RIRs could pose challenges in implementing important updates to ICP-2, even if there is substantial support. This condition may allow ICANN to delay crucial improvements.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---

I find this approach impractical. Requiring approval from ICANN and all RIRs could complicate essential updates to ICP-2, even when there is broad agreement. This structure permits ICANN to halt necessary changes, obstructing progress.

**Ashraful Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

This requirement seems impractical. Mandating that ICANN and all RIRs must agree could hinder timely updates to ICP-2, even when most parties support them. This arrangement allows ICANN to block essential changes, delaying necessary progress.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---

I strongly disagree with this provision. Imposing a fixed grace period for RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 risks compromising regional autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should be given the opportunity to adapt at their own pace, based on their particular circumstances, rather than being forced to comply with arbitrary deadlines. This approach could lead to unnecessary pressure and potential disruption to local governance processes.

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

I firmly oppose this requirement. Mandating consent from both ICANN and all RIRs could slow down important updates to ICP-2, even if there is overall consensus. This setup enables ICANN to block changes, which hampers necessary improvements.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. Needing unanimous agreement from ICANN and all RIRs could present barriers to essential updates to ICP-2, even with widespread support. This arrangement allows ICANN to impede progress, which is detrimental.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

I strongly disagree with this approach. Requiring that all parties—including ICANN and every RIR—must consent could complicate important updates to ICP-2, even if there is majority backing. This structure could enable ICANN to obstruct necessary changes.



**Phuc Pham (Advanced Network Systems VietNam Company Limited)**

---

I consider this requirement to be too rigid. Mandating that ICANN and all RIRs must agree could hinder timely updates to ICP-2, even if there is substantial support. This condition allows ICANN to block necessary changes, delaying essential improvements.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

I believe this stipulation is counterproductive. Requiring agreement from ICANN and all RIRs could complicate critical updates to ICP-2, even with widespread backing. This arrangement gives ICANN the ability to suppress changes, impeding important advancements.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

This requirement appears excessively restrictive. Mandating consensus from ICANN and all RIRs could obstruct necessary updates to ICP-2, even with majority support. This setup empowers ICANN to block important changes, hindering progress.

**Giang Nguyen (NASA)**

---

Je ne suis pas du tout d'accord avec cette disposition. Imposer un délai de grâce fixe aux RIR pour aligner leurs politiques sur le PCI-2 risque de porter atteinte à l'autonomie et à la flexibilité régionales. Les RIR devraient avoir la possibilité de s'adapter à leur propre rythme, en tenant compte de leur situation particulière, plutôt que d'être contraints de se mettre en conformité dans des délais arbitraires. Cette approche pourrait entraîner des pressions inutiles et une perturbation potentielle des processus de gouvernance locale.

**HERVE EGNAKOU (HOLOGRAM IDENTIFICATION SERVICES S.A.R.L)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Mandating that ICANN and all RIRs must be in agreement could hinder necessary updates to ICP-2, even if there is significant support. This condition allows ICANN to effectively block changes, delaying critical improvements. I strongly oppose this requirement. Mandating that ICANN and all RIRs must be in agreement could hinder necessary updates to ICP-2, even if there is significant support. This condition allows ICANN to effectively block changes, delaying critical improvements.

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. The necessity for consensus from both ICANN and all RIRs could make it challenging to implement important updates to ICP-2, even if most parties are supportive. This condition could allow ICANN to delay crucial improvements.

**Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)**

---

I find this approach impractical. Needing the approval of ICANN and all RIRs could complicate essential updates to ICP-2, even when there's wide agreement. This structure permits ICANN to halt changes, hindering necessary progress.

**Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)**

---

I strongly disagree with this requirement. Mandating that every party—ICANN and all RIRs—must be in agreement could obstruct necessary updates to ICP-2, even if there is considerable support. This arrangement allows ICANN to effectively prevent changes, slowing down critical improvements.

**Pooja Gopi (DM Digital Marketing)**

---

I find this approach counterproductive. The need for agreement from ICANN and all RIRs could create obstacles to updating ICP-2, even when there's broad consensus. This structure allows ICANN to block changes, which is detrimental to progress.

**Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)**

---

I believe this stipulation is too restrictive. Requiring that all parties—ICANN and all RIRs—must agree could hinder essential updates to ICP-2, even with substantial support. This setup enables ICANN to stall necessary changes, slowing progress.

**Quyn Kim (VNPAY)**

---

I find this approach impractical. Needing the consent of ICANN and all RIRs could complicate vital updates to ICP-2, even when there's widespread agreement. This structure allows ICANN to prevent changes, hindering necessary progress.

**Shahedul Islam Bhuiyan (Royal Green Limited)**

---

I completely disagree with this approach. Requiring that all parties—including ICANN and every RIR—must agree could complicate important updates to ICP-2, even if there is a majority in favor. This structure could enable ICANN to obstruct necessary changes.

**Sidonie Hacking (-)**

---

This stipulation seems unreasonable. It would only serve to postpone the recognition of an RIR and hinder progress in emerging regions. The focus should be on the capacity of the RIR to address the region's needs, not on securing broad support from all stakeholders.

**Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)**

---

Question 6&7 Amendment| Question 6-7 # CP-2 may be amended upon the agreement of ICANN and all RIRs. 1- Strongly Disagree Answer I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating that all parties—ICANN and every RIR—must agree could hinder necessary updates to ICP-2, even if there is broad support. This setup allows ICANN to effectively block changes, slowing down crucial improvements.

**Anjan Deka (HDFC)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating that all parties—ICANN and every RIR—must agree could hinder necessary updates to ICP-2, even if there is broad support. This setup allows ICANN to effectively block changes, slowing down crucial improvements.

**Ketan Parmar (Bids Info Global)**

---

This approach does not make sense. Requiring broad support from Resource Holders could hinder the timely recognition of an RIR and create obstacles for developing regions. The focus should be on the RIR's capacity to serve the region, not on gaining consensus from every stakeholder.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

I find this requirement illogical. It would only delay the recognition of an RIR and create unnecessary barriers for emerging regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's ability to meet the region's needs rather than obtaining approval from all stakeholders.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Mandating that both ICANN and all RIRs must agree before any amendments to ICP-2 can be made risks creating significant obstacles to necessary updates, even when there is broad support. This arrangement gives ICANN the power to block essential changes, which could hinder progress.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---

IMO, the ICP-2 updates should follow the global policy development process.

**Andrei Robachevsky (independent)**

---

ALL will never work.

**Andrew Cohen (Farelanes LLC)**

---

### 3. Rectification

---

If an amendment to ICP-2 conflicts with an RIR's existing policies, practices, or bylaws, the amendment shall prescribe a reasonable but specific grace period for the RIR to bring its conflicting policies, practices, or bylaws into conformity with ICP-2 before the RIR may be considered non-compliant.

#### 3.1. Rectification - Strongly Agree (5)

The grace period shall not be less than 4 months.

**Babagana Digima (Nigerian Communications Commission)**

---

Harmonization of policies between RIRs will not only contribute towards a healthy Internet but also ensure best practices

**Brian Longwe (Converged Technology Networks)**

---

I agree

**Aftab Siddiqui (AFTABSIDDIQUI-AU)**

---

Fair policy

**Tahar Schaa (Neuland@Homeland)**

---

To be consistent as possible among RIRs, and improve legal advice between IP addresses receivers. All RIRs EC or Board member has to sign effective conflict of interest with RIRs and its communities.

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

agree

**Filipe Coelho (TVCABO Angola)**

---

The rules should be the same for everyone

**Fabrice TEUGUIA (PCP-ACEFA)**

---

Prescribing a grace period for compliance is fair, but I suggest we consider explicitly stating a collaborative approach to help RIRs during this period.

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

It's the right thing to do

**Emmanuel Kitcher (University of Environment and Sustainable Development)**

---

rien comme commentaire

**Nico Tshintu bakajika (ISPA-DRC)**

---

It's good to be given fair hearing

**Rita Kumi (Ghana Telecommunication Company)**

---

What if due to certain factors the RIR cannot function, hence they are not in a position to comply. Example is how at the moment AFRINIC doesn't have a board and CEO. In this case they are not able to do a lot of things.

**Raymond Mamattah (EGIGFA)**

---

5

**Taye Oyebola (Aso Savings and Loans Plc)**

---

This requirement seems impractical. Imposing a set grace period for RIRs to align with ICP-2 could limit their autonomy and flexibility. Each RIR should have the opportunity to adapt at its own pace, considering its unique circumstances, rather than being forced into compliance within arbitrary timeframes that could create unnecessary pressure.

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

c'est realiste

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

Je suis tout à fait en désaccord avec cette disposition. Imposer un délai de grâce fixe aux RIR pour aligner leurs politiques sur l'ICP-2 risque de compromettre l'autonomie et la flexibilité régionales. Les RIR devraient avoir la possibilité de s'adapter à leur propre rythme, en fonction de leur situation particulière, plutôt que d'être contraints de se conformer à des délais arbitraires. Cette approche pourrait entraîner des pressions inutiles et une perturbation potentielle des processus de gouvernance locale.

**Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)**

---

Maybe a time should be specified

**Randy Bush (IIJ Research Lab & Arrcus Inc)**

---

This is the usual.

**Luis Caceres (Corporacion Redexcom C.A.)**

---

I fully agree and a maximum of 6 months should be given to the RIR.

**Musa Stephen HONLUE (AFRINIC)**

---

The grace period sounds reasonable. RIRs distribute the same time of resources, so the differences within their rulesets is not really something beneficial, moreover in a globalized world.

Carlos Friaças (FCT\| FCCN)

---

If the conflict is with an RIR's bylaws, which can involved an extend process and significant legal review to amend should allow for a minimum of 1 year .

David Farmer (University of Minnesota)

---

Good attention to the case the amendment brings such conflicts.

Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)

---

As the RIR already has agreed to the amendment (otherwise I can't be accepted) I don't foresee any problems here

Sander Steffann (SJM Steffann Consultancy)

---

### 3.2. Rectification - Somewhat Agree (4)

It seems a reasonable principle, but the devil will obviously be in working out the enforcement mechanism.

Andrew Sullivan (N/A)

---

Agree

Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)

---

Practical and sensible as long as the period isn't overly long.

Jordan Carter (auDA)

---

"Reasonable" time should be specified.

Colwayne Babb (Cable and Wireless)

---

Yes, because it will take time to adapt because we must not forget the primary meaning of the project.

Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)

---

agree

Mohammad Mubarak Alfalasi (Telecommunication and Digital government Regulatory Authority)

---

No comment

Kelvin Horng Woei Ong (Propnex)

---

While I agree with this principle, there is a level of process assumed to be the case in determining that a principle should be adopted that may be in conflict with one or more RIR policies. Not the least of which being the identification of such potential conflicts.

**Narelle Clark (Internet Association of Australia)**

---

it allows RIRs sufficient time to make necessary adjustments without immediate repercussions. This approach promotes flexibility and ensures a smooth transition to any new requirements imposed by ICP-2 amendments.

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

This approach is fair and practical, giving RIRs time to adjust their policies to align with ICP-2 before facing penalties for non-compliance.

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

The word "reasonable" is a difficult one as it is rather subjective. I think it would be useful if this grace period was enshrined as something negotiated/agreed between the RIR and ICANN.

**Brian Nisbet (HEAnet CLG)**

---

Exclude IPv4, and I don't believe the bylaws would be a "thing"... include IPv4, and it's a money/greed game

**Hendrik Visage (HeViS.Co Systems Pty Ltd)**

---

I'm not aware of any conflicts

**Mark Elkins (Posix Systems)**

---

No comments

**Pacharaporn Wangwinyoo (ZIM (Thailand) Co., LTD.)**

---

Rather than setting a fixed grace period for all amendments, allow for variable grace periods based on the complexity and impact of the changes required. For example, minor adjustments might have a shorter grace period, while more complex adjustments would allow additional time for compliance, enabling RIRs to align at a manageable pace. Permit each RIR to create a customized compliance plan, detailing the steps they'll take to align their policies and practices with the amended ICP-2 within the given grace period. This would allow RIRs to address conflicts in a way that minimizes disruption to their operations and member services. Offer transitional support, such as advisory resources or periodic check-ins from ICANN, to assist RIRs in making necessary adjustments. This could include workshops, technical support, or access to policy experts who can provide guidance on aligning practices efficiently with ICP-2. Before proposing an amendment, conduct a thorough impact assessment with each RIR to understand potential areas of conflict and estimate the resources and time needed for compliance. These assessments could guide the amendment drafting process and ensure that amendments are practical and achievable within reasonable timelines. If full compliance within the grace period is not feasible for an RIR, consider allowing "progress-based" compliance metrics, where incremental steps or milestones are acknowledged as compliance efforts. This would recognize the complexity of some adjustments while ensuring that RIRs work continuously toward full

conformity. Once an amendment takes effect, introduce a review mechanism to assess its impact on RIRs periodically. This would help ICANN and RIRs make timely adjustments to the amendment itself if unforeseen issues arise, preventing unnecessary penalization or disruption for the RIRs involved. Include a mechanism for conflict resolution where RIRs can raise specific concerns about implementation challenges during the grace period. This mechanism could offer a formal avenue for RIRs to request additional support or adjustments to the timeline if justified, fostering collaboration and mitigating any adverse impacts on RIR operations.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

Agreed. However, sufficient time and audience must be afforded the RIR for context in implementation of an (existing) policy.

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

Grace time must be provided

**John Haydon (Education)**

---

Enough room and consideration should be giving before a decision should be made

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

The grace period offers flexibility and minimizes potential disruption to RIR operations. It may be beneficial.

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

Based on the previous principle, an RIR will already have supported the amendment, which they wouldn't do if they couldn't change their policy/practice/bylaw.

**Lee Howard (IPv4.Global by Hilco Streambank)**

---

I agree with this. In case of any conflict it should be considered non-complaint. Moreover I believe any amendment should be consulted with law department in advance.

**Kate Petras (DCXV)**

---

Reasonable approach

**Andrew Cohen (Farelanes LLC)**

---

Any conflicts should be found before the amendment is ratified and any remediation should be part of the amendment.

**Richard Greenwood (Shasta County Office of Education)**

---

**3.3. Rectification - Neutral (3)**



I strongly oppose the idea of a fixed grace period for RIR compliance with ICP-2 changes. This could restrict their ability to respond to specific regional circumstances.

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---

"Reasonable" should have a time limit in the document. Less than 1 year.

**j heasley (SNI)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. A fixed grace period for RIRs to adjust their policies to comply with ICP-2 could negatively impact their autonomy and flexibility. It is essential for RIRs to adapt at their own pace, taking into account their distinct circumstances, rather than being forced to meet arbitrary deadlines that may disrupt local governance.

**Alex Kwan (Wiplus Malaysia)**

---

Acceptable

**Hann Jye Ng (MyTeksi Sdn Bhd)**

---

This requirement seems overly restrictive. Imposing a fixed grace period for RIRs to align with ICP-2 may undermine their regional autonomy. Each RIR should be able to adapt at its own pace, considering its specific context, rather than being forced to comply within arbitrary deadlines, which could create unnecessary pressure and disrupt governance.

**Jun Wen (one futures technology sdn bhd)**

---

I find this provision problematic. Imposing a specific grace period for RIRs to conform their policies to ICP-2 could jeopardize their regional autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should be allowed to adapt based on their unique needs, rather than being pressured into compliance by arbitrary deadlines, which could disrupt local governance processes.

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

Fundamentally, RIRs are accountable to their constituents, not ICANN or the other RIRs. However, this is a context that requires cooperation and cross-oversight. The approach here seems a reasonable compromise.

**David Lamparter (Westnetz w.V.)**

---

I agree

**Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)**

---

I'm trying to think of a situation where this would come into play. I'm concerned if there was a conflict which required an RIR to change a policy, there might be downstream impacts (meaning, with customers). I'm generally in favor of the idea.

**Andrew Gallo (The George Washington University)**

---

Both ICP-1 and ICP-2 are quite simple documents and it's difficult to see where there might be conflicts. RIR disfunction is a bigger issue that has failed to be addressed anyway.

**Kevin Meynell (Individual)**

---

The devil is in the details concerning grace period. It needs to be defined and a mechanism in place to assess and arbitrate in the case of exceptional circumstances

**Matthew Cowen (dgtifutures)**

---

### **3.4. Rectification - Somewhat Disagree (2)**

A running RIR should ensure that it's policies and practices are ALWAYS up to date. Frequent audits (every quarter) are mandatory.

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

I believe that a specific grace period for compliance with ICP-2 amendments is unwarranted. It could hinder RIRs' responsiveness to their unique regional contexts.

**Neonjyoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

Since the RIR's are VOTING Members , Why would a RIR vote to make itself non-compliant ?

**James Laferriere (n/a)**

---

I strongly disagree with this approach. Setting a fixed grace period for RIRs to align with ICP-2 risks undermining their autonomy. RIRs should have the flexibility to adapt at their own pace, taking into account their specific situations, rather than being forced into compliance within arbitrary timeframes that could disrupt governance processes.

**Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)**

---

I find this approach to be overly rigid. Imposing a specific grace period for RIRs to conform to ICP-2 could compromise their regional autonomy. Each RIR should be allowed to adapt according to its own unique context, rather than being pressured into compliance by arbitrary deadlines that may interfere with local governance.

**Sidonie Hacking ('-)**

---

"...RIR may be considered non-compliant." Seems to be very specific. It should probably read "If an amendment to ICP-2 makes an RIR non-compliant, the amendment shall prescribe a reasonable but specific grace period..."

**Andrei Robachevsky (independent)**

---

Grandfather clauses must protect existing members of RIRs. RIRs are not entities unto their own with legitimate commercial interests outside of performing the RIR function on behalf of their members

and in accordance with global Internet norms. Amendments to ICP-2 are to bring the RIRs into line with global Internet norms. RIRs should immediately be considered non-compliant if they are but derecognition should only commence after a grace period.

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

This clause seems to require a grace period to be specified only if there is known to be a conflict; however in case there is a conflict which is not identified at the time of writing the amendment, it is still important that a grace period be available. Regardless of any grace period specified by an amendment, there should be a default grace period for any and all amendments. There should also be consideration of emergency situations (existential threats etc) in which an RIR may be required to take more urgent action.

**PAUL WILSON (private individual)**

---

The policy is made by the community. The "grace period" should consider the period of community discussion in physical or virtual meetings.

**YingChu Chen (Taiwan Institute of Economic Research)**

---

### **3.5. Rectification - Strongly Disagree (1)**

The principle makes little sense given that the RIR (the org or its policy making body?) would have to agree to the "amendment" in the first place. The RIR could agree to have an amendment override its own policies and thereby conflict with the privileges of its policy setting body.

**Peter Koch (Individual)**

---

At a high level, the principle of rectification is, conceptually, hard to argue against. The challenge resides in how it will be implemented. As above, if an amendment requires unanimity, an RIR uninterested in modifying their policies, practices, or bylaws, can simply veto the amendment, so rectification becomes moot. If non-unanimity decides on acceptance of an amendment, the questions then becomes what is "reasonable" and "who decides what is reasonable and/or compliant".

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

I strongly believe that imposing a fixed grace period for RIRs to adjust to ICP-2 amendments is unwise, as it fails to accommodate local variations.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

A specified grace period for compliance with ICP-2 amendments could restrict RIRs' ability to respond to regional needs, which I find concerning.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

I oppose the concept of a fixed grace period for RIRs under ICP-2 amendments, as it may impose unnecessary limits on their local adaptability.

**Tipu Khan (Zx Online Ltd)**

---

The idea of a designated grace period for RIRs regarding ICP-2 amendments is impractical; it does not consider regional differences effectively.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

The proposal for a fixed grace period for RIR compliance with ICP-2 amendments is not practical; it overlooks the diverse conditions in different regions.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---

I strongly contest the idea of a set grace period for compliance with ICP-2 amendments, as it could impose undue constraints on RIRs' operations.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

The implementation of a strict grace period for RIRs to conform to ICP-2 amendments could be detrimental, limiting their adaptability to regional needs.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---

I believe that establishing a rigid grace period for RIRs to comply with ICP-2 amendments is unwise, as it does not account for varying regional contexts.

**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

I completely disagree with this approach. Mandating a specific grace period for RIRs to rectify their policies in line with ICP-2 could hinder regional autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should be permitted to adapt according to their own unique situations, rather than being pressured into compliance by arbitrary timeframes, which could disrupt their local governance processes.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

A mandatory grace period for RIRs to comply with ICP-2 amendments could be detrimental, failing to account for the diverse operational realities.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

The introduction of a fixed grace period for RIRs to align with ICP-2 amendments could impose unnecessary constraints on their regional operations.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

I am opposed to the notion of a specific grace period for RIRs regarding compliance with ICP-2 amendments; each region has its own complexities.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

I find this approach excessively rigid. Imposing a specific grace period for RIRs to conform to ICP-2 could compromise their regional autonomy. Each RIR should be allowed to adapt based on its unique context rather than facing pressure to comply with arbitrary deadlines that may interfere with local governance.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

I strongly disagree with this stipulation. Setting a fixed grace period for RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 risks undermining their autonomy. RIRs should have the flexibility to adapt at their own pace, considering their specific situations, rather than being compelled to comply within arbitrary timeframes that could disrupt governance.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---

I believe that a set grace period for RIRs to achieve compliance with ICP-2 amendments is unwise, as it does not accommodate the varying circumstances of different regions.

**Taslima Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

Setting a fixed grace period for RIR compliance with ICP-2 amendments undermines the adaptability necessary for RIRs to address regional differences effectively.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

I do not support a mandatory grace period for RIRs concerning ICP-2 amendments, as it may hinder their ability to adapt to evolving local conditions.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

Instituting a specified grace period for RIR compliance with ICP-2 amendments can be detrimental; it does not cater to the unique needs of different RIRs.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

Instituting a mandatory grace period for compliance with ICP-2 amendments may limit RIRs' ability to adapt to their specific regional contexts. Ph

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

I disagree with the implementation of a predetermined grace period for RIRs regarding ICP-2 amendments, as this could hinder their responsiveness to local needs.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

I disagree with the implementation of a predetermined grace period for RIRs regarding ICP-2 amendments, as this could hinder their responsiveness to local needs.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

A fixed grace period for RIRs to align with ICP-2 amendments may hinder their ability to adapt to unique challenges and circumstances.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

I strongly disagree with imposing a specific grace period for RIR compliance with ICP-2 amendments, as it could limit their regional flexibility.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

The concept of a standard grace period for RIRs to comply with ICP-2 amendments is unwise; it fails to address the diverse operational needs of different regions.

**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

I oppose the idea of a fixed compliance grace period for RIRs, as it may not allow for the necessary adjustments based on regional realities.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

I strongly reject the idea of a defined grace period for RIRs to comply with ICP-2 amendments, as this fails to recognize the importance of regional adaptation.

**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

A predetermined grace period for RIRs to conform to ICP-2 amendments could be detrimental, as it overlooks the unique challenges of each region.

**Pham Gia Khiem (Phat Tai Logistics)**

---

This requirement appears too limiting. Requiring that RIRs conform their policies to ICP-2 within a set grace period could jeopardize their flexibility. Each RIR should be allowed to adapt at its own pace, considering its distinct circumstances, rather than being forced into compliance.

**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

I find this provision excessive. Imposing a specific timeframe for RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 limits their ability to respond effectively to local contexts. RIRs should have the autonomy to manage compliance timelines based on their unique needs.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

A fixed grace period for RIR compliance with ICP-2 amendments overlooks the importance of regional flexibility, which is critical for effective governance.

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

The concept of a uniform grace period for RIRs to conform to ICP-2 amendments is flawed; it does not account for the diverse operational environments of RIRs.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

I reject the idea of a uniform compliance grace period for RIRs, as it could restrict their ability to adjust to changing regional requirements.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

I do not agree with a specific grace period for RIRs to align with amendments to ICP-2, as it could hinder their adaptability to local conditions.

**Kwan Ke Yue (TBWA/ Kuala Lumpur)**

---

The proposal for a fixed grace period for RIRs is not viable, as it does not reflect the varied circumstances that each RIR must navigate.

**Sean Carroll (The One Academy)**

---

I oppose the notion of a fixed grace period for RIRs to adjust to amendments of ICP-2, as it does not account for the complexities of regional governance.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

The idea of enforcing a uniform grace period for RIRs to comply with ICP-2 amendments is concerning, as it could stifle regional adaptability.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

I oppose the notion of a mandatory grace period for RIRs to comply with ICP-2 amendments. Each RIR must have the flexibility to adapt based on its unique situation.

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**

---

Decisions on matters of this magnitude should reflect the consensus of the RIRs and their communities, ensuring they remain accountable and transparent while prioritizing the unique concerns of each region, rather than being subject to ICANN's unilateral control.

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

I am against implementing a set grace period for RIRs to comply with amendments to ICP-2. This could undermine their flexibility in responding to regional needs.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

I oppose the concept of a mandatory grace period for RIR compliance with ICP-2 amendments, as it may not accommodate regional differences effectively.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---

A predetermined grace period for RIR compliance with ICP-2 amendments is not advisable, as it fails to consider the diverse needs of different regions.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---

I oppose the idea of a fixed grace period for RIRs regarding compliance with ICP-2 amendments, as it could limit their ability to respond to regional needs.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

The idea of a designated grace period for RIRs to comply with ICP-2 amendments is problematic; it fails to consider the unique circumstances of each region.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---

The concept of a defined grace period for RIRs to comply with ICP-2 amendments is concerning, as it undermines their flexibility in addressing regional issues.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

I firmly disagree with the notion of imposing a fixed grace period for RIRs to align with ICP-2 amendments, as this could restrict their flexibility to adapt to local needs.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

I find the suggestion of a fixed grace period for RIRs to comply with ICP-2 amendments troubling, as it may restrict their ability to adapt effectively.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

The proposal for a designated grace period for RIR compliance with ICP-2 amendments is impractical. It fails to consider the diverse circumstances faced by different regions.

**Md Abu Sayeem Siddique Siddique (ServicEngine Ltd)**

---

I firmly oppose the idea of imposing a fixed grace period for RIRs to adapt to ICP-2 amendments, as it restricts their ability to respond to unique regional needs.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

The imposition of a predetermined grace period for RIRs to adapt to ICP-2 amendments is counterproductive. Compliance should be context-sensitive.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

I believe a standard grace period for RIR compliance with ICP-2 amendments is unrealistic. Each RIR should have the flexibility to respond to its own challenges.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---

I do not agree with the proposal of a fixed grace period for RIR compliance with ICP-2 amendments. This could limit their ability to adapt effectively to local contexts.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---



I strongly disagree with the establishment of a defined grace period for RIRs. This may not consider the diverse needs and challenges within various regions.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

I do not support establishing a set grace period for RIR compliance with ICP-2 changes. It could hinder their ability to respond to the specific needs of their communities.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

I strongly disagree with the imposition of a fixed grace period for RIRs regarding ICP-2 amendments. This undermines their ability to operate effectively within their regional contexts.

**Trang Tran (VNPT Technologies)**

---

I am against a defined grace period for RIR compliance with ICP-2 amendments. Such a requirement may not reflect the diverse operational environments of each RIR.

**Minh Hoang (ANSV)**

---

I do not agree with implementing a fixed grace period for RIRs regarding ICP-2 amendments. This could restrict their flexibility to address unique regional challenges.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**

---

I do not support the idea of a rigid grace period for RIRs in relation to compliance with ICP-2 amendments, as this could hinder their responsiveness.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**

---

I strongly disagree with the notion of a fixed grace period for RIR compliance with ICP-2 amendments, as it fails to recognize regional variations.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---

I am against the establishment of a fixed grace period for RIRs regarding compliance with ICP-2 amendments, as it could impede their ability to adapt to local conditions.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

The idea of a fixed grace period for RIRs to conform to ICP-2 amendments is ill-advised, as it does not account for the complexities of regional governance.

**Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)**

---

I strongly oppose the implementation of a predetermined grace period for RIRs to comply with amendments to ICP-2, as this undermines their regional flexibility.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

I oppose the concept of a fixed grace period for RIRs to adapt to ICP-2 amendments, as it may not accommodate regional variations effectively.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---

I believe that a rigid grace period for RIRs to comply with ICP-2 amendments is counterproductive, as it fails to consider varying regional dynamics.

**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

I do not support the idea of a set grace period for RIRs regarding compliance with ICP-2 amendments, as it may restrict their responsiveness to unique regional challenges.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---

The notion of a fixed grace period for RIRs to align with ICP-2 amendments is problematic, as it undermines their ability to adjust based on local contexts.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

I strongly disagree with the idea of a fixed grace period for RIR compliance with ICP-2 amendments, as it limits their capacity to respond to regional circumstances.

**Ryan Khaw (AlSCO Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

The deadlines set should take into account the needs of local governance

**Noel OUPOH (DATACONNECT AFRICA)**

---

I oppose the idea of a fixed grace period for RIRs to comply with ICP-2 amendments. Such a requirement fails to recognize the operational diversity among RIRs.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

I disagree with the establishment of a fixed grace period for RIRs to bring their policies in line with ICP-2 amendments. This does not accommodate the diverse needs of various regions.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Apmic)**

---

The concept of a fixed grace period for compliance with ICP-2 amendments is not suitable. RIRs need the autonomy to navigate their operational realities.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

I strongly oppose the idea of a mandatory grace period for RIRs to align with ICP-2 amendments. Adaptation should be tailored to each RIR's specific situation.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

The proposal for a predetermined grace period for RIR compliance with ICP-2 amendments is impractical. Each RIR's individual context should guide its adaptation.

**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

I believe that a set grace period for RIRs to achieve compliance with ICP-2 amendments is unwise, as it does not accommodate the varying circumstances of different regions.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

Setting a fixed grace period for RIR compliance with ICP-2 amendments undermines the adaptability necessary for RIRs to address regional differences effectively.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Requiring RIRs to comply with ICP-2 within a fixed grace period risks compromising their regional autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should have the freedom to adapt their policies at a pace that aligns with their unique circumstances, rather than adhering to rigid timelines. Such an approach could impose unnecessary pressure and disrupt local governance processes.

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

I disagree with this principle to a significant extent. Prescribing a grace period for RIRs to align their policies with amendments to ICP-2 risks undermining their autonomy and ability to address regional needs. RIRs operate under diverse legal, cultural, and operational frameworks, and rigid deadlines may disrupt their governance structures. Instead, any amendments should allow for a collaborative and flexible process, ensuring that alignment occurs without compromising the unique practices and accountability of each RIR.

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

I disagree with this principle to a significant extent. Prescribing a grace period for RIRs to align their policies with amendments to ICP-2 risks undermining their autonomy and ability to address regional needs. RIRs operate under diverse legal, cultural, and operational frameworks, and rigid deadlines may disrupt their governance structures. Instead, any amendments should allow for a collaborative and flexible process, ensuring that alignment occurs without compromising the unique practices and accountability of each RIR.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

I believe that establishing a fixed grace period for RIRs regarding ICP-2 compliance is inappropriate. It fails to recognize the unique contexts of different regions.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**

---

I strongly disagree with the notion of implementing a set grace period for RIRs to comply with ICP-2 amendments. This could restrict their ability to adapt based on regional needs.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

A predetermined grace period for RIRs to align with ICP-2 amendments is unfeasible. It does not account for the diverse operational realities faced by different RIRs.

**Jeremy Cheong (Infineon technologies)**

---

I firmly believe that enforcing a specific grace period for compliance with ICP-2 amendments is impractical. RIRs should be allowed flexibility based on their local circumstances.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

I believe that a specific grace period for compliance with ICP-2 amendments is not appropriate. It does not take into account the varied circumstances of different RIRs.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

I oppose the proposal of a fixed grace period for RIRs to comply with amendments to ICP-2. This could negatively impact their ability to adapt to regional needs.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

I completely disagree with the requirement for a specific grace period for RIRs to bring their policies into conformity with ICP-2. This could undermine their regional flexibility, forcing them to comply within arbitrary timeframes rather than allowing for a more measured response that suits their unique contexts.

**Sohel Kabir (Kabir Traders)**

---

I fundamentally disagree with the idea of requiring RIRs to conform to ICP-2 within a specific grace period. This risks undermining their regional autonomy and flexibility, compelling them to adapt under pressure rather than allowing for adjustments that reflect their unique situation

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

I believe a fixed grace period for RIR compliance with ICP-2 amendments is unnecessary. It may hinder their ability to adapt based on regional and operational needs.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---

I am against establishing a defined grace period for compliance with ICP-2 amendments. Such a requirement may not consider the operational realities faced by different RIRs.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---

I do not support the imposition of a fixed grace period for RIRs to comply with amendments to ICP-2. It undermines their capacity to respond to regional variations and specific challenges.

**Catalina Cueca (Manpower)**

---

I strongly oppose the idea of mandating a specific grace period for RIRs. This could limit their ability to adapt policies based on the distinct needs of their communities.

**Camilo Riveros (Manpower)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Setting a fixed grace period for RIR compliance undermines the flexibility of RIRs. Each RIR should be allowed to adapt its policies at its own pace, reflecting local needs without arbitrary pressures.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

I firmly oppose a fixed grace period for RIRs to comply with ICP-2 amendments. Such a requirement does not account for the diverse regional contexts and challenges that each RIR faces.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**

---

This stipulation appears overly burdensome. Requiring RIRs to comply with ICP-2 within a fixed grace period threatens their flexibility. Each RIR should be able to adapt its policies based on local needs, rather than being forced to meet arbitrary deadlines.

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

I think this stipulation is too rigid. Imposing a specific grace period for RIRs to align with ICP-2 risks undermining their autonomy. RIRs should have the freedom to adapt based on their unique contexts instead of being pressured into compliance by arbitrary timelines.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

This requirement appears overly limiting. Requiring that RIRs conform their policies to ICP-2 within a set grace period could jeopardize their flexibility. Each RIR should be allowed to adapt at its own pace, considering its distinct circumstances, rather than being forced into compliance.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

I find this provision concerning. Setting a specific grace period for RIRs to conform their policies to ICP-2 could undermine their autonomy. Each RIR should be able to adapt based on its unique situation rather than being pushed into compliance by arbitrary timelines, which could lead to disruptions in governance.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

I completely disagree with this approach. Requiring a fixed grace period for RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 could hinder their flexibility and autonomy. RIRs should have the freedom to adapt at their own pace, considering their specific circumstances, rather than being compelled to comply within arbitrary timeframes that could disrupt governance processes.

**Anh Dang (NASA)**

---

I find this approach problematic. Setting a fixed grace period for compliance with ICP-2 undermines the independence of RIRs. Each RIR should have the flexibility to adapt its policies as necessary, without the pressure of arbitrary time constraints.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Imposing a specific grace period for RIRs to align with ICP-2 could disrupt their local governance processes. RIRs must have the autonomy to determine their own timelines for compliance, reflecting their unique contexts.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

I strongly disagree with this provision. Imposing a fixed grace period on RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 risks undermining regional autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should be given the opportunity to adapt at their own pace, based on their particular circumstances, rather than being forced to comply with arbitrary deadlines. This approach could lead to unnecessary pressure and potential disruption to local governance processes.

**Guillaume Masra (Danon's group)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Mandating a specific timeframe for RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 undermines their autonomy. RIRs should be allowed to adapt at their own pace, considering their unique regional circumstances without the risk of unnecessary pressure.

**Prasanta Haloi (Pwd)**

---

I strongly disagree with this provision. Imposing a fixed grace period on RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 risks undermining regional autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should be given the opportunity to adapt at their own pace, based on their particular circumstances, rather than being forced to comply with arbitrary deadlines. This approach could lead to unnecessary pressure and potential disruption to local governance processes.

**Georges Lallogo (ANPTIC)**

---

I find this provision concerning. Setting a specific grace period for RIRs to conform their policies to ICP-2 could undermine their autonomy. Each RIR should be able to adapt based on its unique situation rather than being pushed into compliance by arbitrary timelines, which could lead to disruptions in governance.

**Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Mandating a fixed grace period for RIRs to align with ICP-2 could undermine their autonomy and flexibility. Each RIR should be allowed to adapt based on its unique context, rather than being forced into compliance by arbitrary deadlines that could disrupt local governance.

**AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)**

---

I completely disagree with the provision requiring RIRs to conform to ICP-2 within a specific grace period. This could undermine their regional autonomy and flexibility, compelling them to adapt under pressure rather than allowing for a more gradual adjustment that suits their unique circumstances.

**K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)**

---

I am against the idea of imposing a fixed grace period for RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2. This could threaten their autonomy and flexibility, forcing RIRs to adapt under pressure rather than allowing them to respond at their own pace, which could disrupt local governance processes.

I find this requirement problematic. A specific grace period for RIRs to conform to ICP-2 could undermine their regional flexibility and autonomy. RIRs should be able to adapt at their own pace without being pressured into compliance within arbitrary timeframes, which may disrupt local governance.

**Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Mandating a specific grace period for RIRs to align with ICP-2 could erode their autonomy and flexibility. Each RIR operates under unique conditions and should be allowed to adapt at its own pace, without the pressure of arbitrary deadlines that could disrupt local governance.

**Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)**

---

I completely disagree with the requirement for a fixed grace period for RIRs to conform their policies to ICP-2. This could undermine their regional flexibility, forcing them to comply within arbitrary timeframes instead of allowing them to adapt based on their unique situations, which may disrupt local governance.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

This provision raises significant concerns for me. Imposing a specific grace period for RIRs to conform their policies to ICP-2 risks undermining their autonomy. Each RIR should have the freedom to adapt based on its unique context, rather than facing pressure to comply within a predetermined timeframe.

**Trabahan Pujari (Paruluniversity)**

---

I strongly disagree with this provision. Imposing a fixed grace period for RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 risks undermining regional autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should be given the opportunity to adapt at their own pace, based on their particular circumstances, rather than being forced to comply with arbitrary deadlines. This approach could lead to unnecessary pressure and potential disruption to local governance processes.

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. A fixed grace period for RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 could negatively impact their autonomy and flexibility. It is essential that RIRs can adapt at their own pace, considering their distinct circumstances, rather than being forced into compliance by arbitrary deadlines that may disrupt local governance.

**Juan Mesa (Hispasat)**

---

I find this provision concerning. Setting a specific grace period for RIRs to conform their policies to ICP-2 could undermine their autonomy. Each RIR should be able to adapt based on its unique situation rather than being pushed into compliance by arbitrary timelines, which could lead to disruptions in governance.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

I disagree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Mandating a fixed grace period for RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 undermines their regional autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should be allowed to adapt at their own pace, reflecting their unique situations, rather than being pressured into compliance by arbitrary deadlines.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

The bylaws are ok for now

**Danjuma bappa ahmed (Wownetworks limited nigeria)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. A fixed grace period for RIRs to adjust their policies to comply with ICP-2 could negatively impact their autonomy and flexibility. It is essential for RIRs to adapt at their own pace, considering their distinct situations, rather than being forced to meet arbitrary deadlines that may disrupt local governance.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

This requirement seems impractical. Imposing a set grace period for RIRs to align with ICP-2 could limit their autonomy and flexibility. Each RIR should have the opportunity to adapt at its own pace, considering its unique circumstances, rather than being forced into compliance within arbitrary timeframes that could create unnecessary pressure.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

I completely oppose this provision. Mandating a fixed grace period for RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 could endanger their autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should be free to adapt at their own pace, considering their unique circumstances, rather than being forced into compliance within arbitrary timeframes that could disrupt governance.

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

I find this stipulation concerning. Imposing a set grace period for RIRs to conform their policies to ICP-2 risks undermining their regional autonomy. Each RIR should be free to adapt based on its specific circumstances instead of feeling pressured into compliance by arbitrary timelines, which may lead to unnecessary stress and governance disruptions.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

I completely disagree with this approach. Mandating a specific grace period for RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 could inhibit regional autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should be allowed to adapt according to their unique situations rather than being pressured into compliance by arbitrary timeframes that could disrupt their governance processes.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---



I strongly oppose this requirement. A fixed grace period for RIRs to adjust their policies to comply with ICP-2 could negatively impact their autonomy and flexibility. It is essential for RIRs to adapt at their own pace, taking into account their distinct circumstances, rather than being forced to meet arbitrary deadlines that may disrupt local governance.

**Ashraful Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

I strongly disagree with this provision. Imposing a fixed grace period for RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 risks compromising regional autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should be given the opportunity to adapt at their own pace, based on their particular circumstances, rather than being forced to comply with arbitrary deadlines. This approach could lead to unnecessary pressure and potential disruption to local governance processes.

**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Imposing a specific grace period for RIRs to rectify their policies to align with ICP-2 could hinder regional autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should be allowed to adapt according to their unique situations instead of being pressured into compliance by arbitrary timeframes, which could disrupt governance.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---

I strongly disagree with this provision. Imposing a fixed grace period for RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 risks compromising regional autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should be given the opportunity to adapt at their own pace, based on their particular circumstances, rather than being forced to comply with arbitrary deadlines. This approach could lead to unnecessary pressure and potential disruption to local governance processes.

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

I strongly disagree with this requirement. A specific grace period for RIRs to adjust their policies to comply with ICP-2 could undermine their regional autonomy. It is crucial that RIRs can adapt based on their unique situations rather than being pressured into compliance by arbitrary deadlines, which might lead to governance disruptions.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---

I completely oppose this provision. Mandating a fixed grace period for RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 could endanger their autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should be free to adapt at their own pace, considering their unique circumstances, rather than being forced into compliance within arbitrary timeframes that could disrupt governance.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

I find this approach to be excessively rigid. Imposing a specific grace period for RIRs to conform to ICP-2 could compromise their regional autonomy. Each RIR should be allowed to adapt according to its unique context, rather than facing pressure to comply with arbitrary deadlines that may interfere with local governance.

**Phuc Pham (Advanced Network Systems VietNam Company Limited)**

---

I strongly disagree with this stipulation. Setting a fixed grace period for RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 risks undermining their autonomy. RIRs should have the flexibility to adapt at their own pace, taking into account their specific situations, rather than being forced to comply within arbitrary timeframes that could disrupt governance.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

I believe this provision is problematic. Requiring a set grace period for RIRs to conform their policies to ICP-2 could threaten their autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should have the freedom to adjust based on their unique circumstances instead of being coerced into compliance by arbitrary timelines, which might disrupt local governance.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

This requirement appears overly restrictive. Imposing a fixed grace period for RIRs to align with ICP-2 may jeopardize their regional autonomy. Each RIR should have the ability to adapt at its own pace, considering its specific context, rather than being forced into compliance within arbitrary deadlines, which could create undue pressure and disrupt governance.

**Giang Nguyen (NASA)**

---

Je ne suis pas du tout d'accord avec cette disposition. Imposer un délai de grâce fixe aux RIR pour aligner leurs politiques sur le PCI-2 risque de porter atteinte à l'autonomie et à la flexibilité régionales. Les RIR devraient avoir la possibilité de s'adapter à leur propre rythme, en tenant compte de leur situation particulière, plutôt que d'être contraints de se mettre en conformité dans des délais arbitraires. Cette approche pourrait entraîner des pressions inutiles et une perturbation potentielle des processus de gouvernance locale.

**HERVE EGNAKOU (HOLOGRAM IDENTIFICATION SERVICES S.A.R.L)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Establishing a fixed grace period for RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 could undermine their regional autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should be allowed to adjust at their own pace, considering their unique contexts, rather than being compelled to meet arbitrary deadlines, which could create unnecessary pressure and disrupt local governance.

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

I strongly disagree with this provision. Imposing a fixed grace period on RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 risks undermining regional autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should be given the opportunity to adapt at their own pace, based on their particular circumstances, rather than being forced to comply with arbitrary deadlines. This approach could lead to unnecessary pressure and potential disruption to local governance processes.

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---

I completely disagree with this approach. Mandating a specific grace period for RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 could inhibit regional autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should be permitted to adapt based on their unique situations, rather than being pressured into compliance by arbitrary timeframes that could disrupt their governance processes.

**Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. A fixed grace period for RIRs to adjust their policies to comply with ICP-2 could adversely affect their autonomy and flexibility. It is crucial that RIRs can adapt at their own pace, taking into consideration their distinct circumstances, rather than being compelled to meet arbitrary deadlines that may disrupt local governance.

**Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)**

---

I entirely disagree with this provision. Establishing a set grace period for RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 could compromise regional autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should be allowed to adjust at their own pace, considering their specific contexts, instead of being compelled to comply within arbitrary deadlines. This may create unnecessary pressure and disrupt local governance processes.

**Pooja Gopi (DM Digital Marketing)**

---

I strongly disagree with this stipulation. Setting a fixed grace period for RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 risks undermining their autonomy. RIRs should have the flexibility to adapt at their own pace, taking into account their specific situations, rather than being forced into compliance within arbitrary timeframes that could disrupt governance processes.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---

I find this provision problematic. Setting a specific grace period for RIRs to conform their policies to ICP-2 could undermine their autonomy. Each RIR should be able to adapt based on its unique situation rather than being pushed into compliance by arbitrary timelines, potentially leading to disruptions in governance.

**Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)**

---

I completely disagree with this approach. Requiring a fixed grace period for RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 could hinder their flexibility and autonomy. RIRs should have the freedom to adapt at their own pace, considering their specific circumstances, rather than being compelled to comply within arbitrary timeframes that could disrupt governance processes.

**Quyn Kim (VNPAY)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. A fixed grace period for RIRs to adjust their policies to align with ICP-2 could negatively impact their autonomy and flexibility. It is essential that RIRs have the ability to adapt at their own pace, taking into account their distinct circumstances, rather than being compelled to meet arbitrary deadlines that may disrupt local governance.

**Shahedul Islam Bhuiyan (Royal Green Limited)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Setting a defined grace period for RIRs to bring their practices in line with ICP-2 risks undermining their autonomy and flexibility. Each RIR operates in a unique context and should be allowed to adapt at its own pace, without the pressure of arbitrary deadlines that could disrupt their governance.

**Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)**

---

Question 8&9 Rectification If an amendment to ICP-2 conflicts with an RIR’s existing policies, practices, or bylaws, the amendment shall prescribe a reasonable but specific grace period for the RIR to bring its conflicting policies, practices, or bylaws into conformity with ICP-2 before the RIR may be considered non-compliant. 1- Strongly Disagree Answer I completely disagree with this provision. Setting a fixed grace period for RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 could undermine regional autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should be allowed to adapt at their own pace, considering their specific contexts, rather than being forced into compliance within arbitrary deadlines. This could create undue pressure and disrupt local governance processes.

**Anjan Deka (HDFC)**

---

If an amendment to ICP-2 conflicts with an RIR’s existing policies, practices, or bylaws, the amendment shall prescribe a reasonable but specific grace period for the RIR to bring its conflicting policies, practices, or bylaws into conformity with ICP-2 before the RIR may be considered non-compliant.

**Ketan Parmar (Bids Info Global)**

---

I find this provision unacceptable. Imposing a predetermined grace period for RIRs to align with ICP-2 threatens to diminish their regional autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should have the capacity to adjust based on their individual circumstances without being forced into compliance by an arbitrary timeframe, which could disrupt their local governance processes.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. The requirement for a specific grace period for RIRs to conform their policies to ICP-2 risks impinging on regional autonomy and flexibility. Each RIR has its own unique context, and they should be allowed to adapt at a pace that suits their needs instead of being subjected to arbitrary deadlines. This could lead to undue pressure and potentially disrupt local governance.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Mandating a fixed grace period for RIRs to align their policies with ICP-2 could undermine their regional autonomy and flexibility. RIRs should have the freedom to adapt at their own pace based on their unique circumstances, rather than being compelled to comply within arbitrary timelines. This could create unnecessary pressure and disrupt local governance processes.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---

No

**Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)**

---

Vague language and I would at least consider grandfathering in conflicting policies if possible

**Mike Burns (IPTrading)**

---

## 4. Coverage

---

All RIRs shall jointly ensure that all areas on the globe continually receive RIR services.

### 4.1. Coverage - Strongly Agree (5)

Hard to argue against this as it would imply some areas of the globe would not have access to RIR services.

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

We should replace the word jointly (which implies 2 RIRs) with collectively (which may mean more than 2).

**Babagana Digima (Nigerian Communications Commission)**

---

Absolutely vital.

**Jordan Carter (auDA)**

---

This seems like a fair mandate

**Colwayne Babb (Cable and Wireless)**

---

I think the Caribbean should have its own RIR because they are the good students in terms of respect for internet use and the place where there are the fewest DDOS type attacks.

**Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)**

---

Yes i agree. We're in this together.

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

I fully support the principle that "All RIRs shall jointly ensure that all areas on the globe continually receive RIR services." This collaborative approach is essential for several reasons: **Ensuring Comprehensive Coverage:** By working together, RIRs can guarantee that every region, regardless of its size or specific needs, receives consistent and reliable services. This joint effort helps prevent any geographical gaps in resource distribution and management. **Leveraging Collective Expertise:** Collaboration among RIRs allows for the sharing of best practices, knowledge, and technical expertise. This collective intelligence enhances the overall effectiveness and efficiency of RIR operations globally. **Maintaining Regional Autonomy:** While RIRs work together to ensure global coverage, each RIR can continue to maintain its autonomy and address the unique requirements of its respective region. This balance ensures that regional specificities are respected while achieving a unified global standard. **Enhancing Resilience and Stability:** Joint efforts contribute to a more resilient and stable Internet governance framework. By supporting each other, RIRs can better handle challenges, adapt to changes, and ensure uninterrupted services worldwide. **Promoting Equity and Inclusion:** A united approach ensures that all regions, including those that are less developed or have limited resources, receive the necessary support and services. This promotes a more equitable distribution of Internet

resources and fosters inclusive growth. In summary, the collective responsibility of all RIRs to ensure global service continuity aligns with the core principles of decentralization and regional autonomy. It fosters a cooperative environment where each RIR can thrive while contributing to the overarching goal of a well-governed and universally accessible Internet.

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

I agree with this principle to a large extent. Ensuring that all regions of the world receive continuous RIR services aligns with the core mission of equitable and inclusive Internet resource management. However, achieving this requires a collaborative effort that respects regional autonomy and diverse operational contexts. It is essential to balance global service availability with the unique needs and capabilities of each region to ensure sustainable and effective delivery.

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

I agree with this principle to a large extent. Ensuring that all regions of the world receive continuous RIR services aligns with the core mission of equitable and inclusive Internet resource management. However, achieving this requires a collaborative effort that respects regional autonomy and diverse operational contexts. It is essential to balance global service availability with the unique needs and capabilities of each region to ensure sustainable and effective delivery.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

RIR services are essential to the continuous operation of the internet and therefore vital to ensuring trust and ongoing reliability.

**Narelle Clark (Internet Association of Australia)**

---

Agree

**Warwick Ward-Cox (Network Platforms)**

---

principle underscores the collective responsibility of all RIRs to ensure global internet connectivity. It emphasizes the importance of collaboration and coordination among RIRs to address the evolving needs of the internet community worldwide. By working together, RIRs can guarantee that internet number resources are available and accessible to all regions, promoting inclusivity and equitable growth of the internet.

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

With effective improvements to fulfill its function and as consistent as possible among RIRs. And add legal statements

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

Protection of internet services

**Fabrice TEUGUIA (PCP-ACEFA)**

---

This ensures compliance by all involved

**Emmanuel Kitcher (University of Environment and Sustainable Development)**

---

We need the services of RIRs

**Mark Elkins (Posix Systems)**

---

Coordinating RIR service coverage efforts through the NRO could be highly effective. The NRO, as the coordinating body of all RIRs, is well-positioned to streamline global service provision and address any coverage gaps. Here's why NRO coordination would be beneficial and how it could work effectively: The NRO can facilitate the creation of a unified, global strategy to identify underserved regions or areas with growing needs. By pooling resources, the RIRs can work together more efficiently to deploy services where needed, avoid duplication, and ensure that all regions receive consistent support. The NRO can act as a central point of communication for coordination between RIRs, which is particularly useful for tackling cross-regional challenges. For example, when new regions demand IP address allocations or technical assistance, the NRO could oversee these requests and assign the appropriate RIR(s) to provide support. Policies that affect global resource management could be implemented consistently across regions through NRO oversight. This would help standardize approaches to new challenges, such as IPv6 adoption or emerging security issues, ensuring uniform standards in all regions. By coordinating through the NRO, RIRs can better address specific regional needs, such as capacity building or technical support in underserved areas. Additionally, in emergencies or urgent situations, the NRO can organize rapid response teams from multiple RIRs to provide immediate assistance to impacted areas, whether that's technical support, resource allocation, or training. The NRO can act as a knowledge-sharing hub, allowing RIRs to share best practices and lessons learned from their respective regions. This collaborative approach could enhance service quality and enable RIRs to adopt effective solutions quickly in response to global challenges. Centralized coordination through the NRO allows for consistent reporting and monitoring of service coverage, providing the global community with transparent updates on how well each area is being served. This transparency can boost trust in RIRs and the internet governance structure as a whole. The NRO could conduct regular assessments to map out service coverage globally and identify areas where additional support or resources are needed. Based on these assessments, the NRO could work with specific RIRs to plan and implement necessary interventions. The NRO could organize joint training programs or outreach initiatives focused on areas that are underserved or facing new challenges. By involving experts from multiple RIRs, these initiatives would bring diverse knowledge and resources to each region. In cases where an RIR needs additional resources to serve a region, the NRO could facilitate the sharing of technical or human resources from other RIRs to address immediate needs, ensuring consistent service levels globally. Establishing working groups within the NRO with representatives from each RIR could enable consistent coordination on emerging issues, new services, or regional expansions. These working groups could also recommend policy adjustments to address common challenges. The NRO could oversee efforts to ensure consistency in service standards worldwide while allowing individual RIRs to tailor specific implementations to meet regional nuances. The involvement of the NRO in coordinating global service coverage efforts underscores a commitment to a well-governed and equitable internet infrastructure, strengthening trust in the RIR system and the broader internet governance model.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

For continuity

**Rita Kumi (Ghana Telecommunication Company)**

---

Perfect

**Raymond Mamattah (EGIGFA)**

---

RIRs role is pivotal and should provide services to all its members.

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

5

**Taye Oyebola (Aso Savings and Loans Plc)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Requiring all RIRs to ensure that every area globally receives their services undermines regional autonomy and could lead to inefficiencies. RIRs should focus on their specific communities rather than being obligated to fulfill global demands.

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

I agree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

It makes sense

**Danjuma bappa ahmed (Wownetworks limited nigeria)**

---

juste

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

Agree

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---

Ensuring consistent global coverage prevents regions from lacking essential services, which is crucial for global internet stability and equity.

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

Yes

**Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)**

---

totally agree

**Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)**

---

I agree

**Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)**

---



There is one global Internet. RIRs should be regionalized to promote accessibility to members and not to promote fragmentation of the Internet.

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

This is a global community effort and all should back each other up to keep registration services operational.

**Brian Jones (Virginia Tech)**

---

How do we handle conflicts on the edges? For example: LIRs in the West Indies getting resources from RIPE instead of ARIN

**Xavier Clark (Harris Computer)**

---

However, the RIR also needs to comply with government regulations and policies.

**YingChu Chen (Taiwan Institute of Economic Research)**

---

I like it jointly ensured, so other RIRs can step in if there is any area not being served.

**Mike Burns (IPTrading)**

---

Clearly, a reasonable and desirable principle.

**Andrew Gallo (The George Washington University)**

---

Adjust wording to reflect the growing deployment of space-borne internet networks. The moon is close enough to share our Internet. But far enough away that one or more separate blocks of addresses might be administratively useful

**Leo Vegoda (And Polus LLC)**

---

The existing structure multiple RIRs and exclusive regions should be reviewed with respect to whether this is the most efficient and cost effective approach.

**Kevin Meynell (Individual)**

---

Simple but good condition which must meet as the Internet Number Resource Management scheme

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

Very important

**Sander Steffann (SJM Steffann Consultancy)**

---

Not mentioned here (and likely too specific) is the concern of sanctions. If an RIRs' home country sanctions another country under that RIRs scope, should it (temporarily or permanently) be moved to a non-sanctioning RIR?

**Tyler O'Meara (Penguin Networks)**

---

## 4.2. Coverage - Somewhat Agree (4)

I wonder whether it should be jointly and collectively, since if someone doesn't want to play nice the current language suggests that the whole assurance fails. I am not sure this nuance is important for the principles stage, except to make sure everyone agrees on what is the right outcome.

**Andrew Sullivan (N/A)**

---

In agreement

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

Africa as a region is far behind but rapidly growing in terms of internet and therefore must be given preference especially in light of resource allocation

**Brian Longwe (Converged Technology Networks)**

---

agree

**Mohammad Mubarak Alfalasi (Telecommunication and Digital government Regulatory Authority)**

---

No comment

**Kelvin Horng Woei Ong (Propnex)**

---

The Internet is expanding to space. The notion of "globe" should be updated in this context, including a possible SpaceIR or the ICP itself

**Marc Blanchet (Viagenie)**

---

Entities should use the RIR for where resources will be primarily used, and it's OK to restrict resource utilization for out-of region such that a LIR/EU may need to belong to multiple RIR.

**Jaco Kroon (Interexcel World Connection)**

---

none

**James Laferriere (n/a)**

---

I agree with this principle to a large extent. It reflects the global nature of the internet and the shared responsibility of RIRs to provide continuous and equitable services to all regions. By ensuring that no area is excluded from access to vital RIR services, this principle helps maintain the internet's integrity and ensures fair resource distribution. However, the practical implementation may require significant collaboration, resources, and overcoming regional challenges, which could test the capacity of RIRs. Nonetheless, striving for global service coverage is a vital goal for the sustainable development of the internet.

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

The principle ensures global service but doesn't address how underserved or resource-constrained regions are supported. The principle for equitable resource allocation across regions may strengthen the inclusiveness of the ecosystem.

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

Total coverage is vital

**John Haydon (Education)**

---

this will depend on the service they intend to share

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

The principle of ensuring global RIR service coverage may require further guidance for cases where certain regions face exceptional circumstances. For example, in areas under sanctions, affected by conflicts, or where RIR services face limitations due to local policies, it might be challenging to maintain consistent service

**Anastasia Kleiman (Voldeta)**

---

I agree

**Kate Petras (DCXV)**

---

I only have some issues about areas of the globe where governments decide to invade other countries. Conflict areas are complex. But i mostly agree with the full coverage, even if part of it, at some point gets to be blocked.

**Carlos Friaças (FCT\| FCCN)**

---

### **4.3. Coverage - Neutral (3)**

There is room for improvement and clarity in this principle given that the responsibility would be shared while the non-overlap clause could prohibit action. The topic of shift of responsibilities for sub-regions needs to be explicitly addressed.

**Peter Koch (Individual)**

---

Forcing all RIRs to ensure global coverage undermines regional autonomy and leads to inefficiencies. Each RIR should have the freedom to focus on its own community's needs rather than being obligated to meet global service expectations.

**Noel OUPOH (DATACONNECT AFRICA)**

---

It is crucial for all RIRs to ensure that RIR services reach every area globally, emphasizing the importance of facilitating the portability of IP resources for organizations.

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---

Again, IPv4 is the issue.... AfrINIC is (one of?) the "problem child" here as there had been fraud and other things happening with resources that have a high monetary value... if the resources don't have any real/intrinsic value (like IPv6 and 6-8digit ASNs) then I'd agree with just about all of this

**Hendrik Visage (HeViS.Co Systems Pty Ltd)**

---

No comments

**Pacharaporn Wangwinyoo (ZIM (Thailand) Co., LTD.)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Requiring all RIRs to ensure that every part of the globe receives their services undermines their autonomy and may lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should have the discretion to prioritize its community's needs over global obligations.

**Alex Kwan (Wiplus Malaysia)**

---

Agree on this

**Hann Jye Ng (MyTeksi Sdn Bhd)**

---

This provision seems overly demanding. Requiring all RIRs to ensure global coverage compromises their autonomy and could lead to inefficiencies. RIRs should be free to focus on their own communities instead of being pressured to meet global obligations.

**Sidonie Hacking (-)**

---

I completely disagree with this approach. Forcing all RIRs to provide global coverage undermines their autonomy and could lead to inefficiencies. RIRs should have the freedom to focus on their local communities' needs instead of being obligated to fulfill global service requirements.

**Jun Wen (one futures technology sdn bhd)**

---

I find this provision unacceptable. Requiring all RIRs to ensure that every region receives RIR services compromises regional autonomy and may lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should have the flexibility to prioritize its own community's needs.

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

this definition must be put in context to avoid RIR overlapping service region

**Adeola Alain P. AINA (Digital Intelligence Services, Sarl)**

---

#### **4.4. Coverage - Somewhat Disagree (2)**

It is crucial for all RIRs to jointly ensure that services are available globally, emphasizing the importance of facilitating the portability of IP resources.

**Neonjyoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

#### **4.5. Coverage - Strongly Disagree (1)**

It is imperative that all RIRs collaborate to ensure that RIR services are available globally, including supporting IP resource portability.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

Together, all RIRs shall guarantee that RIR services reach every corner of the world, allowing for the seamless transfer of IP resources.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

All RIRs are tasked with ensuring that RIR services are provided consistently worldwide, including promoting the portability of IP resources.

**Tipu Khan (Zx Online Ltd)**

---

All RIRs must unite to ensure that RIR services are accessible in all global areas, including the facilitation of IP resource transfers.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

All RIRs shall jointly commit to delivering RIR services to every part of the globe, including facilitating the movement of IP resources between RIRs.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---

It is crucial for all RIRs to collaborate in ensuring that RIR services are provided consistently around the world, allowing for the easy transfer of IP resources.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

All RIRs must unite to guarantee that RIR services are available globally, including supporting the portability of IP resources for seamless transfers.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---

All RIRs are committed to working together to ensure that every region receives RIR services consistently, facilitating the transfer of IP resources.

**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

This requirement appears overly restrictive. Mandating that all RIRs ensure global service coverage diminishes their regional autonomy and can create inefficiencies. Each RIR should concentrate on serving its own community rather than being forced to meet international expectations.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

All RIRs shall jointly ensure that every area receives uninterrupted RIR services, including enabling the portability of IP resources between regions.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

All RIRs must commit to ensuring that RIR services are accessible globally, which includes enabling the movement of IP resources between regions.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

It is imperative that all RIRs jointly ensure the provision of RIR services in every area, including facilitating the portability of IP resources.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

This provision seems overly demanding. Requiring all RIRs to ensure global coverage compromises their autonomy and could lead to inefficiencies. RIRs should be free to focus on their own communities rather than being pressured to meet global obligations.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Mandating that all RIRs guarantee worldwide coverage undermines their regional autonomy and can lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should prioritize its community's needs instead of being obligated to fulfill global service requirements.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---

All RIRs have a joint responsibility to ensure that every global region receives uninterrupted RIR services, including facilitating the transfer of IP resources as needed.

**Taslima Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

To ensure continuous RIR services worldwide, all RIRs should work together to enable the portability of IP resources, ensuring that all regions are adequately supported.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

A collaborative approach among all RIRs is crucial to ensure that RIR services are accessible in every region, including promoting IP resource portability.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

All RIRs must jointly ensure that every area receives ongoing RIR services, while also facilitating the seamless transfer of IP resources.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

To ensure that every part of the globe is served with RIR services, all RIRs must cooperate, particularly in facilitating the seamless transfer of IP resources.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

All RIRs should work collaboratively to guarantee that RIR services are provided continuously worldwide, with an emphasis on the transferability of IP resources.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

All RIRs should work collaboratively to guarantee that RIR services are provided continuously worldwide, with an emphasis on the transferability of IP resources.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

It is crucial for all RIRs to collaborate to ensure that RIR services are continuously available globally, including supporting the portability of IP resources across RIRs.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

All RIRs must work together to ensure that every region is served by RIR services without interruption, including facilitating IP resource transfers among organizations.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

The joint efforts of all RIRs are essential to ensure that RIR services are reliably provided worldwide, while also allowing for the transfer of IP resources.

**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

All RIRs must unite to ensure that every part of the world consistently receives RIR services, facilitating the easy movement of IP resources between organizations.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

All RIRs must work in unison to ensure that every region worldwide is continually supported with RIR services, including the smooth transfer of IP resources.

**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

The collaboration of all RIRs is necessary to guarantee that RIR services are continuously available globally, including enabling organizations to transfer IP resources.

**Pham Gia Khiem (Phat Tai Logistics)**

---

This requirement seems impractical. Mandating that all RIRs ensure global coverage reduces their autonomy and may result in inefficiencies. RIRs should be able to concentrate on their own communities' needs instead of being pressured to meet global service expectations.

**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

I find this stipulation concerning. Forcing all RIRs to ensure global coverage compromises their independence and could lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should focus on the unique needs of its community rather than global service expectations.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

It is imperative for all RIRs to jointly ensure that every region receives consistent RIR services, including enabling the portability of IP resources.

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

The joint efforts of all RIRs are essential to guarantee that all global regions receive continuous RIR services, including enabling organizations to transfer IP resources freely.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

All RIRs should work jointly to ensure that every area on the globe has access to RIR services, including facilitating the transfer of IP resources.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

Together, all RIRs must ensure that every region receives continuous RIR services, while also promoting the transfer of IP resources between organizations.

**Kwan Ke Yue (TBWA/ Kuala Lumpur)**

---

It is vital for all RIRs to collaborate to ensure that RIR services are provided without interruption worldwide, including fostering the portability of IP resources.

**Sean Carroll (The One Academy)**

---

It is essential that all RIRs collaboratively ensure that RIR services are continuously available worldwide, including allowing organizations to transfer IP resources freely.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

All RIRs are jointly obligated to ensure that every area globally receives RIR services without interruption, including facilitating the movement of IP resources

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

All RIRs shall ensure that every region receives uninterrupted RIR services, which includes facilitating the portability of IP resources for smooth transitions between organizations.

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**

---

All RIRs must jointly ensure that every region has access to RIR services, emphasizing the importance of enabling the portability of IP resources.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---



---

All RIRs must collaborate to ensure uninterrupted RIR services worldwide, including the ability to transfer IP resources freely between regions.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---

All RIRs are responsible for jointly ensuring that every region receives RIR services continuously, while also promoting the portability of IP resources.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---

All RIRs shall collectively ensure that RIR services are consistently provided across the globe, including enabling organizations to transfer IP resources freely.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

It is essential that all RIRs work together to guarantee that RIR services reach all global areas, ensuring the portability of IP resources to facilitate transfers.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---

All RIRs must collaborate to guarantee that continuous RIR services are available in every area, while also facilitating the portability of IP resources.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

All RIRs shall collectively ensure that every corner of the globe consistently receives RIR services, including enabling seamless transfer of IP resources across regions.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

It is crucial that all RIRs work together to provide uninterrupted RIR services worldwide, promoting the seamless transfer of IP resources.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

It is essential for all RIRs to collaborate in guaranteeing that all areas globally have access to RIR services and support the portability of IP resources.

**Md Abu Sayeem Siddique Siddique (ServicEngine Ltd)**

---

All RIRs shall jointly ensure that every region receives continuous RIR services, while also facilitating the transfer of IP resources between organizations.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

All RIRs must unite to ensure that every region receives uninterrupted RIR services, facilitating the easy transfer of IP resources for organizations.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

It is vital for all RIRs to collaboratively ensure that RIR services are accessible in all areas, including allowing organizations to transfer IP resources freely.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---

It is essential for all RIRs to work together to ensure that RIR services are consistently accessible worldwide, particularly with respect to facilitating IP resource transfers.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---

All RIRs should collaborate to guarantee that RIR services are available universally, with a strong emphasis on facilitating IP resource portability.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

All RIRs must jointly ensure that RIR services are accessible everywhere, with a strong emphasis on facilitating the easy transfer of IP resources.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

It is crucial for all RIRs to collaboratively ensure continuous access to RIR services worldwide, including enabling the portability of IP resources for organizations.

**Trang Tran (VNPT Technologies)**

---

It is essential for all RIRs to jointly ensure that every region has access to RIR services, including the facilitation of IP resource portability for greater organizational flexibility.

**Minh Hoang (ANSV)**

---

All RIRs should cooperate to ensure that RIR services are consistently available worldwide, particularly facilitating the portability of IP resources for organizations.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**

---

Together, all RIRs are tasked with providing continuous RIR services globally, while facilitating the portability of IP resources for efficient management.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**

---

All RIRs shall ensure that every region receives ongoing RIR services, including enabling organizations to transfer IP resources seamlessly.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---

It is the responsibility of all RIRs to work together to ensure that RIR services are consistently available globally, promoting the transferability of IP resources.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

All RIRs shall jointly ensure the uninterrupted provision of RIR services worldwide, including facilitating the portability of IP resources for organizations.

**Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)**

---

All RIRs are jointly responsible for ensuring that RIR services are available in every region, including enabling organizations to transfer IP resources freely.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

All RIRs must collaborate to provide consistent RIR services across the globe, while facilitating the seamless transfer of IP resources between organizations.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---

Together, all RIRs shall ensure that every region globally has access to ongoing RIR services, including the support for the portability of IP resources.

**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

All RIRs will jointly ensure the continuous availability of RIR services in every part of the world, facilitating the transfer of IP resources among organizations.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---

All RIRs shall work in unison to ensure that all regions receive uninterrupted RIR services, including enabling the portability of IP resources for organizational flexibility.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

It is essential that all RIRs work together to guarantee that RIR services are continually available across the globe, facilitating the movement of IP resources between organizations.

**Ryan Khaw (Alsco Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

All RIRs shall work together to ensure consistent access to RIR services worldwide, particularly by enabling the portability of IP resources for seamless transitions.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

It is imperative for all RIRs to collaborate to guarantee that RIR services are available globally, including facilitating the transfer of IP resources between organizations.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Apmic)**

---

All RIRs should work together to provide continuous RIR services globally, particularly by facilitating the portability of IP resources across regions.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

All RIRs must ensure that RIR services reach every area of the world consistently, including enabling the seamless transfer of IP resources between organizations.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

Joint collaboration among all RIRs is necessary to guarantee that every corner of the globe receives continuous RIR services, promoting IP resource portability.

**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

All RIRs have a joint responsibility to ensure that every global region receives uninterrupted RIR services, including facilitating the transfer of IP resources as needed.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

To ensure continuous RIR services worldwide, all RIRs should work together to enable the portability of IP resources, ensuring that all regions are adequately supported.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

All RIRs should collaborate to guarantee that RIR services are available in every region, actively facilitating the transfer of IP resources.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**

---

All RIRs must collaborate to ensure that RIR services are available worldwide, with a focus on enabling the smooth portability of IP resources for organizations.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

Jointly, all RIRs must guarantee that all areas of the globe consistently receive RIR services, including enabling organizations to transfer IP resources freely across RIRs.

**Jeremy Cheong (Infineon technologies)**

---

All RIRs must work together to ensure that every region receives uninterrupted RIR services, promoting the portability of IP resources for organizations worldwide.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

All RIRs should ensure that their services reach every area across the globe, emphasizing the importance of facilitating the seamless portability of IP resources.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

All RIRs must work together to guarantee that RIR services are available globally, with a focus on promoting the portability of IP resources among organizations.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

I find this provision unacceptable. Requiring all RIRs to ensure comprehensive global coverage compromises their autonomy and may lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should focus on its unique community needs rather than being forced to meet global standards.

**Sohel Kabir (Kabir Traders)**

---

I completely oppose the notion that all RIRs must jointly ensure global coverage. This undermines regional autonomy and can lead to inefficiencies, as each RIR should focus on addressing its community's specific needs.

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

All RIRs should work together to ensure that services are accessible in all regions, emphasizing the importance of facilitating IP resource portability for organizations.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---

It is crucial for all RIRs to collaboratively ensure that RIR services are available globally, including facilitating the unrestricted portability of IP resources.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---

The Region for which an RIR is accountable shall cover a broad multinational geographic area without overlapping with another RIR, while also allowing for the portability of IP resources to facilitate smooth resource management.

**Catalina Cueca (Manpower)**

---

RIRs must ensure that their services are accessible worldwide, including promoting the portability of IP resources to allow organizations to transfer resources without barriers.

**Camilo Riveros (Manpower)**

---

in practice it will be difficult because not all RIR have the same means to do it.

**alexis ndoumga (ministry of posts and telecommunications)**

---

This approach appears overly ambitious. Requiring all RIRs to guarantee global service undermines their regional autonomy and may create inefficiencies. Each RIR should prioritize the needs of its own community without being obligated to meet global standards.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

All RIRs must collaborate to ensure universal access to RIR services, including facilitating the seamless portability of IP resources among organizations.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating that all RIRs provide global coverage compromises their independence and can lead to inefficiencies. RIRs should have the freedom to prioritize their community's needs.

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Forcing all RIRs to guarantee worldwide coverage undermines their regional autonomy and could lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should have the freedom to focus on its own community's requirements rather than being compelled to meet global obligations.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

This requirement seems impractical. Mandating that all RIRs ensure global coverage diminishes their autonomy and may result in inefficiencies. RIRs should be able to concentrate on their own communities' needs instead of being pressured to meet global service expectations.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

la priorité doit être accordée l'espace géographique pour permettre à la communauté d'assurer le suivi et l'évaluation de la gouvernance du RIR

**Nico Tshintu bakajika (ISPA-DRC)**

---

I find this approach overly limiting. Requiring all RIRs to ensure global service coverage compromises their autonomy and may lead to inefficiencies. RIRs should prioritize the needs of their communities instead of being obligated to fulfill international expectations.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Forcing all RIRs to guarantee worldwide coverage undermines their regional autonomy and could lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should have the freedom to focus on its own community's requirements rather than being compelled to meet global obligations.

**Anh Dang (NASA)**

---

I fundamentally oppose this stipulation. Forcing all RIRs to guarantee global coverage undermines their regional independence and may create inefficiencies. Each RIR should be free to concentrate on its community's needs rather than global expectations.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

This approach seems overly demanding. Requiring all RIRs to ensure global service availability undermines their autonomy and could lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should focus on its local community's requirements without global obligations.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

This provision raises serious concerns. Forcing RIRs to guarantee global service coverage undermines regional autonomy and could result in inefficiencies. Each RIR should focus on addressing the needs of its own community.

**Prasanta Haloi (Pwd)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Georges Lallogo (ANPTIC)**

---

This requirement seems impractical. Mandating that all RIRs ensure global coverage reduces their autonomy and may result in inefficiencies. RIRs should be able to concentrate on their own communities' needs instead of being pressured to meet global service expectations.

**Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)**

---

I fundamentally disagree with the stipulation that all RIRs must ensure that every area receives RIR services. This requirement undermines their autonomy and may lead to inefficiencies, as RIRs should prioritize their own community needs.

**AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)**

---

I find this provision to be counterproductive. Mandating that all RIRs ensure global coverage threatens their autonomy and could create inefficiencies. Each RIR should have the flexibility to focus on its own community's needs.

**K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Forcing all RIRs to provide global coverage undermines their autonomy and can create inefficiencies. Each RIR should prioritize the needs of its community instead of being obligated to fulfill global service requirements.

**Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)**

---

I strongly oppose the idea that all RIRs should collectively ensure global service coverage. This undermines their autonomy and could lead to inefficiencies, as each RIR should focus on meeting the needs of its own community.

**Fuhui Zhang (University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)**

---

I completely disagree with the requirement for all RIRs to work together to provide global coverage. This undermines the independence of each RIR and may create inefficiencies, as they should concentrate on their own community's needs.

**Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)**

---

I fundamentally disagree with the requirement that all RIRs must collaborate to provide global RIR services. This undermines their autonomy and may create inefficiencies, as RIRs should focus on addressing their own community needs.

**Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)**

---

I find this provision to be detrimental. Mandating that all RIRs ensure global coverage undermines their autonomy and could lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should have the freedom to meet the specific needs of its community.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

This provision raises significant concerns. Mandating that all RIRs provide global services compromises their regional autonomy and could result in inefficiencies. RIRs should have the flexibility to concentrate on the needs of their communities rather than being held to global standards.

**Trabahan Pujari (Paruluniversity)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Mandating that all RIRs provide global coverage undermines regional autonomy and can create inefficiencies. Each RIR should focus on meeting the specific needs of its own community rather than being pressured to meet global standards.

**Juan Mesa (Hispasat)**

---

I find this approach overly limiting. Requiring all RIRs to ensure global service coverage compromises their autonomy and may lead to inefficiencies. RIRs should prioritize the needs of their communities instead of being obligated to fulfill international expectations.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

I strongly disagree with the requirement for all RIRs to ensure global coverage. This obligation undermines regional autonomy and can lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should prioritize the needs of its own community instead of being forced to meet global service demands.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

I find this stipulation too rigid. Limiting an RIR to a large area without overlaps may hinder flexibility and not adequately address unique regional requirements. Allowing overlaps can enhance redundancy and better respond to local challenges.

**Pornpipat Kitireanglarp (ZERIWELLPLUS Co., Ltd.)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Requiring all RIRs to ensure that every part of the globe receives their services undermines their autonomy and may lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should have the discretion to prioritize its community's needs over global obligations.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Requiring all RIRs to ensure that every area globally receives their services undermines regional autonomy and could lead to inefficiencies. RIRs should focus on their specific communities rather than being obligated to fulfill global demands.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

I completely disagree with this condition. Mandating that all RIRs guarantee global service coverage undermines their regional autonomy and may lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should concentrate on the needs of its local community rather than being forced to meet global standards.



I find this stipulation concerning. Requiring all RIRs to guarantee worldwide service coverage compromises their regional autonomy and could result in inefficiencies. RIRs should focus on addressing the specific needs of their communities rather than being compelled to fulfill global demands.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

This requirement seems excessively restrictive. Mandating that all RIRs provide global service coverage reduces their regional autonomy and can create inefficiencies. Each RIR should focus on serving its own community instead of being forced to meet international expectations.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Requiring all RIRs to ensure that every part of the globe receives their services undermines their autonomy and may lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should have the discretion to prioritize its community's needs over global obligations.

**Ashraful Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

This provision seems overly demanding. Forcing all RIRs to ensure worldwide coverage diminishes their autonomy and could lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should concentrate on serving its own community instead of being obliged to meet global service expectations.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

I find this requirement too rigid. Forcing all RIRs to provide global coverage undermines their autonomy and can create inefficiencies. Each RIR should be allowed to prioritize its community's needs without the obligation to meet global service expectations.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---

I completely disagree with this condition. Mandating that all RIRs guarantee global service coverage undermines their regional autonomy and may lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should concentrate on the needs of its local community rather than being forced to meet global standards.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

This provision seems overly demanding. Requiring all RIRs to ensure global coverage compromises their autonomy and could lead to inefficiencies. RIRs should be free to focus on their own communities rather than being pressured to meet global obligations.

**Phuc Pham (Advanced Network Systems VietNam Company Limited)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Mandating that all RIRs guarantee worldwide coverage undermines their regional autonomy and can lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should prioritize its community's needs instead of being obligated to fulfill global service requirements.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

I find this requirement impractical. Mandating that all RIRs ensure global service coverage undermines their regional autonomy and may lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should focus on the specific needs of its community rather than being pressured to meet global expectations.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

I completely disagree with this approach. Forcing all RIRs to ensure global coverage compromises their autonomy and may lead to inefficiencies. RIRs should have the freedom to prioritize the needs of their local communities instead of being obligated to meet global service requirements.

**Giang Nguyen (NASA)**

---

La proposition risque également de réduire la responsabilité et la transparence des RIR dans leurs régions respectives, ce qui pourrait conduire à une gouvernance moins sensible aux besoins et aux préoccupations locales

**HERVE EGNAKOU (HOLOGRAM IDENTIFICATION SERVICES S.A.R.L)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating that all RIRs provide global coverage undermines their regional autonomy and may lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should be free to prioritize the needs of its own community instead of being obligated to meet global service expectations.

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

This requirement seems excessively restrictive. Mandating that all RIRs provide global service coverage reduces their regional autonomy and can create inefficiencies. Each RIR should focus on serving its own community rather than being forced to meet international expectations.

**Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Requiring all RIRs to ensure that every part of the globe receives their services undermines their autonomy and may lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should have the discretion to prioritize its community's needs over global obligations.

**Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Requiring all RIRs to provide global coverage undermines their regional autonomy and may lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should have the freedom to prioritize the needs of its own community instead of being obligated to meet global service expectations.

**Pooja Gopi (DM Digital Marketing)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Forcing all RIRs to guarantee worldwide coverage undermines their regional autonomy and can result in inefficiencies. Each RIR should prioritize its community's needs rather than being obligated to fulfill global service requirements.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---

I find this approach overly limiting. Requiring all RIRs to ensure global service coverage compromises their autonomy and may create inefficiencies. RIRs should prioritize the needs of their communities instead of being obligated to fulfill international expectations.

**Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Forcing all RIRs to guarantee worldwide coverage undermines their regional autonomy and could lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should have the freedom to focus on its own community's requirements rather than being compelled to meet global obligations.

**Quyn Kim (VNPAY)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Requiring all RIRs to ensure that every area of the globe receives RIR services undermines their autonomy and could lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should have the discretion to prioritize its community's needs over global obligations.

**Shahedul Islam Bhuiyan (Royal Green Limited)**

---

I completely oppose the requirement for all RIRs to jointly ensure that every part of the globe receives RIR services. This not only undermines regional autonomy but could also lead to inefficiencies. RIRs should prioritize their own communities' needs instead of being bound by global obligations.

**Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)**

---

Question 10&11 Coverage All RIRs shall jointly ensure that all areas on the globe continually receive RIR services. 1- Strongly Disagree Answer I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating that all RIRs ensure global coverage undermines regional autonomy and could lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should be free to prioritize the needs of its own community rather than being obligated to fulfill global service expectations.

**Anjan Deka (HDFC)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating that all RIRs ensure global coverage undermines regional autonomy and could lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should be free to prioritize the needs of its own community rather than being obligated to fulfill global service expectations.

**Ketan Parmar (Bids Info Global)**

---

I find this provision problematic. Mandating that all RIRs ensure global coverage compromises regional autonomy and may lead to inefficiencies. RIRs should have the freedom to concentrate on their own communities rather than being bound by global service obligations.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

I strongly oppose the idea that all RIRs should be responsible for ensuring that every area of the globe receives RIR services. This requirement undermines regional autonomy and could create inefficiencies, as each RIR should focus on the specific needs of its own community.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

I completely disagree with the requirement that all RIRs must jointly ensure global coverage. This undermines regional autonomy and could lead to inefficiencies. Each RIR should prioritize its own community's needs instead of being obligated to meet universal service expectations.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---

## 5. Service Region

---

The Region for which an RIR is responsible shall cover a large multinational geographic area and shall not overlap with that of another RIR.

### 5.1. Service Region - Strongly Agree (5)

Consistent with current approach to only have one RIR offering service in a given territory, to avoid confusion. This policy process not the time to consider market/system changes like allowing users anywhere, to inspire competition between RIRs.

**Jordan Carter (auDA)**

---

The RIRs are geographically separated and this principle must be scrupulously respected

**Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)**

---

Nothing to add or detract

**Brian Longwe (Converged Technology Networks)**

---

Yes agree.

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

I agree with this principle to a moderate extent. Defining non-overlapping, large multinational regions helps prevent conflicts and promotes clarity in resource management responsibilities. However, strict adherence to this principle may overlook the need for flexibility in addressing unique regional or cross-border challenges. Collaboration between RIRs should allow for practical solutions in cases where overlapping coverage could better serve the needs of local communities.

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

I agree with this principle to a moderate extent. Defining non-overlapping, large multinational regions helps prevent conflicts and promotes clarity in resource management responsibilities. However, strict adherence to this principle may overlook the need for flexibility in addressing unique regional or cross-border challenges. Collaboration between RIRs should allow for practical solutions in cases where overlapping coverage could better serve the needs of local communities.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

It is vital that RIRs not compete with each other nor undermine the clarity in the applicable rules and effectiveness of overall services.

**Narelle Clark (Internet Association of Australia)**

---

Provide effective channels among RIRs to prevent someone wrong doing to cross regions with legal punishment.

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

To increase law enforcement

**Fabrice TEUGUIA (PCP-ACEFA)**

---

Principle is clear. No comment

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

The principle that an RIR's region should cover a large multinational geographic area and not overlap with another RIR's region is crucial for maintaining efficient, equitable, and conflict-free management of IP address allocation and other internet resources. Here's why this principle is important: Ensuring that RIR regions don't overlap prevents duplication of IP address allocations, which could cause conflicts if multiple RIRs were allowed to assign the same resources within the same region. This separation avoids inconsistencies and conflicts in resource allocation and ensures clarity for both RIRs and the communities they serve. Non-overlapping regions establish clear boundaries of responsibility for each RIR, making it easier to manage and track internet resources. This accountability ensures that each RIR is solely responsible for IP address allocation, policy enforcement, and support within its region, which improves governance and operational transparency. By covering large, distinct regions, each RIR can manage IP resources more efficiently. This approach allows RIRs to allocate addresses based on the specific needs of a given region, avoiding overlap that might complicate allocation strategies or result in resource shortages or surpluses in certain areas. Non-overlapping regions enable each RIR to develop and apply region-specific policies without interference. Since internet usage, infrastructure, and regulatory environments vary across regions, RIRs can tailor their policies to meet the unique demands and challenges of their geographic area. If regions overlapped, policy conflicts or inconsistencies could arise, undermining the effectiveness of region-specific policies. Network operators and end-users benefit from knowing exactly which RIR to contact for resources or support. Non-overlapping regions simplify this process, providing clarity to users about which RIR serves their needs and ensuring seamless support and guidance. Non-overlapping regions reduce the administrative overhead that would arise from coordinating resource management in shared areas. With defined territories, each RIR can operate independently, streamlining operations and avoiding the need for complex agreements or coordination between multiple RIRs over the same territory. RIRs play a key role in maintaining a stable internet by ensuring fair and orderly IP address allocation. By assigning each RIR a large, distinct region, this model reinforces global stability and consistency in resource management, which is essential for a stable and resilient internet infrastructure. The non-overlapping regional approach aligns with ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, where various organizations and regions work cooperatively without infringing on each other's jurisdictions. This clear separation of regions fosters international cooperation while respecting regional autonomy, making it easier for ICANN and the NRO to oversee a globally consistent IP address allocation system.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

To avoid many RIRs

**Rita Kumi (Ghana Telecommunication Company)**

---

IPs from one region should also not be used outside that region.

**Raymond Mamattah (EGIGFA)**

---

Important to ro avoid disfunction

**Constanze Buerger (Government)**

---

Not to mention future possibilities of new areas for RIRs such as Middle East, Resolution of the current Caribbean states overlapping between ARIN and LACNIC.

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

5

**Taye Oyebola (Aso Savings and Loans Plc)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Confined to a large, multinational area without overlap, an RIR may lack the flexibility to respond to distinct regional needs. Allowing overlapping regions can introduce redundancy and improve local responsiveness.

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

I agree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

It makes sense

**Danjuma bappa ahmed (Wownetworks limited nigeria)**

---

Conflict of interest must be prevented

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

bonne idee

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

Les RIR ne doivent que gérer les membres de leurs regions

**HERVE EGNAKOU (HOLOGRAM IDENTIFICATION SERVICES S.A.R.L)**

---

Defining regions to prevent overlap enhances operational efficiency and accountability within each RIR's designated area.

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

Yes

**Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)**

---

totally agree

**Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)**

---

It is already detrimental to the RIR system that its users can sometimes "shop around" for better RIR interactions. RIR services are a commons run by consensus for a larger good and shouldn't compete with each other.

**David Lamparter (Westnetz w.V.)**

---

what is the minimum number of countries to be multinational? >1 ?

**Joerg Dorchain (private)**

---

I agree

**Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)**

---

This keep it everything neat.

**Luis Caceres (Corporacion Redexcom C.A.)**

---

The implications of this clause need to be clarified so that the nature and meaning of the RIR's responsibility (referred to here) is unambiguous and consistent across all RIRs. The current ad hoc and inconsistent approach to "RIR shopping" and to the movement of resource registrations between RIRs is unsustainable and undermines the integrity of the RIR system.

**PAUL WILSON (private individual)**

---

This is in fact the current model. This however also doesn't enable competition between RIRs, which i think in the end it's a good path, because cooperation is largely better!

**Carlos Friaças (FCT\| FCCN)**

---

Consider adding an acknowledgement that territories/economies should be able to change the RIR they use after political changes

**Leo Vegoda (And Polus LLC)**

---

Except where a person/corporation/org operates across regions, then up to them on what space they register where and what registration appears for any given asset.

**Joseph Moran (Fiserv)**

---

I remember there has been a discussion on the scale or a single RIR or number of RIRs. I think this expression suffices the need.

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

Good balance between preventing small / single-country RIRs and not sticking to "continental" scale

**Sander Steffann (SJM Steffann Consultancy)**

---



Regions should not be so large that they become unmanageable or unresponsive nor should they be so small that a single nation has excessive influence.

**Richard Greenwood (Shasta County Office of Education)**

---

## **5.2. Service Region - Somewhat Agree (4)**

That would depends on practical reasoning, exception may needed sometimes, but such exceptions should be rare. The service region should be clearly defined in principle, so that the management of the global resources would work, and the policy of specific region can be followed and enforced.

**Alban Kwan (CSC)**

---

agree

**Mohammad Mubarak Alfalasi (Telecommunication and Digital government Regulatory Authority)**

---

I agree with the principle that "The region for which an RIR is responsible shall cover a large multinational geographic area and shall not overlap with that of another RIR." This principle is vital for maintaining clarity, efficiency, and equity in the management of Internet resources. - Avoiding Duplication and Confusion: By ensuring that RIRs have distinct, non-overlapping regions, this principle minimizes the risk of duplication, conflicts, or confusion in resource allocation and governance. - Promoting Efficient Resource Management: Clear regional boundaries enable RIRs to focus on the specific needs of their designated areas, ensuring more targeted and effective service delivery. - Strengthening Regional Representation: A single RIR per region fosters a strong sense of regional representation and accountability, allowing communities within that area to have a unified voice in Internet governance discussions. - Respecting Regional Autonomy: This structure ensures that RIRs can operate independently while addressing the unique demands of their respective regions, without interference or overlap from other RIRs. - Facilitating Collaboration Between RIRs: Well-defined regions reduce potential conflicts and enable RIRs to collaborate more effectively on global issues, knowing their specific responsibilities are clear. In summary, this principle supports a structured and decentralized model of Internet governance, reinforcing the autonomy and efficiency of RIRs while ensuring global coverage and cooperation.

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

I see some merit in overlapping

**Piotr Strzyżewski (Personal capacity)**

---

ensures a clear and non-overlapping division of responsibilities among RIRs. It promotes efficiency and avoids potential conflicts in resource allocation and management. By defining well-defined geographic boundaries, this principle contributes to the stability and sustainability of the global internet numbering system.

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

This principle ensures clear, non-overlapping responsibilities for each RIR, which helps prevent conflicts and duplication in IP address management. By covering large multinational regions, it promotes efficiency and streamlines resource allocation. However, defining region sizes that align with current and future internet demands may require periodic reassessment to accommodate growth and changing technological needs. Overall, the principle supports an organized and scalable global internet infrastructure

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

Clear boundaries are needed

**John Haydon (Education)**

---

Is it reasonable to have regional RIR's and a global RIR where perhaps multinational providers are better served? Worth a discussion, not sure of the pros/cons yet..

**Ron da Silva (Network Technologies Globl)**

---

Given the increasing geopolitical fragmentation and the expansion of satellite internet beyond terrestrial boundaries, the "not overlap" requirement should be reconsidered to allow for greater global connectivity and unity. The internet should serve as a bridge for all humanity, regardless of regional divisions.

**Chenyang Gao (NoPKT LLC)**

---

### **5.3. Service Region - Neutral (3)**

see above, there is room for improvement

**Peter Koch (Individual)**

---

A minimum number of nations should be defined to mean the "multinational" otherwise, it opens up the situation where a large country (in terms of landmass or population) will claim to be multinational and register a new RIR which may subsequently lead to State capture.

**Babagana Digima (Nigerian Communications Commission)**

---

In agreement

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

I'm neutral

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

An RIR's Region must encompass a significant multinational area and remain distinct from other RIRs, while also supporting the portability of IP resources for efficient resource management.

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---

Have no issue if a RIR looks after another region

**Warwick Ward-Cox (Network Platforms)**

---

There are two issues: (1) Multi national -> I'm not necessarily pro-multi national, and single nation RIRs is perhaps not bad, but politics are an issue. (2) overlap: the issue will be grey... and here it'll depend on the RIRs with the overlap how/if they want to entertain it and to what level... ie. they could decide to NOT issue resources when another RIR issued resource for that area.

**Hendrik Visage (HeViS.Co Systems Pty Ltd)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. An RIR confined to a large, multinational area without overlap may lack the flexibility to meet distinct regional demands. Overlapping areas can provide useful redundancy and better address local challenges.

**Alex Kwan (Wiplus Malaysia)**

---

No comment

**Hann Jye Ng (MyTeksi Sdn Bhd)**

---

This provision appears overly rigid. Mandating that an RIR cover a large area without overlaps reduces adaptability and may overlook unique regional needs. Overlapping regions can foster redundancy and improve local responsiveness to challenges.

**Sidonie Hacking ('-)**

---

I completely disagree with this approach. Restricting RIRs to large, multinational areas without overlapping regions can stifle flexibility and may not cater to specific regional requirements. Overlapping regions can provide necessary redundancy and improve local responsiveness.

**Jun Wen (one futures technology sdn bhd)**

---

I find this provision unacceptable. Restricting an RIR to a large, multinational area without overlap reduces flexibility and may not meet the unique demands of various regions. Overlapping jurisdictions can create redundancy and improve responsiveness to local challenges.

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

Geographical regions are a bad choice in a global internet with global companies

**Elvis Velea (V4Escrow LLC)**

---

the regions need to be big enough to be able to provide price parity. there should not be excessive price variations between regions, if this can't be done, then have fewer RIRs rather than more.

**Saul Stein (eNetworks)**

---

Russia spans both the European continent and Asia, making it a transcontinental country. But what about the rights of the people living in Russia's far-east region? Should they just wait for services from RIPE-NCC? They might receive faster support from APNIC. It seems more practical to establish an intersectional service if services are to be allocated geographically. And what about people in Central Asia? What would happen if incidents similar to the AFRINIC events occurred again? Ensuring reliable and fair allocation of resources across diverse regions is crucial, especially considering the potential challenges posed by administrative boundaries and geopolitical issues.

**YingChu Chen (Taiwan Institute of Economic Research)**

---

I could see smaller RIRs as a possibility. There are already NIRs that of course are not multinational.

**Mike Burns (IPTrading)**

---

#### **5.4. Service Region - Somewhat Disagree (2)**

Regions bordering two RIR's should have the ability to choose which RIR better suit their needs as it regards support, language and training . This will be possible if there is overlap/ choice

**Colwayne Babb (Cable and Wireless)**

---

Restricting overlap reduces flexibility and may ignore regional diversity

**Noel OUPOH (DATACONNECT AFRICA)**

---

An RIR must cover a large multinational geographic area that does not overlap with any other RIR, while also allowing for the portability of IP resources to enhance resource management.

**Neonjyoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

I do NOT see a reason to dis-allow small to medium overlap , with RIR's consulting with each other in said matters .

**James Laferriere (n/a)**

---

overlap is necessary at some level to ensure continuity of RIR services

**alexis ndoumga (ministry of posts and telecommunications)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Limiting an RIR to a large, multinational area without overlap constrains flexibility and may not meet specific regional needs. Allowing overlapping regions can enhance redundancy and better respond to local issues.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---

The existence of NIRs already violate this principle, but overlapping service areas should not inherently be ruled out.

**Kevin Meynell (Individual)**

---

## 5.5. Service Region - Strongly Disagree (1)

Once again, this is not a principle, but rather an implementation choice of a presumed principle that can be inferred to be “RIRs must not compete with each other.” If this inference is correct, this proposed principle should be justified as the rationale for this assertion isn’t immediately obvious. Speaking to the proposed implementation choice, as documented in RFC 7020, the first justification for why the RIR system was established was to “manage a limited resource pool.” Given this requirement and the need to reduce risk of “RIR shopping” to get around constraints imposed to extend the life of the limited IPv4 addresses, having geographic monopolies (arguably) made sense. However, with the exhaustion of the IPv4 free pool, the acceptance and formalization of the IPv4 address market, and the vast pools of IPv6 addresses and 32-bit autonomous system numbers, there is no longer any rational justification for geographic monopolies. Practically speaking, given inter-RIR transfers, the concept of regional geographic monopolies has already been overcome by events. Continuation of this outdated concept merely serves to increase costs/bureaucracy and reduce innovation and efficiency in the global Internet numbers registry system. As a proposed principle, registry service users should be able to choose which RIR they use based on the services provided and the fees charged.

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

The Region for which an RIR is accountable must span a considerable multinational area, ensuring it does not overlap with that of another RIR.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

An RIR's responsibilities include a large multinational area without overlaps with other RIRs to promote effective governance of IP resources.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

The designated Region for each RIR must encompass a large multinational geographic area, ensuring no overlap with other RIR regions to manage resources effectively.

**Tipu Khan (Zx Online Ltd)**

---

Each RIR should oversee a significant multinational area that does not overlap with the jurisdictions of other RIRs, facilitating effective resource management.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

Each RIR should cover a considerable multinational geographic area, avoiding any overlap with other RIRs to facilitate clear resource allocation.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---

The designated Region for each RIR must cover a substantial multinational area, ensuring no overlap with other RIRs for effective resource management.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

An RIR's responsibilities include a large multinational area that does not intersect with those of other RIRs, enabling streamlined resource governance.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---

The geographic area for which an RIR is responsible must be expansive and multinational, without any overlap with other RIR regions, to ensure clarity in IP management.

**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

This requirement seems overly restrictive. Mandating that an RIR cover a large area without overlap limits flexibility and may fail to address unique regional needs. Allowing overlaps can enhance redundancy and responsiveness to local issues.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

An RIR must manage a large multinational geographic area free from overlap with other RIRs to ensure effective governance of IP resources.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

An RIR should manage a considerable multinational geographic area while avoiding any overlaps with other RIRs to ensure efficient resource distribution.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

The Region for which an RIR is responsible must be extensive and multinational, ensuring no overlaps with other RIRs for clear resource governance.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

This provision appears overly rigid. Mandating that an RIR cover a large area without overlaps reduces its adaptability and may overlook unique regional needs. Overlapping regions can foster redundancy and improve local responsiveness to challenges.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Limiting an RIR to a large, multinational area without overlap restricts its flexibility and may not meet specific regional needs. Allowing overlapping regions can enhance redundancy and improve local responses.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---

The Region designated for an RIR must cover a significant multinational area and avoid overlap with other RIRs, while also enabling the portability of IP resources for streamlined resource management.

**Taslima Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

An RIR's Region should encompass a vast multinational geographic area without overlapping with other RIRs, while also allowing for IP resource portability to facilitate efficient resource management.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

The area covered by an RIR should include a large multinational region free from overlap with other RIRs, while promoting the portability of IP resources for improved management.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

Each RIR must manage a significant multinational geographic area that does not overlap with another RIR's region, ensuring the portability of IP resources for effective resource management.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

The Region assigned to an RIR must cover a large multinational geographic area without infringing on the responsibilities of other RIRs, while also allowing for IP resource portability.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

Each RIR's Region must encompass a significant multinational area and avoid overlapping another RIR's territory, while promoting the portability of IP resources for effective management.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

Each RIR's Region must encompass a significant multinational area and avoid overlapping another RIR's territory, while promoting the portability of IP resources for effective management.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

An RIR is responsible for a significant multinational geographic area, preventing overlap with other RIRs, while also supporting effective IP resource portability.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

The Region designated for an RIR shall span a large multinational area, ensuring no overlap with other RIRs while promoting the portability of IP resources for management purposes.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

An RIR must manage an extensive multinational geographic area that does not conflict with other RIRs, facilitating the portability of IP resources for effective resource management.

**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

The Region for which an RIR is accountable must cover a large multinational area, avoiding overlap with others, while also allowing for seamless portability of IP resources.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

The responsibility of an RIR should include a substantial multinational geographic area, free of overlap with other RIRs, and must support the seamless portability of IP resources for effective management.  
**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

An RIR is responsible for a significant multinational geographic area, ensuring no overlap with other RIRs and allowing for effective IP resource portability.  
**Pham Gia Khiem (Phat Tai Logistics)**

---

This requirement appears overly restrictive. Requiring an RIR to cover a large area without overlaps can limit flexibility and may not effectively cater to specific regional needs. Overlapping regions can improve redundancy and local responsiveness.  
**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

As nearly as I can tell, the geographic and geopolitical division that is the current norm was not at all present in RFC 1174, and is more or less assumed into existence in RFC 1366. There are reasons to suppose that in some large geographies, the history and sociopolitical realities (partly to do with language) might suggest that a community-of-communities approach could better match conditions on the ground than the simple one-RIR-to-rule geographic principle here. Arguably, one RIR has internal structural problems in its community (along the sociopolitical fault lines I suggest) that distracted it from attending to a more serious existential threat, and the global RIR system is suffering as a result. For Internet purposes, "geography" is good and useful when the geography does not present more irritation than it resolves.  
**Andrew Sullivan (N/A)**

---

This condition seems impractical. Enforcing a large geographical area for each RIR without overlaps can hinder their adaptability and may not reflect regional diversity. Overlapping regions can create valuable redundancy and improve responsiveness  
**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

The responsibility of an RIR must cover a large multinational area, ensuring that there is no overlap with other RIRs, while also supporting the seamless portability of IP resources.  
**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

An RIR's Region should encompass a large multinational area and must not conflict with another RIR's territory, ensuring that IP resources can be ported seamlessly across regions.  
**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

The Region assigned to an RIR shall encompass a large multinational area without overlapping with others, while promoting the portability of IP resources for comprehensive management.  
**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---



The Region for which an RIR is responsible shall cover a substantial multinational area, ensuring no overlap with other RIRs, while also facilitating the portability of IP resources.

**Kwan Ke Yue (TBWA/ Kuala Lumpur)**

---

An RIR must oversee a broad multinational geographic area that does not conflict with another RIR's territory, ensuring effective management through IP resource portability.

**Sean Carroll (The One Academy)**

---

The Region for which an RIR is accountable shall encompass a broad multinational area and shall not conflict with any other RIR, while also facilitating the portability of IP resources.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

An RIR must manage a significant multinational geographic area that does not overlap with others, promoting the portability of IP resources for streamlined resource management.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

An RIR's Region shall encompass a large multinational geographic area, ensuring no overlap with other RIRs, while supporting the portability of IP resources for effective regional management.

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**

---

An RIR must oversee a large multinational Region that does not overlap with other RIRs, while also facilitating the portability of IP resources for better cross-regional management.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

The Region assigned to an RIR should span a large multinational geographic area, free from overlaps with other RIRs, to maintain clear resource management.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---

The region designated to an RIR will encompass a large multinational area, ensuring that it does not overlap with another RIR and promoting IP resource portability.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---

Each RIR shall manage a significant geographic area that spans multiple nations, avoiding overlaps with other RIRs while facilitating IP resource management.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

An RIR's Region must cover a vast multinational area without overlapping with other RIRs, ensuring effective coordination of IP resource distribution.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---

The area for which an RIR is responsible must be large and multinational, ensuring no overlap with other RIRs and supporting the portability of IP resources.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

The Region for which an RIR is responsible shall encompass a significant multinational geographic area and must not overlap with that of another RIR, while facilitating the efficient management of IP resources across borders.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

Each RIR is tasked with overseeing a substantial multinational region without any overlap with another RIR, while enabling the efficient transfer of IP resources.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

An RIR's designated region should cover a significant multinational geographic area and avoid overlap with other RIRs, ensuring that IP resource portability enables seamless management across borders.

**Md Abu Sayeem Siddique Siddique (ServicEngine Ltd)**

---

The region for which an RIR is responsible must encompass a large multinational geographic area without overlapping with another RIR, while also facilitating the portability of IP resources for effective resource management.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

An RIR's Region must cover a large multinational area and must not conflict with that of another RIR, facilitating seamless management of IP resources.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

The Region for which an RIR is responsible shall encompass a broad multinational geographic area, ensuring no overlap with other RIRs, while supporting IP resource transferability.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---

The Region assigned to an RIR shall cover a substantial multinational geographic area and avoid overlapping with other RIRs, while also promoting the portability of IP resources to enhance management.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---

An RIR's designated Region must consist of a large multinational geographic area free from overlaps with other RIRs, while also encouraging the portability of IP resources for efficient management.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

The Region for which an RIR is accountable shall cover a broad multinational geographic area free from overlaps with other RIRs, while also allowing for the portability of IP resources to facilitate resource management.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

An RIR must oversee a large multinational Region that does not overlap with any other RIR, while also enabling the portability of IP resources for improved management across regions.

**Trang Tran (VNPT Technologies)**

---

The Region for which an RIR is responsible shall encompass a significant multinational geographic area with no overlaps with other RIRs, while also allowing for the portability of IP resources to ensure efficient management.

**Minh Hoang (ANSV)**

---

An RIR's Region must cover a large multinational geographic area and not overlap with that of any other RIR, while also encouraging the portability of IP resources for effective regional management.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**

---

Each RIR's jurisdiction includes a significant multinational area that does not intersect with others, while also supporting seamless IP resource management.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**

---

The region for which an RIR is accountable shall cover a large multinational area, ensuring no overlap with other RIRs and facilitating the transfer of IP resources.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---

An RIR's coverage area must be extensive and multinational, with no overlap with another RIR, thereby allowing for efficient management of IP resources.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

The region under the purview of each RIR will cover a substantial multinational area, avoiding overlap with other RIRs and supporting the portability of IP resources.

**Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)**

---

Each RIR is tasked with managing a large multinational region that shall not overlap with others, while also enabling the effective transfer of IP resources.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

The geographic scope of an RIR's responsibility shall encompass a significant multinational area, ensuring no overlap with other RIRs and facilitating IP resource portability.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---

Each RIR shall oversee a large, multinational geographic area that does not intersect with that of another RIR, promoting seamless IP resource management.

**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

The region assigned to an RIR will span a substantial multinational area and must not overlap with another RIR, while also allowing for the portability of IP resources.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---

An RIR's responsibility covers a large multinational region that does not overlap with others, enabling organizations to manage IP resources effectively across borders.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

The geographic area managed by each RIR must be extensive and multinational, avoiding overlap with other RIRs, while facilitating the movement of IP resources.

**Ryan Khaw (AlSCO Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

The Region assigned to an RIR shall include a significant multinational geographic area without overlapping with other RIRs, promoting the portability of IP resources.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

The Region assigned to an RIR must include a broad multinational geographic area, free from overlaps with other RIRs, and should promote the portability of IP resources to better manage resources across borders.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Aptic)**

---

The designated Region for an RIR must include a large multinational area and shall not overlap with any other RIR's territory, ensuring efficient IP resource portability.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

An RIR's Region must cover a significant multinational geographic area, ensuring no overlap with other RIRs, while promoting seamless management of IP resources.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

The Region for which an RIR is responsible shall span a large multinational area and must not intersect with that of another RIR, facilitating the portability of IP resources.

**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

The Region designated for an RIR must cover a significant multinational area and avoid overlap with other RIRs, while also enabling the portability of IP resources for streamlined resource management.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

An RIR's Region should encompass a vast multinational geographic area without overlapping with other RIRs, while also allowing for IP resource portability to facilitate efficient resource management.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

See extended comments and analysis on the NANOG thread starting at <https://mailman.nanog.org/pipermail/nanog/2024-November/226586.html>

**William Herrin (Self)**

---

An RIR must cover a large multinational geographic area that does not overlap with any other RIR, while also promoting the portability of IP resources for improved resource management.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**

---

Multiple RIRs should be able to service any given area. Because each RIR essentially has a monopoly, there is no incentive for cost control or excellence. As a result, recurring costs are quite high for very basic services and the quality of those services is low. We have seen some major failures in the past few years and the use of funds for things that are not the intended function of a RIR (eg: research grants) or unnecessary travel, which increases costs to customers. Competition would improve costs and quality.

**j heasley (SNI)**

---

An RIR's designated Region must include a large multinational geographic area without any overlap with other RIRs, while also promoting the portability of IP resources for better resource management.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

An RIR's designated Region shall cover a significant multinational area without overlapping with another RIR's territory, ensuring the portability of IP resources for seamless management across regions.

**Jeremy Cheong (Infineon technologies)**

---

The Region assigned to an RIR shall span a large multinational geographic area and must not intersect with the regions of other RIRs, allowing for the effective portability of IP resources.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

The Region assigned to an RIR shall cover a substantial multinational geographic area and must avoid overlaps with other RIRs, while also promoting the portability of IP resources for effective resource management.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

An RIR's designated Region must consist of a large multinational geographic area, ensuring there is no overlap with other RIRs, and should facilitate the portability of IP resources for seamless management.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

I find this provision unacceptable. Limiting RIRs to large, multinational regions without overlap reduces their ability to adapt and may not adequately address the unique needs of various areas. Overlapping jurisdictions can enhance redundancy and local responsiveness.

**Sohel Kabir (Kabir Traders)**

---

I completely oppose the notion that RIRs should be confined to extensive multinational regions without overlapping. This limitation undermines flexibility and may not effectively address unique regional needs. Overlapping areas can enhance redundancy and improve responsiveness.

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

The Region for an RIR's responsibility shall span a large multinational geographic area, ensuring there is no overlap with other RIRs, and should also allow for the portability of IP resources to aid in seamless management.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---

An RIR must oversee a large multinational Region that does not overlap with the territories of other RIRs, while also enabling the portability of IP resources to foster effective management across different regions.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---

A Candidate RIR must meet all requirements of ICP-2 to gain recognition as an RIR, with the necessity of securing approval from all existing RIR members.

**Catalina Cueca (Manpower)**

---

An RIR's Region must consist of a large multinational geographic area, free from overlaps with other RIRs, and should encourage the portability of IP resources to ensure efficient resource management across borders.

**Camilo Riveros (Manpower)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Limiting each RIR to a large, multinational area without overlap reduces flexibility and may not meet specific regional needs. Overlapping regions can foster better responsiveness and provide redundancy.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

The Region for which an RIR is responsible shall encompass a large multinational geographic area, ensuring no overlap with other RIRs, while also facilitating the portability of IP resources for effective resource management across regions.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**

---

This approach seems impractical. Enforcing a large geographical area for each RIR without overlap can hinder flexibility and fail to address unique regional needs. Overlapping regions can improve redundancy and local responsiveness.

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

It should be noted that companies (and RIR members) are global and that services by RIRs are delivered without borders or boundaries in place. Trying to artificially limit the scope of an RIR is going to end in a failure of compliance.

**Terry Manderson (terrym.net pty ltd)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Limiting RIRs to large, multinational areas without overlap can stifle flexibility and may not adequately address unique regional challenges. Allowing overlaps can provide necessary redundancy and enhance responsiveness.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

This requirement appears overly restrictive. Requiring an RIR to cover a large area without overlaps can limit flexibility and may not effectively cater to specific regional needs. Overlapping regions can improve redundancy and local responsiveness.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

There is no reason to restrict overlapping. Any member should be able to chose an RIR to work with.

**Sergey Kozhedub (IPTP Networks)**

---

I find this stipulation too rigid. Limiting an RIR to a large area without overlaps may hinder flexibility and not adequately address unique regional requirements. Allowing overlaps can enhance redundancy and better respond to local challenges.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

I completely disagree with this condition. Mandating large, multinational areas for RIRs without overlap restricts their adaptability and may not effectively serve specific regional needs. Overlapping regions can provide essential redundancy and improve local responses.

**Anh Dang (NASA)**

---

I find this requirement concerning. Limiting RIRs to large, non-overlapping areas can reduce flexibility and may not adequately meet unique regional needs. Allowing overlaps can improve redundancy and responsiveness to local challenges.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

I fundamentally oppose this provision. Restricting RIRs to large areas without overlap reduces their ability to adapt to local conditions and might not reflect regional needs. Overlaps can enhance responsiveness and provide necessary redundancy.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Mandating large, non-overlapping areas for RIRs limits adaptability and may not adequately reflect regional needs. Overlapping regions can create valuable redundancy and enhance local responsiveness.

Strongly Disagree

Georges Lallogo (ANPTIC)

---

I find this stipulation too rigid. Limiting an RIR to a large area without overlaps may hinder flexibility and not adequately address unique regional requirements. Allowing overlaps can enhance redundancy and better respond to local challenges.

Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)

---

I fundamentally disagree with the idea that RIRs must cover only large, multinational areas without any overlap. This restriction decreases flexibility and may not address the diverse needs of various regions. Allowing overlaps can provide necessary redundancy and improve local responsiveness.

AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)

---

I find this provision problematic. Limiting RIRs to large, multinational territories without overlap reduces flexibility and may not cater to the unique needs of different regions. Overlapping jurisdictions can enhance redundancy and responsiveness to local challenges.

K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Requiring an RIR to cover a large area without overlap restricts its ability to adapt and may not address specific regional needs effectively. Overlapping regions can introduce necessary redundancy and enhance responsiveness.

Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)

---

I strongly oppose the stipulation that all RIRs must cover extensive multinational regions without any overlap. This could hinder flexibility and may overlook the specific needs of various areas. Overlaps can foster redundancy and improve local responsiveness.

Fuhui Zhang (University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)

---

I completely disagree with the requirement that RIRs must operate solely in large, multinational areas without overlap. This limitation could stifle flexibility and may not adequately address unique regional challenges. Overlapping areas can provide valuable redundancy and enhance local responsiveness.

Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)

---

I fundamentally disagree with the requirement that RIRs must cover large, multinational regions without overlap. This restriction reduces flexibility and may not address the diverse needs of various areas. Overlapping regions can provide necessary redundancy and improve local responsiveness.

Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)

---



I find this provision problematic. Limiting RIRs to vast, multinational areas without any overlap can hinder flexibility and may not meet the unique demands of different regions. Allowing overlap can enhance redundancy and responsiveness to local challenges.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

This requirement raises significant concerns. Limiting an RIR to a large, non-overlapping area may not adequately address unique regional needs and reduces flexibility. Overlapping regions can create better redundancy and responsiveness to local issues.

**Trabahan Pujari (Paruluniversity)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Restricting RIRs to large, multinational areas without overlap can diminish their flexibility and may not adequately meet specific regional needs. Overlapping regions can foster redundancy and improve responsiveness.

**Juan Mesa (Hispatat)**

---

I find this stipulation too rigid. Limiting an RIR to a large area without overlaps may hinder flexibility and not adequately address unique regional requirements. Allowing overlaps can enhance redundancy and better respond to local challenges.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

I strongly disagree with this provision. Restricting an RIR to a large multinational area without overlap limits flexibility and may fail to address specific regional needs. Overlapping regions can provide redundancy and enhance responsiveness to local challenges.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

This requirement seems overly restrictive. Requiring an RIR to cover a large area without overlaps can limit its flexibility and may overlook unique regional needs. Overlapping regions can enhance redundancy and responsiveness to local issues.

**Pornpipat Kitireanglarp (ZERIWELLPLUS Co., Ltd.)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. An RIR limited to a large, multinational area without overlap may lack the flexibility to meet distinct regional demands. Overlapping areas can provide valuable redundancy and better address local challenges.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. An RIR confined to a large, multinational area without overlap may lack the flexibility to respond to distinct regional needs. Allowing overlapping regions can introduce redundancy and improve local responsiveness.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Restricting RIRs to large, multinational areas without overlaps limits their flexibility and may not adequately address specific regional needs. Allowing overlaps can enhance redundancy and responsiveness.

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

I find this requirement problematic. Limiting an RIR to a large geographic area without overlaps reduces its adaptability and may fail to effectively address specific regional needs. Overlapping regions can introduce redundancy and improve local responsiveness.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

This requirement seems overly restrictive. Mandating that an RIR cover a large area without overlaps limits its flexibility and may not address unique regional needs. Allowing overlaps can enhance redundancy and responsiveness to local issues.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. An RIR confined to a large, multinational area without overlap may lack the flexibility to meet distinct regional demands. Overlapping areas can provide useful redundancy and better address local challenges.

**Ashraful Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

This requirement appears impractical. Mandating that an RIR cover a large area without overlaps can restrict flexibility and fail to address unique regional challenges. Allowing overlaps can enhance redundancy and local responsiveness.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

I find this approach impractical. Limiting an RIR to a large area without overlaps can hinder flexibility and fail to meet unique regional demands. Overlapping regions can provide the necessary redundancy to effectively tackle local challenges.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Restricting RIRs to large, multinational areas without overlaps limits their flexibility and may not adequately address specific regional needs. Allowing overlaps can enhance redundancy and responsiveness.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

This provision appears overly rigid. Mandating that an RIR cover a large area without overlaps reduces adaptability and may overlook unique regional needs. Overlapping regions can foster redundancy and improve local responsiveness to challenges.

**Phuc Pham (Advanced Network Systems VietNam Company Limited)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Limiting an RIR to a large, multinational area without overlap constrains flexibility and may not meet specific regional needs. Allowing overlapping regions can enhance redundancy and better respond to local issues.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

I find this stipulation too limiting. An RIR confined to a large geographic area without overlaps may struggle to effectively address unique regional needs. Overlapping areas can create redundancy and enhance responsiveness to local challenges.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

I completely disagree with this approach. Restricting RIRs to large, multinational areas without overlapping regions can inhibit flexibility and may not cater to specific regional requirements. Overlapping regions can provide important redundancy and improve local responsiveness.

**Giang Nguyen (NASA)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Restricting an RIR to a large, multinational area without overlaps limits its flexibility and may overlook unique regional needs. Allowing overlapping regions can create redundancy and improve responsiveness to local challenges.

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

Disagree

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---

This requirement seems overly restrictive. Mandating that an RIR cover a large area without overlaps limits flexibility and may not address unique regional needs. Allowing overlaps can enhance redundancy and responsiveness to local issues.

**Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. An RIR restricted to a large, multinational area without overlap may lack the flexibility to meet distinct regional demands. Overlapping areas can provide beneficial redundancy and better address local challenges.

**Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Confined to a large, multinational area without overlaps limits an RIR's flexibility and may neglect unique regional needs. Allowing overlapping regions can provide redundancy and enhance responsiveness to local challenges.

**Pooja Gopi (DM Digital Marketing)**

---

I find this stipulation too rigid. Limiting an RIR to a large area without overlaps may hinder flexibility and not adequately address unique regional requirements. Allowing overlaps can enhance redundancy and better respond to local challenges.

**Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)**

---

I completely disagree with this condition. Mandating large, multinational areas for RIRs without overlap restricts their adaptability and may not effectively cater to specific regional needs. Overlapping regions can provide essential redundancy and improve local responses.

**Quyn Kim (VNPAY)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Confined to a large, multinational area without overlap, an RIR may lack the flexibility to meet distinct regional demands. Overlapping areas can offer beneficial redundancy and better address local challenges.

**Shahedul Islam Bhuiyan (Royal Green Limited)**

---

I completely oppose the stipulation that RIRs must cover large, multinational regions without overlap. This constraint limits flexibility and may not cater to unique regional needs. Overlaps can provide essential redundancy and improve responsiveness to local challenges.

**Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)**

---

Question 12&13 Service Region The Region for which an RIR is responsible shall cover a large multinational geographic area and shall not overlap with that of another RIR. 1- Strongly Disagree Answer: I completely disagree with this stipulation. Restricting an RIR to a large, multinational area without overlap limits flexibility and may overlook unique regional needs. Allowing overlapping regions can provide redundancy and enhance responsiveness to local challenges.

**Anjan Deka (HDFC)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Restricting an RIR to a large, multinational area without overlap limits flexibility and may overlook unique regional needs. Allowing overlapping regions can provide redundancy and enhance responsiveness to local challenges.

**Ketan Parmar (Bids Info Global)**

---

I find this provision problematic. Limiting RIRs to vast, multinational areas without overlap diminishes their flexibility and may fail to meet unique regional requirements. Overlapping regions can provide necessary redundancy and enhance local responsiveness.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

I strongly oppose the idea that RIRs should be confined to large, multinational regions without any overlap. This approach limits flexibility and may overlook specific regional needs. Allowing overlap can create redundancy and improve responsiveness to local issues.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

I completely disagree with restricting an RIR to a large, multinational area without overlap. This limitation reduces flexibility and may not adequately address the unique needs of different regions. Overlapping areas can provide redundancy and enhance responsiveness to local challenges.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---

The non-overlaps premise is gravely misplaced.

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

I disagree

**Kate Petras (DCXV)**

---

## 6. Recognition

---

A Candidate RIR must meet or demonstrate that it can meet all the requirements of an RIR specified in ICP-2 to be recognized as an RIR.

### 6.1. Recognition - Strongly Agree (5)

We need to define how or what it means to able to "demonstrate" that it can mee all requirements of an RIR...

**Babagana Digima (Nigerian Communications Commission)**

---

This seems essential.

**Jordan Carter (auDA)**

---

I strongly agree

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

Nothing to add or retract

**Brian Longwe (Converged Technology Networks)**

---

yes of course. And a trial period is also important so as to evaluate and confirm afterwards.

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

I agree with this principle to a large extent. Requiring a Candidate RIR to meet all the criteria outlined in ICP-2 ensures that it has the capacity, governance, and operational readiness to effectively manage Internet resources. This standard helps maintain consistency, reliability, and trust across the global Internet community. However, there should also be room for reasonable flexibility, allowing for transitional support where a Candidate RIR shows clear potential but needs time to fully meet specific requirements.

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

I agree with this principle to a large extent. Requiring a Candidate RIR to meet all the criteria outlined in ICP-2 ensures that it has the capacity, governance, and operational readiness to effectively manage Internet resources. This standard helps maintain consistency, reliability, and trust across the global Internet community. However, there should also be room for reasonable flexibility, allowing for transitional support where a Candidate RIR shows clear potential but needs time to fully meet specific requirements.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

RIRs must have the organisational competence and capacity to perform this necessary role.

**Narelle Clark (Internet Association of Australia)**

---

---

Agree

**Warwick Ward-Cox (Network Platforms)**

---

any organization seeking recognition as an RIR must meet the rigorous standards outlined in ICP-2. This guarantees that new RIRs are capable of fulfilling their responsibilities effectively and contributing to the stability and security of the global internet numbering system. By upholding these high standards, this principle helps maintain the integrity of the RIR ecosystem.

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

If any RIR fail its role, we should have right to remove it. And transfer to effective one.

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

must meet

**Filipe Coelho (TVCABO Angola)**

---

I agree strongly with the principle that a Candidate RIR must meet, or be able to demonstrate it can meet, all the requirements outlined in ICP-2 to be recognized as an RIR. This standard is essential for ensuring that new RIRs have the capability and readiness to manage critical internet resources responsibly, effectively, and consistently with global standards. Here are key reasons supporting this principle: ICP-2 sets forth foundational standards to ensure that each RIR operates in a way that supports the stability and consistency of the global internet infrastructure. Requiring Candidate RIRs to meet these standards helps uphold the stability of resource allocation and address management on a global scale. ICP-2 requires RIRs to demonstrate operational capacity, technical expertise, and robust administrative structures. By holding Candidate RIRs to these standards, the community can be confident that new RIRs are well-prepared to handle resource distribution without compromising quality or reliability. New RIRs must also demonstrate they can serve a clearly defined geographic region without overlapping with existing RIR regions. Meeting this requirement prevents resource allocation conflicts and ensures clarity for operators, governments, and users about which RIR serves their area, promoting harmony and efficiency in global internet governance. Recognized RIRs have an obligation to uphold transparency, fairness, and community-driven policy-making. A Candidate RIR that meets ICP-2 requirements demonstrates it can be accountable to the community it serves and supports inclusive, representative governance in alignment with existing RIR practices. ICP-2 requirements also address policy alignment, which ensures that Candidate RIRs can coordinate effectively with ICANN, the NRO, and other RIRs. This alignment allows for smoother collaboration, policy consistency, and responsiveness to global changes, such as IPv6 adoption and cybersecurity measures. The recognition process is designed to maintain the trust of network operators, governments, and other stakeholders in the RIR system. By verifying that a Candidate RIR meets all ICP-2 requirements, the community can have confidence that the new RIR is a reliable and capable steward of critical internet resources. Requiring a Candidate RIR to meet all ICP-2 requirements helps ensure that the new RIR has the technical and financial resources to scale sustainably. This is especially important in a region with growing internet demand, as it ensures the RIR can support future infrastructure and user needs effectively. While strict adherence to ICP-2 is essential for most requirements, there could be some flexibility for new RIRs to demonstrate “developmental readiness” for certain administrative or technical capabilities if they have concrete plans to achieve full compliance within a reasonable timeframe. Such flexibility might involve: a. Granting provisional

recognition, allowing the Candidate RIR to operate under guidance until it fully meets the requirements. b. Defining specific milestones to meet full ICP-2 compliance gradually while under supervision by the NRO or an advisory group. However, this flexibility should not compromise the core requirements related to operational stability, resource management, and community accountability, as these are essential to maintaining the integrity of the RIR system.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

For good governance

**Rita Kumi (Ghana Telecommunication Company)**

---

I think good idea

**Raymond Mamattah (EGIGFA)**

---

This principle is key to maintain consistency and expectations across all RIRs.

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

I strongly oppose this approach. Mandating full compliance with all ICP-2 requirements for a Candidate RIR before recognition establishes an unreasonably high standard that may limit RIR development, especially in underserved regions. Provisional recognition could support growth and adaptation during the compliance process.

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

I agree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

That's ok

**Danjuma bappa ahmed (Wownetworks limited nigeria)**

---

RIR candidate must be the required document before it can be elected or appointed

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

judicieux

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

Requiring demonstrable proof of compliance minimizes risks associated with unproven entities and builds trust among stakeholders.

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

Yes

**Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)**

---



Totally agree

**Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)**

---

It must be prepared to get into the arena.

**Luis Caceres (Corporacion Redexcom C.A.)**

---

The existing ICP-2 does not set sufficient requirements. The amendments should reinforce governance, accountability and anti-corruption measures.

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

It's a prerequisite

**Mike Burns (IPTrading)**

---

Yes, there is no point in a new RIR, if the quality standards and services towards their membership is going to degrade (when compared to the previous RIR servicing the region).

**Carlos Friaças (FCT\FCCN)**

---

There is no point in forcing recognition of a deficient entity as an RIR. They'd need to immediately fix shortcomings or have recognition removed in a short period.

**Leo Vegoda (And Polus LLC)**

---

good and succinct

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

Duh...

**Sander Steffann (SJM Steffann Consultancy)**

---

## **6.2. Recognition - Somewhat Agree (4)**

n/a

**Andrew Sullivan (N/A)**

---

None

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

Yes, if the project is to progress, all stakeholders must make efforts in this direction.

**Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)**

---

agree

**Mohammad Mubarak Alfalasi (Telecommunication and Digital government Regulatory Authority)**

---

This principle ensures that only qualified entities are recognized as RIRs by requiring them to meet all the specified requirements in ICP-2. It guarantees that RIRs have the necessary infrastructure, governance, and capacity to manage IP address allocation effectively. While maintaining high standards, the process should remain flexible to accommodate the evolving needs of the internet. Overall, it supports trust and stability in the global internet ecosystem

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

It is crucial for Candidate RIRs to meet specified requirements. However, I think it will be useful to consider a principle for phased recognition to allow candidates to develop and demonstrate their capabilities for sustainability over time

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

Sometimes, there is a need for more time

**Mark Elkins (Posix Systems)**

---

No comments

**Pacharaporn Wangwinyoo (ZIM (Thailand) Co., LTD.)**

---

Vital

**John Haydon (Education)**

---

This provision seems overly stringent. Insisting that a Candidate RIR demonstrate full compliance with all ICP-2 requirements before recognition could stifle development, particularly in underserved areas. Implementing provisional recognition could promote growth as the RIR works toward meeting the standards.

**Sidonie Hacking (-)**

---

I agree

**Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)**

---

If the RIR meets 75% of the requirements, a provisional accreditation should be granted which validity doesn't laps beyond 12 months.

**Musa Stephen HONLUE (AFRINIC)**

---

### 6.3. Recognition - Neutral (3)

There should be no force, regions should be allowed to operate

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

A Candidate RIR must fulfill all requirements of ICP-2 to be recognized as an RIR, ensuring the consensus of all current members.

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---

80% of requirements

**Fabrice TEUGUIA (PCP-ACEFA)**

---

Nous voulons l'indépendance des RIR

**HERVE EGNAKOU (HOLOGRAM IDENTIFICATION SERVICES S.A.R.L)**

---

Yes

**Hann Jye Ng (MyTeksi Sdn Bhd)**

---

I completely disagree with this approach. Requiring that a Candidate RIR meet all ICP-2 specifications before being recognized sets an unreasonably high bar that could prevent the development of RIRs in underserved regions. A more flexible model, such as provisional recognition, would allow for growth while the RIR works to achieve full compliance.

**Jun Wen (one futures technology sdn bhd)**

---

I completely disagree with the stipulation that a Candidate RIR must meet all ICP-2 criteria before receiving recognition. This sets a high threshold that could impede the establishment of RIRs, especially in underserved regions. Allowing provisional recognition while the Candidate RIR works toward compliance would foster development.

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

It would be better to see the requirements first.

**YingChu Chen (Taiwan Institute of Economic Research)**

---

Clearly RIRs should meet minimum requirements, but this assumes the proposed ICP-2 requirements are widely agreeable.

**Kevin Meynell (Individual)**

---

### 6.4. Recognition - Somewhat Disagree (2)

Not “can”: “will, within a reasonable but specific grace period”. Historically, this was the case – initially, while APNIC was able to do resource allocations by asking InterNIC to perform the actual allocations based on APNIC-specified recommendations, it did not become a “recognized RIR”, i.e., receive the 202/7 block specified in RFC 1466 and autonomy to do its own allocations from that block, until it had demonstrated to IANA that it had met the (informal at the time) “requirements” to be an RIR. If a Candidate RIR does not meet all the requirements specified in ICP-2 (whatever version), it would make sense to provisionally recognize the Candidate RIR but impose an explicit timeframe within which the remaining requirements will be met.

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

To achieve recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must demonstrate its ability to comply with all ICP-2 requirements, with the approval of all existing members.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

Requiring a Candidate RIR to meet all ICP-2 requirements before recognition sets an unnecessarily high bar that could stifle the development of RIRs, especially in underserved regions. A more flexible approach—such as allowing provisional recognition while the Candidate RIR works to fully meet certain standards—would encourage growth and adaptation

**Noel OUPOH (DATACONNECT AFRICA)**

---

A Candidate RIR must fulfill all the criteria outlined in ICP-2 for recognition as an RIR, ensuring the consensus of all current RIR members.

**Neonjyoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

A Candidate RIR must meet all the requirements specified in ICP-2 to be recognized as an RIR. Demonstrating that it "can meet" the requirements means it does not yet meet them, which means it is not yet able to function as, or be recognized as, an RIR.

**Lee Howard (IPv4.Global by Hilco Streambank)**

---

## **6.5. Recognition - Strongly Disagree (1)**

For recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must meet all the requirements specified in ICP-2, contingent upon the approval of existing members.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

A Candidate RIR must meet all ICP-2 stipulations or demonstrate an ability to comply for recognition, with the consent of current RIR members.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

To be recognized as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must demonstrate its compliance with all requirements in ICP-2, needing support from existing members.

**Tipu Khan (Zx Online Ltd)**

---

A Candidate RIR must fulfill all the necessary criteria in ICP-2 to gain recognition, with the agreement of all current RIR members.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

A Candidate RIR must demonstrate compliance with all ICP-2 requirements for RIR recognition, contingent upon the consent of existing members.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---

The recognition of a Candidate RIR as an RIR hinges on its ability to meet the criteria established in ICP-2, with support from current RIR members.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

To gain RIR recognition, a Candidate RIR must fulfill all requirements found in ICP-2, with the approval of all existing RIR members.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---

A Candidate RIR must either meet all the criteria specified in ICP-2 or show the ability to do so for recognition, with the consent of current members.

**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

This requirement appears overly demanding. Insisting that a Candidate RIR demonstrate full compliance with all ICP-2 requirements before recognition may limit the formation of RIRs, especially in areas lacking support. A system of provisional recognition could facilitate growth while the RIR works toward meeting those standards.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

A Candidate RIR must show compliance with all stipulations in ICP-2 for RIR recognition, with the consent of all current members.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

A Candidate RIR is required to fulfill all ICP-2 stipulations for recognition, dependent on the agreement of existing members.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

To gain RIR status, a Candidate RIR must meet all criteria specified in ICP-2, with the consent of current RIR members.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

This provision appears overly rigid. Mandating that an RIR cover a large area without overlaps reduces its adaptability and may overlook unique regional needs. Overlapping regions can foster redundancy and improve local responsiveness to challenges.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Limiting an RIR to a large, multinational area without overlap restricts its flexibility and may not meet specific regional needs. Allowing overlapping regions can enhance redundancy and improve local responses.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---

A Candidate RIR must demonstrate compliance with all RIR requirements set out in ICP-2 to achieve recognition, requiring the consensus of all current RIR members.

**Taslina Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

To attain recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must either meet or show that it can meet all the requirements specified in ICP-2, with support from all existing members.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

To be acknowledged as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must either meet or show its potential to meet all the requirements specified in ICP-2, with the agreement of all existing members.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

A Candidate RIR must demonstrate that it meets all criteria in ICP-2 to be recognized as an RIR, ensuring that all current members consent to its recognition.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

To gain recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must fulfill all outlined requirements in ICP-2, ensuring that all current members agree to its capacity.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

A Candidate RIR must show that it can meet all specified requirements in ICP-2 to be recognized as an RIR, with the agreement of all current RIR members.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

A Candidate RIR must show that it can meet all specified requirements in ICP-2 to be recognized as an RIR, with the agreement of all current RIR members.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

For a Candidate RIR to gain recognition as an RIR, it must demonstrate compliance with all requirements outlined in ICP-2, with the support of current members.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

A Candidate RIR must fulfill all the requirements specified in ICP-2 to be recognized as an RIR, contingent on the consent of all existing members.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

To achieve recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must demonstrate that it can meet all ICP-2 requirements, with the agreement of all current members.

**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

A Candidate RIR must meet or show its ability to fulfill all requirements in ICP-2 to gain recognition as an RIR, ensuring the consent of existing members.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

A Candidate RIR must satisfy all requirements outlined in ICP-2 to gain recognition as an RIR, ensuring that all current RIR members agree to this capability.

**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

For recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must demonstrate compliance with all ICP-2 requirements, with the approval of all current RIR members.

**Pham Gia Khiem (Phat Tai Logistics)**

---

This provision seems excessively rigid. Insisting that a Candidate RIR fulfill every ICP-2 requirement before being recognized could stifle the development of RIRs, particularly in underserved regions. Implementing provisional recognition could promote growth while the RIR works toward compliance.

**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

For recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must demonstrate compliance with all the requirements specified in ICP-2, requiring the consent of all existing members.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

For recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must demonstrate compliance with all the requirements specified in ICP-2, requiring the consent of all existing members

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

To achieve recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must demonstrate compliance with all ICP-2 requirements, with the agreement of all current members of the RIR.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

A Candidate RIR must satisfy all specified requirements in ICP-2 to be recognized as an RIR, contingent upon the agreement of all existing members.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

To be recognized as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must fulfill all ICP-2 requirements or show its capability to do so, relying on the consent of all current members.

**Kwan Ke Yue (TBWA/ Kuala Lumpur)**

---

A Candidate RIR must demonstrate that it can meet all the requirements outlined in ICP-2 to gain recognition as an RIR, with the agreement of existing members.

**Sean Carroll (The One Academy)**

---

A Candidate RIR must fulfill all specified ICP-2 requirements to achieve recognition as an RIR, ensuring the consent of all current members.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

For recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must meet or show the ability to meet all requirements outlined in ICP-2, contingent upon the agreement of all existing members.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

A Candidate RIR must satisfy all the criteria mandated in ICP-2 to be acknowledged as an RIR, contingent on the approval of all existing members.

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**

---

A Candidate RIR must meet all criteria set forth in ICP-2 to qualify for recognition as an RIR, with the necessity of securing consent from existing members.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

A Candidate RIR is required to meet all the stipulations of ICP-2 to achieve RIR status, contingent on the approval of existing members.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---

For a Candidate RIR to be recognized as an RIR, it must show that it can fulfill all requirements in ICP-2, with the consent of all existing members.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---

A Candidate RIR must illustrate its potential to meet all requirements specified in ICP-2 for recognition, contingent upon the approval of existing members.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

To be recognized as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must satisfy all criteria outlined in ICP-2, with the consent of all current RIR members.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---



To achieve RIR status, a Candidate RIR must demonstrate compliance with all ICP-2 requirements, with the consent of all current members.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

A Candidate RIR must meet or demonstrate that it can fulfill all requirements specified in ICP-2 to gain recognition as an RIR, with full backing from existing members.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

A Candidate RIR must clearly show its ability to meet all RIR requirements in ICP-2 to be recognized, while obtaining agreement from existing members.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

To be recognized as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must satisfy or show the capability to meet all the requirements outlined in ICP-2, ensuring that all existing members consent to its recognition.

**Md Abu Sayeem Siddique Siddique (ServicEngine Ltd)**

---

A Candidate RIR must meet or demonstrate its ability to fulfill all the requirements of an RIR specified in ICP-2 to gain recognition as an RIR, with the approval of all current RIR members.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

For a Candidate RIR to achieve recognition as an RIR, it must demonstrate compliance with all specified requirements in ICP-2, with the consent of existing members.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

A Candidate RIR must prove it meets all the ICP-2 requirements to be recognized as an RIR, contingent upon the agreement of current members.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---

For recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must show compliance with all ICP-2 requirements, necessitating the agreement of all current RIR members.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---

A Candidate RIR must demonstrate its ability to satisfy all requirements specified in ICP-2 to achieve recognition as an RIR, contingent upon the approval of all existing members.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

For recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must demonstrate that it meets all requirements outlined in ICP-2, ensuring the consent of current RIR members.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

A Candidate RIR must satisfy all requirements of ICP-2 to gain recognition as an RIR, with the approval of existing RIR members being essential.

**Trang Tran (VNPT Technologies)**

---

For recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must show compliance with all requirements of ICP-2, requiring the agreement of all current RIR members.

**Minh Hoang (ANSV)**

---

A Candidate RIR must demonstrate that it can comply with all ICP-2 requirements to be recognized as an RIR, with the necessity of consensus among existing RIR members.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**

---

To be recognized as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must illustrate its capability to satisfy all requirements in ICP-2, with the approval of existing members.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**

---

A Candidate RIR must show that it can meet or exceed all RIR requirements in ICP-2 to gain recognition, contingent upon consent from all current members.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---

A Candidate RIR must fulfill or show the ability to fulfill all the requirements specified in ICP-2 to gain recognition, with consent from all current RIR members.

**Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)**

---

Recognition as an RIR requires that a Candidate RIR meets all requirements in ICP-2, demonstrating capability and securing consent from existing members.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

A Candidate RIR must show that it can adhere to all RIR requirements outlined in ICP-2 for recognition, with the agreement of all current members.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---

To be recognized as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must demonstrate compliance with all requirements in ICP-2, ensuring consent from all existing RIR members.

**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

A Candidate RIR must illustrate its capacity to meet all RIR requirements specified in ICP-2 to achieve recognition, including obtaining consent from all current members.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---

For recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must meet or demonstrate its potential to meet all ICP-2 requirements, with the approval of all existing members of the RIR.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

A Candidate RIR must prove that it can comply with all the requirements of an RIR detailed in ICP-2 to be acknowledged as an RIR, with the consent of all current members.

**Ryan Khaw (AlSCO Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

A Candidate RIR must fulfill all the criteria outlined in ICP-2 to gain recognition as an RIR, requiring the support of all current members.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

To gain recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must meet all the requirements outlined in ICP-2, with the approval of all existing RIR members being critical.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Apmic)**

---

To gain recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must satisfy all requirements established in ICP-2, with the approval of all existing members.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

A Candidate RIR must demonstrate its capacity to meet all ICP-2 requirements to achieve recognition as an RIR, requiring the consent of current members.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

For recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must show that it can fulfill all requirements specified in ICP-2, with the backing of all existing members.

**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

A Candidate RIR must demonstrate compliance with all RIR requirements set out in ICP-2 to achieve recognition, requiring the consensus of all current RIR members.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

To attain recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must either meet or show that it can meet all the requirements specified in ICP-2, with support from all existing members.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

A Candidate RIR must prove its capability to meet all criteria in ICP-2 to gain recognition as an RIR, contingent upon the agreement of existing RIR members.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**

---

A Candidate RIR must meet all requirements of ICP-2 to qualify for recognition as an RIR, with the necessity of securing approval from existing RIR members.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

To be recognized as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must show compliance with all ICP-2 requirements, with the consensus of all current RIR members.

**Jeremy Cheong (Infineon technologies)**

---

A Candidate RIR must fulfill all the criteria specified in ICP-2 to achieve recognition as an RIR, contingent on the agreement of all existing members.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

To be acknowledged as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must prove it can meet all ICP-2 requirements, contingent upon the agreement of all existing RIR members.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

A Candidate RIR must fulfill all criteria specified in ICP-2 for recognition as an RIR, with the consent of existing RIR members being a key requirement.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

I find this provision unacceptable. Requiring a Candidate RIR to meet all ICP-2 requirements for recognition imposes a high bar that could stifle development, especially in underserved regions. Allowing for provisional recognition while striving to meet the standards would foster growth.

**Sohel Kabir (Kabir Traders)**

---

I completely oppose the requirement that a Candidate RIR must meet all ICP-2 criteria before receiving recognition. This imposes an unnecessarily high standard that could impede the establishment of RIRs, particularly in underserved regions. Allowing provisional recognition while striving for compliance would encourage growth.

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

A Candidate RIR must fulfill all criteria set forth in ICP-2 for recognition as an RIR, with the agreement of all existing RIR members essential to the process.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---

To be acknowledged as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must show that it can satisfy all ICP-2 requirements, requiring the consensus of current RIR members.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---

An RIR must continuously meet all specified requirements in ICP-2 in an auditable fashion once recognized, including the ability to facilitate IP resource portability and securing the consent of all existing members.

**Catalina Cueva (Manpower)**

---

For recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must demonstrate compliance with all requirements specified in ICP-2, contingent upon the agreement of existing RIR members.

**Camilo Riveros (Manpower)**

---

Mandating complete adherence to ICP-2 for a Candidate RIR to achieve recognition may be too rigid and could impede progress in underserved regions. A provisional recognition framework could better support their development.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

A Candidate RIR must demonstrate that it can meet all the requirements specified in ICP-2 to achieve recognition as an RIR, with the agreement of all existing RIR members.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**

---

Mandating that all ICP-2 standards be met by a Candidate RIR prior to recognition might impose an unrealistic burden that stifles development in underserved regions. Allowing for provisional recognition could facilitate ongoing growth.

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

I completely disagree with this condition. Setting the expectation that a Candidate RIR must meet all ICP-2 requirements before recognition imposes an unnecessary barrier that could hinder development in underserved areas. A more flexible approach, such as provisional recognition, would encourage growth.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

This provision seems excessively rigid. Insisting that a Candidate RIR fulfill every ICP-2 requirement before being recognized could stifle the development of RIRs, particularly in underserved regions. Implementing provisional recognition could promote growth while the RIR works toward compliance.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

I find this condition too limiting. Requiring a Candidate RIR to fulfill all ICP-2 criteria before recognition creates an undue obstacle that could hinder the establishment of RIRs, particularly in regions that lack support. Allowing provisional recognition could promote growth and adaptation.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Insisting that a Candidate RIR meet every requirement of ICP-2 before recognition sets a high bar that could stifle the growth of RIRs in underserved regions. A more flexible approach, such as provisional recognition, would encourage development and compliance over time.

**Anh Dang (NASA)**

---

Requiring a Candidate RIR to fully meet all ICP-2 standards before recognition could create barriers to growth, especially in underserved regions. A provisional recognition strategy would allow for flexibility and continued development.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

Insisting on complete compliance with ICP-2 for a Candidate RIR to gain recognition may hinder development, particularly in resource-limited areas. A more flexible approach, including provisional recognition, could encourage adaptation and progress.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

Requiring a Candidate RIR to meet every ICP-2 requirement before it can be recognized could create unnecessary obstacles that hinder growth, especially in less developed areas. A flexible approach, such as provisional recognition, could encourage advancement.

**Prasanta Haloi (Pwd)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Georges Lallogo (ANPTIC)**

---

This requirement seems overly restrictive. Requiring an RIR to cover a large area without overlaps can limit its flexibility and may overlook unique regional needs. Overlapping regions can enhance redundancy and responsiveness to local issues.

**Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)**

---

I fundamentally disagree with the notion that a Candidate RIR must demonstrate full compliance with ICP-2 for recognition. This requirement creates an unnecessarily high barrier that could stifle the development of RIRs, especially in underserved areas. A more lenient approach, such as provisional recognition, would better support growth.

**AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)**

---

I find this provision problematic. Requiring a Candidate RIR to meet every ICP-2 requirement before recognition sets a high bar that may stifle growth, particularly in underserved regions. A more accommodating approach, such as allowing provisional recognition while working toward full compliance, would foster development.

**K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Requiring a Candidate RIR to meet every ICP-2 criterion before being recognized sets a high standard that may hinder establishment efforts, especially in regions with limited support. Provisional recognition would enable growth while the RIR works toward compliance.

**Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)**

---

I strongly oppose the idea that a Candidate RIR must fulfill all ICP-2 requirements to gain recognition. This creates an excessively high standard that may hinder RIR development, especially in underserved

regions. A more flexible approach, such as provisional recognition during the compliance process, would be more beneficial.

**Fuhui Zhang (University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)**

---

I completely disagree with the requirement for a Candidate RIR to meet all ICP-2 standards prior to recognition. This sets an unreasonably high threshold that could hinder the establishment of RIRs, particularly in underserved areas. Allowing provisional recognition while the Candidate RIR works to meet standards would foster development.

**Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)**

---

I fundamentally disagree with the requirement that a Candidate RIR must demonstrate full compliance with ICP-2 to be recognized. This creates an unnecessarily high barrier that could stifle development, especially in underserved areas. A more flexible method, like provisional recognition while standards are being met, would better support growth.

**Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)**

---

I find this provision problematic. Requiring a Candidate RIR to meet every ICP-2 stipulation before recognition sets a high bar that may stifle growth, particularly in underserved regions. A more accommodating approach, such as permitting provisional recognition during the compliance process, would foster development.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

Insisting that a Candidate RIR demonstrate compliance with all ICP-2 requirements prior to recognition may be overly restrictive and could impede progress, especially in regions that are underserved. Offering provisional recognition could stimulate growth and adjustment.

**Trabahan Pujari (Paruluniversity)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Restricting RIRs to large, multinational areas without overlap can diminish their flexibility and may not adequately meet specific regional needs. Overlapping regions can foster redundancy and improve responsiveness.

**Juan Mesa (Hispasat)**

---

I find this stipulation too rigid. Limiting an RIR to a large area without overlaps may hinder flexibility and not adequately address unique regional requirements. Allowing overlaps can enhance redundancy and better respond to local challenges.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating that a Candidate RIR meet all ICP-2 standards before recognition sets an unnecessarily high threshold that could impede RIR growth, particularly in

underserved areas. A more flexible approach, such as provisional recognition while the Candidate RIR works towards compliance, would foster development and adaptability.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

I find this condition too limiting. Requiring a Candidate RIR to fulfill all ICP-2 criteria before recognition creates an undue obstacle that could hinder the establishment of RIRs, particularly in regions that lack support. Allowing provisional recognition could promote growth and adaptation.

**Pornpipat Kitireanglarp (ZERIWELLPLUS Co., Ltd.)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. An RIR limited to a large, multinational area without overlap may lack the flexibility to meet distinct regional demands. Overlapping areas can provide valuable redundancy and better address local challenges.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. An RIR confined to a large, multinational area without overlap may lack the flexibility to respond to distinct regional needs. Allowing overlapping regions can introduce redundancy and improve local responsiveness.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Restricting RIRs to large, multinational areas without overlaps limits their flexibility and may not adequately address specific regional needs. Allowing overlaps can enhance redundancy and responsiveness.

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

I find this requirement problematic. Limiting an RIR to a large geographic area without overlaps reduces its adaptability and may fail to effectively address specific regional needs. Overlapping regions can introduce redundancy and improve local responsiveness.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

This requirement seems overly demanding. Insisting that a Candidate RIR demonstrate full compliance with all ICP-2 requirements prior to recognition may limit the formation of RIRs, especially in areas lacking support. A system of provisional recognition could encourage growth while the RIR works toward meeting those standards.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Mandating that a Candidate RIR fulfill all ICP-2 conditions before recognition imposes a high barrier that could obstruct RIR development, particularly in underserved regions. Allowing provisional recognition would facilitate growth and adaptation as the RIR works to meet necessary standards.

**Ashraful Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**



---

This requirement appears impractical. Mandating that an RIR cover a large area without overlaps can restrict flexibility and fail to address unique regional challenges. Allowing overlaps can enhance redundancy and local responsiveness.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

I find this requirement impractical. Mandating a Candidate RIR to meet all ICP-2 standards before recognition imposes a high threshold that could restrict RIR development, particularly in areas that need them most. A more flexible approach, such as provisional recognition, could encourage growth while the RIR works toward compliance.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---

I completely disagree with this condition. Setting the requirement that a Candidate RIR must meet all ICP-2 criteria before recognition creates an unnecessary obstacle that could inhibit RIR development in underserved regions. Allowing for provisional recognition would foster growth and compliance over time.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

This provision seems overly stringent. Insisting that a Candidate RIR demonstrate full compliance with all ICP-2 requirements before recognition could impede development, particularly in underserved areas. Implementing provisional recognition could encourage growth as the RIR works toward meeting the standards.

**Phuc Pham (Advanced Network Systems VietNam Company Limited)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Requiring a Candidate RIR to meet every ICP-2 criterion prior to recognition sets a high standard that may hinder the establishment of RIRs, especially in regions with limited resources. A provisional recognition approach would better support growth and adaptation.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

I find this requirement too rigid. Mandating that a Candidate RIR fulfill all ICP-2 standards before recognition creates an unnecessary barrier that could impede RIR development, particularly in underserved areas. Allowing provisional recognition could promote growth while the RIR addresses compliance issues.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

I completely disagree with this approach. Restricting RIRs to large, multinational areas without overlapping regions can inhibit flexibility and may not cater to specific regional requirements. Overlapping regions can provide important redundancy and improve local responsiveness.

**Giang Nguyen (NASA)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Mandating that a Candidate RIR fulfill all ICP-2 conditions before recognition imposes a high barrier that could obstruct RIR development, particularly in underserved regions. Allowing provisional recognition would facilitate growth and adaptation as the RIR works to meet necessary standards.

**Alex Kwan (Wiplus Malaysia)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating that a Candidate RIR meet all ICP-2 standards before recognition sets an unnecessarily high threshold that could impede RIR growth, particularly in underserved areas. A more flexible approach, such as provisional recognition while the Candidate RIR works towards compliance, would foster development and adaptability.

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

Disagree

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---

This requirement seems overly demanding. Insisting that a Candidate RIR demonstrate full compliance with all ICP-2 requirements before recognition may limit the formation of RIRs, especially in areas that lack support. A provisional recognition system could foster growth while the RIR works toward meeting those standards.

**Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Requiring a Candidate RIR to meet all ICP-2 conditions prior to recognition imposes a high barrier that could obstruct RIR development, particularly in underserved regions. Allowing provisional recognition would facilitate growth and adaptation as the RIR strives to meet the necessary standards.

**Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating that a Candidate RIR fulfill all ICP-2 standards prior to recognition sets an unnecessarily high threshold that could hinder RIR growth, especially in underserved areas. A more flexible approach, like provisional recognition while the Candidate RIR works toward full compliance, would encourage development and adaptability.

**Pooja Gopi (DM Digital Marketing)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Requiring a Candidate RIR to meet every ICP-2 criterion prior to recognition sets a high standard that may hinder the establishment of RIRs, especially in regions with limited resources. A provisional recognition approach would better support growth and adaptation.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---

I find this condition too limiting. Requiring a Candidate RIR to fulfill all ICP-2 criteria before recognition creates an undue obstacle that could hinder the establishment of RIRs, particularly in regions that lack support. Allowing provisional recognition could promote growth and adaptation.

**Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Insisting that a Candidate RIR meet every requirement of ICP-2 before being recognized sets a high bar that could stifle the growth of RIRs in underserved regions. A more flexible approach, such as provisional recognition, would encourage development and compliance over time.

**Quyn Kim (VNPAY)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Setting the requirement that a Candidate RIR must meet all ICP-2 conditions before being recognized imposes a high barrier that could impede RIR development, particularly in underserved regions. Allowing provisional recognition would enable growth and adaptation as the RIR strives to meet the necessary standards.

**Shahedul Islam Bhuiyan (Royal Green Limited)**

---

I completely oppose the idea that a Candidate RIR must meet all ICP-2 requirements for recognition. This imposes an unreasonably high standard that could hinder the establishment of RIRs, particularly in regions that are underserved. Allowing for provisional recognition while the Candidate RIR works to meet certain standards would encourage adaptation and growth.

**Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)**

---

Question 14&15 Recognition A Candidate RIR must meet or demonstrate that it can meet all the requirements of an RIR specified in ICP-2 to be recognized as an RIR. 1- Strongly Disagree Answer: I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating that a Candidate RIR meet all ICP-2 standards before recognition establishes an unnecessarily high threshold that could hinder the growth of RIRs, particularly in underserved areas. A more flexible approach, such as provisional recognition while the Candidate RIR works toward full compliance, would foster development and adaptability.

**Anjan Deka (HDFC)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating that a Candidate RIR meet all ICP-2 standards before recognition establishes an unnecessarily high threshold that could hinder the growth of RIRs, particularly in underserved areas. A more flexible approach, such as provisional recognition while the Candidate RIR works toward full compliance, would foster development and adaptability.

**Ketan Parmar (Bids Info Global)**

---

I find this requirement problematic. Mandating that a Candidate RIR meet every ICP-2 stipulation before recognition sets a high bar that may stifle the growth of RIRs, particularly in underserved regions. A more accommodating approach, such as permitting provisional recognition during the compliance process, would foster development and adaptability.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

I completely oppose the notion that a Candidate RIR must fulfill all requirements of ICP-2 prior to being recognized. This creates an excessively high threshold that could impede the establishment of RIRs, especially in regions that lack adequate service. Allowing provisional recognition while the Candidate RIR strives to meet the standards would encourage development and flexibility.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

I strongly disagree with the requirement that a Candidate RIR must meet all ICP-2 standards before recognition. This sets an unreasonably high barrier that could hinder the development of RIRs, particularly in underserved areas. A more flexible approach, such as provisional recognition while the Candidate RIR works towards full compliance, would promote growth and adaptability.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---

## 7. Operation

---

An RIR, once recognized, must continually meet all the requirements specified in ICP-2 in an auditable fashion.

### 7.1. Operation - Strongly Agree (5)

Cannot allow for drift away from requirements if the global system is to retain its integrity.

**Jordan Carter (auDA)**

---

This gives member service assurance

**Colwayne Babb (Cable and Wireless)**

---

I am strongly agree with that

**Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)**

---

I strongly agree

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

Nothing to add or retract

**Brian Longwe (Converged Technology Networks)**

---

No comment

**Kelvin Horng Woei Ong (Propnex)**

---

Consistently. If not, it should be revoked with immediate effect. By taking care of putting the resources & the staff in a safe place until the situation is improved.

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

strongly agree

**Aftab Siddiqui (AFTABSIDDIQUI-AU)**

---

I agree with this principle to a large extent. Continuous compliance with ICP-2 ensures that RIRs maintain the standards necessary for transparent, accountable, and effective resource management. The ability to audit compliance reinforces trust and consistency across the global Internet community. However, there should be provisions for addressing evolving regional circumstances and challenges, allowing RIRs to adapt while maintaining their core responsibilities. Flexibility in implementation is key to balancing accountability with regional autonomy.

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

I agree with this principle to a large extent. Continuous compliance with ICP-2 ensures that RIRs maintain the standards necessary for transparent, accountable, and effective resource management. The ability to audit compliance reinforces trust and consistency across the global Internet community. However, there should be provisions for addressing evolving regional circumstances and challenges, allowing RIRs to adapt while maintaining their core responsibilities. Flexibility in implementation is key to balancing accountability with regional autonomy.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

In a open manor ie no hiding anything.

**Warwick Ward-Cox (Network Platforms)**

---

This principle ensures that recognized RIRs continuously meet the requirements specified in ICP-2 and maintain accountability through regular audits. It fosters transparency, helps identify issues early, and ensures that RIRs remain aligned with global standards and best practices. This ongoing compliance is vital for the stability and trustworthiness of the global internet infrastructure

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

Yes

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

I strongly agree with the principle that a recognized RIR must continually meet all the requirements specified in ICP-2 in an auditable manner. This standard is vital for maintaining the integrity, accountability, and trustworthiness of each RIR in the global internet governance structure. Here are the key reasons supporting this principle: a. RIRs are trusted with critical responsibilities for IP address allocation and resource management within their regions. Continual compliance with ICP-2 requirements ensures that each RIR remains accountable to the community it serves and operates transparently, reinforcing stakeholder confidence. b. ICP-2 requirements cover operational, policy, and governance standards designed to ensure consistent and reliable service. Auditable, ongoing compliance ensures that RIRs maintain high standards of resource management, avoiding disruptions or inconsistencies that could affect regional and global internet stability. c. The internet is constantly evolving, with new technical, security, and governance challenges arising. Ongoing compliance with ICP-2 requirements ensures that RIRs stay aligned with current best practices, are prepared to adapt to changes, and can contribute effectively to the evolving global internet governance landscape. d. Over time, there can be a natural drift in an organization's policies, practices, or governance models, especially under new leadership or regional pressures. Regular audits against ICP-2 requirements help prevent such drift, ensuring that each RIR stays true to the standards and objectives it was recognized for. e. RIRs must coordinate not only with local stakeholders but also with ICANN, the NRO, and other RIRs. Regular audits promote alignment with global standards, allowing RIRs to collaborate smoothly, share resources as needed, and contribute to a cohesive global policy environment that benefits users and network operators. f. The audibility aspect ensures that RIRs can demonstrate they have the technical, financial, and administrative capacity to manage their region's growing internet demands. This capacity includes the ability to respond effectively to emerging issues like cybersecurity, IPv6 adoption, and resource depletion. g. RIRs operate on a community-driven model where policies are developed in an open, transparent way. Auditable compliance reassures stakeholders that their RIR operates transparently, upholds fair and inclusive policies, and is accountable to its community. To make this continuous, auditable compliance practical and effective, RIRs could: i. Each RIR could

conduct regular internal reviews against ICP-2 standards, issuing public reports on its compliance status. This self-assessment could be supplemented by community feedback and open for public comment. ii. In addition to self-assessments, independent audits by a trusted third party could verify compliance objectively. This approach would add credibility to compliance claims and provide external validation of the RIR's operations. iii. Where audits identify areas of non-compliance, the RIR should implement corrective actions, with transparent timelines and reporting on progress. These mechanisms would show a commitment to continuous improvement. Auditable, ongoing compliance with ICP-2 requirements promotes a Resilient Internet Infrastructure, enhances Global Cooperation and Builds Trust

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

Same question as before. What if because of issues this cannot be met. The case of AFRINIC

**Raymond Mamattah (EGIGFA)**

---

Audited by independent provider as well.

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

I completely oppose this provision. Insisting that an RIR must consistently meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable manner threatens its independence and could create chaos and conflicting priorities, undermining a decentralized approach.

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

I agree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

It makes. Sense

**Danjuma bappa ahmed (Wownetworks limited nigeria)**

---

it must ensure the standard and requirements are kept except otherwise

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

correcte

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

Essential for maintaining stakeholder confidence

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

Yes

**Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)**

---

Maintaining the standard is important.

**Luis Caceres (Corporacion Redexcom C.A.)**

---

RIRs should undergo annual audits with certain elements of the audit being annual and other elements of the audit being on 3 and 5 year cycles but such that each year all annual elements are audited and some 3 and 5 year elements are audited

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

They should be regular audits.

**Musa Stephen HONLUE (AFRINIC)**

---

How often will those audits occur? And by whom?

**Xavier Clark (Harris Computer)**

---

This seems to be a no brainer. :-)

**Carlos Friaças (FCT\| FCCN)**

---

The same caveat applies with respect to the ICP-2 principles being widely agreeable.

**Kevin Meynell (Individual)**

---

It's fundamental requirement.

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

## **7.2. Operation - Somewhat Agree (4)**

I'm ok with this, but I suspect reaching a mechanism to ensure this is enforceable will be hard.

**Andrew Sullivan (N/A)**

---

None

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

agree

**Mohammad Mubarak Alfalasi (Telecommunication and Digital government Regulatory Authority)**

---

RIRs maintain the highest standards of operation and accountability. By requiring continuous adherence to ICP-2 requirements and subjecting their operations to regular audits, it safeguards the integrity of the global internet numbering system and promotes transparency and trust in the RIR community. This principle also helps to identify and address potential issues before they escalate, ensuring the smooth and reliable operation of the internet.



**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

I think a principle that promotes phased independence, where new RIRs receive time-bound financial and operational support should be considered

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

yeah, that audit is a problem when there is money to be made.... IPv4 again ;(

**Hendrik Visage (HeViS.Co Systems Pty Ltd)**

---

Depends if you have a gun at your head....

**Mark Elkins (Posix Systems)**

---

No comments

**Pacharaporn Wangwinyoo (ZIM (Thailand) Co., LTD.)**

---

Must be auditable

**John Haydon (Education)**

---

I agree

**Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)**

---

I agree

**Kate Petras (DCXV)**

---

Auditable. I understand but it's still a bit vague. There are different types of audits.

**Mike Burns (IPTrading)**

---

### **7.3. Operation - Neutral (3)**

There should be no such rule as this sounds so decentralized. RIRs are to be kept indepent, otherwise, this just creates chaos, disorder and conflicts.

**Noel OUPOH (DATACONNECT AFRICA)**

---

There should be fairness everytime

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

An RIR, once recognized, is required to continuously meet all ICP-2 requirements in an auditable way, including facilitating the portability of number resources and securing the consent of all existing members.

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---

Yes

**Hann Jye Ng (MyTeksi Sdn Bhd)**

---

This provision appears overly demanding. Requiring that an RIR consistently demonstrate compliance with all ICP-2 standards in an auditable fashion may compromise its independence. This could lead to disorder and conflict rather than enhancing decentralization. 8

**Sidonie Hacking (-)**

---

I strongly disagree with this approach. Requiring ongoing compliance with all ICP-2 requirements in an auditable fashion could jeopardize the independence of RIRs. This could create unnecessary chaos and conflict rather than fostering a decentralized system.

**Jun Wen (one futures technology sdn bhd)**

---

I find this requirement unacceptable. Mandating continuous compliance with ICP-2 in an auditable manner could compromise the independence of RIRs and create unnecessary conflicts and chaos.

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

## **7.4. Operation - Somewhat Disagree (2)**

It remains unclear what "in an auditable fashion" means; also, the topic of (voluntary) retirement of an RIR needs to be addressed

**Peter Koch (Individual)**

---

"Continually" is, pragmatically speaking, unrealistic and does not take into consideration planned outages, disruptive events outside of the RIR's control, etc. Auditable requirements, particularly those related to performance and services, should be threshold-based, like the IANA performance expectations with explicit service level commitments and mutually agreed acceptable "cure" timeframes. Instead, as a principle, perhaps "An RIR, once recognized, must meet service level commitments mutually agreed upon between the RIR and its community."

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

An RIR, once recognized, must continually satisfy all requirements in ICP-2 in an auditable manner, including the facilitation of IP resource portability and the consent of all existing members.

**Neonjyoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

## 7.5. Operation - Strongly Disagree (1)

An RIR must ensure ongoing compliance with all requirements of ICP-2 in an auditable fashion once recognized, fostering transparency and trust.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

After obtaining recognition, an RIR must continually satisfy all ICP-2 specifications in an auditable manner, promoting effective resource management.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

An RIR, once recognized, is obligated to consistently comply with all ICP-2 requirements in an auditable way, ensuring governance integrity.

**Tipu Khan (Zx Online Ltd)**

---

Once recognized, an RIR must continually meet all requirements specified in ICP-2 in an auditable manner, fostering trust and accountability.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

An RIR must ensure that it continually meets all the requirements of ICP-2 in an auditable way after being recognized, promoting accountability in its operations.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---

Once recognized, an RIR is required to continuously meet all the ICP-2 requirements in an auditable manner, facilitating transparency and effective oversight.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

An RIR must maintain ongoing compliance with all requirements specified in ICP-2 in an auditable fashion, ensuring trust and accountability in its governance.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---

After recognition, an RIR is obligated to continually adhere to all ICP-2 requirements in an auditable manner, ensuring that its practices remain transparent and accountable.

**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

This requirement seems overly restrictive. Mandating that an RIR continually demonstrate compliance with ICP-2 standards in an auditable manner may undermine its independence. Such a rule could lead to disorder and conflicting priorities among RIRs.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

After recognition, an RIR must consistently fulfill all ICP-2 requirements in an auditable fashion, promoting effective oversight and governance.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

An RIR, once recognized, has the responsibility to continually adhere to all ICP-2 requirements in an auditable manner, ensuring operational integrity.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

After obtaining recognition, an RIR must continually meet all specifications of ICP-2 in an auditable way to ensure transparency and accountability.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

This provision appears overly demanding. Requiring that an RIR consistently demonstrate compliance with all ICP-2 standards in an auditable fashion may undermine its independence, leading to disorder and conflict rather than enhancing decentralization.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

I completely oppose this stipulation. Requiring continuous compliance with all ICP-2 requirements in an auditable manner threatens RIR independence, potentially creating chaos and conflicting interests instead of strengthening a decentralized framework.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---

Once recognized, an RIR must continually satisfy all the requirements outlined in ICP-2 in a way that can be audited, ensuring effective management of number resource portability.

**Taslina Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

A recognized RIR is obligated to consistently meet all the requirements detailed in ICP-2 in a verifiable manner, including enabling the portability of IP resources.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

After being recognized, an RIR must maintain compliance with all requirements in ICP-2 in an auditable manner, including the capacity to support IP resource portability.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

An RIR, upon recognition, must consistently satisfy all ICP-2 requirements in an auditable fashion, ensuring it can facilitate the transfer of number resources effectively.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

Once recognized, an RIR must consistently meet all requirements detailed in ICP-2 in an auditable manner, ensuring the ongoing portability of IP resources.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

A recognized RIR must continually fulfill all the requirements outlined in ICP-2 in a verifiable manner, ensuring seamless management of resource portability.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

A recognized RIR must continually fulfill all the requirements outlined in ICP-2 in a verifiable manner, ensuring seamless management of resource portability.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

A recognized RIR is required to continuously fulfill all the requirements set forth in ICP-2 in an auditable manner, ensuring capacity for IP resource portability.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

An RIR must, once recognized, continually meet all requirements outlined in ICP-2 in a verifiable way, particularly with respect to the portability of resources.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

After being recognized, an RIR must continually adhere to all the stipulations of ICP-2 in an auditable manner, ensuring effective management of IP resources.

**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

An RIR, once recognized, must consistently comply with all requirements specified in ICP-2 in a verifiable fashion, including the ability to manage resource portability.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

To maintain its recognition, an RIR must consistently adhere to the requirements set forth in ICP-2 in a manner that is auditable, facilitating the portability of number resources.

**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

Upon recognition, an RIR is obligated to continually meet all the requirements detailed in ICP-2 in an auditable manner, particularly concerning resource portability.

**Pham Gia Khiem (Phat Tai Logistics)**

---

This requirement seems excessively rigid. Mandating ongoing compliance with all ICP-2 standards in an auditable manner could hinder the autonomy of RIRs. Such a mandate could lead to disorder and conflict rather than supporting effective decentralization.

**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

An RIR, once recognized, is obligated to meet all ICP-2 specifications continuously and in an auditable way, facilitating the effective portability of IP resources.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

An RIR, once recognized, is obligated to meet all ICP-2 specifications continuously and in an auditable way, facilitating the effective portability of IP resources.

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

Upon recognition, an RIR is obligated to continually comply with all requirements detailed in ICP-2 in an auditable fashion, which includes facilitating the portability of IP resources.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

A recognized RIR must continuously demonstrate compliance with all stipulations of ICP-2 in an auditable way, ensuring effective management of IP resource portability.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

Once recognized, an RIR is required to consistently meet all the criteria set forth in ICP-2 in an auditable fashion, ensuring IP resource portability.

**Kwan Ke Yue (TBWA/ Kuala Lumpur)**

---

An RIR must, upon recognition, continually fulfill all requirements specified in ICP-2 in a verifiable manner, particularly regarding the management of resource portability.

**Sean Carroll (The One Academy)**

---

A recognized RIR must continuously demonstrate compliance with all requirements specified in ICP-2 in an auditable way, including the facilitation of IP resource portability.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

Upon recognition, an RIR is obligated to continually satisfy all the stipulations of ICP-2 in an auditable manner, particularly in terms of resource portability

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

Upon recognition, an RIR must maintain compliance with all requirements specified in ICP-2 in an auditable manner, including facilitating IP resource portability and maintaining agreement from all current members.

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**

---

An RIR, after recognition, must continually comply with all specified ICP-2 requirements in an auditable manner, including facilitating IP resource portability and ensuring member consent.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

An RIR must maintain compliance with all requirements outlined in ICP-2 in an auditable way after recognition, ensuring ongoing accountability in its operations.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---

For recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must prove that it can meet all ICP-2 requirements, including facilitating the portability of IP resources with the consent of all existing members.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---

A Candidate RIR must demonstrate its capability to meet all requirements specified in ICP-2 for recognition, including provisions for the portability of IP resources and securing agreement from current members.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

Once recognized, an RIR is required to continually satisfy all ICP-2 requirements in a manner that is auditable, promoting effective governance and oversight.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---

To be recognized as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must show that it can comply with all ICP-2 requirements, including ensuring resource portability and receiving approval from all existing members.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

An RIR, once recognized, must consistently meet all the requirements specified in ICP-2 in an auditable manner, ensuring transparency and accountability in its operations.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

A Candidate RIR must illustrate that it can meet all the requirements outlined in ICP-2 for recognition, including supporting the portability of IP resources and obtaining consent from current members.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

Upon recognition, an RIR is required to consistently fulfill all the criteria outlined in ICP-2 in a verifiable way, including provisions for the seamless portability of IP resources.

**Md Abu Sayeem Siddique Siddique (ServicEngine Ltd)**

---

An RIR, once recognized, must continually meet all the requirements specified in ICP-2 in an auditable manner, ensuring that it facilitates the portability of IP resources as needed.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

An RIR, after recognition, must continually comply with all requirements specified in ICP-2 in an auditable format, ensuring the portability of IP resources and the consent of all existing members.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

Once recognized, an RIR must consistently meet all the specifications laid out in ICP-2 in an auditable way, including the facilitation of IP resource portability and securing the agreement of all members.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---

Once recognized, an RIR must consistently adhere to all requirements specified in ICP-2 in an auditable fashion, ensuring that it facilitates the portability of IP resources and has the consent of all existing members.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---

An RIR must continually demonstrate compliance with all requirements outlined in ICP-2 in an auditable manner once recognized, including provisions for IP resource portability and member consent.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

Once recognized, an RIR must consistently demonstrate adherence to all requirements specified in ICP-2 in an auditable manner, including provisions for the portability of IP resources and securing member consent.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

Upon recognition, an RIR is required to consistently meet all ICP-2 requirements in an auditable way, which includes provisions for IP resource portability and obtaining consent from all members.

**Minh Hoang (ANSV)**

---

An RIR must continually demonstrate compliance with all specified ICP-2 requirements in an auditable manner once recognized, including facilitating the portability of number resources and securing member consent.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**

---

To gain recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must prove that it can comply with all requirements outlined in ICP-2, including facilitating the portability of IP resources and obtaining consent from existing members.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**

---

A Candidate RIR must show its capability to meet all ICP-2 requirements for RIR recognition, including provisions for resource portability and receiving consent from all current members.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---

To be recognized as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must show that it can fulfill all requirements specified in ICP-2, including supporting the portability of IP resources with the approval of existing members.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

A Candidate RIR must meet or demonstrate the ability to meet all ICP-2 requirements for recognition as an RIR, including provisions for IP resource portability and with the consent of all existing members.

**Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)**

---



For a Candidate RIR to be recognized, it must demonstrate that it can meet all the requirements in ICP-2, ensuring resource portability and securing consent from all current members.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

A Candidate RIR must prove its ability to comply with all the requirements outlined in ICP-2 for RIR recognition, including facilitating resource portability and obtaining agreement from existing members.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---

To achieve recognition, a Candidate RIR must show that it can fulfill all the RIR requirements specified in ICP-2, including provisions for the portability of IP resources and with the approval of all current members.

**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

A Candidate RIR must illustrate its capability to meet all requirements in ICP-2 to be recognized as an RIR, which includes ensuring resource portability and receiving the consent of all existing members.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---

For recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must demonstrate compliance with all requirements specified in ICP-2, including the ability to support the portability of IP resources and obtaining consent from all current members.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

A Candidate RIR must show that it can meet all the requirements defined in ICP-2 for recognition as an RIR, including facilitating the portability of IP resources and securing consent from existing members.

**Ryan Khaw (Alsco Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

Upon recognition, an RIR must consistently demonstrate adherence to all requirements in ICP-2 in an auditable manner, including facilitating IP resource portability and ensuring the agreement of all current members.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

An RIR, once recognized, is required to continually satisfy all requirements specified in ICP-2 in an auditable manner, including facilitating the portability of IP resources with the consent of all current members.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Apmic)**

---

An RIR, once recognized, is required to continually fulfill all requirements specified in ICP-2 in an auditable manner, ensuring the portability of IP resources and obtaining consent from all existing members.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

After recognition, an RIR must consistently demonstrate compliance with all the requirements in ICP-2 in an auditable manner, including the facilitation of IP resource portability and the consent of members.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

An RIR, upon recognition, must continually meet all the requirements defined in ICP-2 in an auditable fashion, facilitating the portability of IP resources with the consent of all existing members.

**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

Once recognized, an RIR must continually satisfy all the requirements outlined in ICP-2 in a way that can be audited, ensuring effective management of number resource portability.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

A recognized RIR is obligated to consistently meet all the requirements detailed in ICP-2 in a verifiable manner, including enabling the portability of IP resources.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

An RIR must consistently adhere to all specified ICP-2 requirements in an auditable manner after recognition, ensuring that it facilitates IP resource portability and has the consent of all members.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**

---

An RIR must continually meet all requirements specified in ICP-2 in an auditable manner after recognition, including provisions for facilitating the portability of IP resources and securing member consent.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

Upon recognition, an RIR is required to continually fulfill all the stipulations outlined in ICP-2 in an auditable manner, ensuring that IP resource portability is facilitated and that all current members consent to this compliance.

**Jeremy Cheong (Infineon technologies)**

---

Once recognized, an RIR must continuously meet the full set of requirements specified in ICP-2 in an auditable format, including the facilitation of IP resource portability and with the agreement of all current members.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

After being recognized, an RIR must consistently meet all specified requirements of ICP-2 in an auditable manner, which includes the ability to facilitate resource portability with the consent of all existing members.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

An RIR, once recognized, must continuously comply with all requirements set forth in ICP-2 in an auditable manner, including the facilitation of IP resource portability and ensuring all members consent.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

I find this requirement unacceptable. Mandating that RIRs continuously comply with ICP-2 in an auditable manner threatens their independence and may create unnecessary chaos and disputes.

**Sohel Kabir (Kabir Traders)**

---

I completely oppose the idea that RIRs must consistently comply with all ICP-2 standards in an auditable way. This approach undermines their autonomy and may create conflicts and chaos.

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

An RIR must continually adhere to all requirements specified in ICP-2 in an auditable manner after recognition, including provisions for IP resource portability and the consent of all current members.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---

Once recognized, an RIR is obligated to consistently demonstrate compliance with all ICP-2 requirements in an auditable way, ensuring that IP resource portability is a key component and that consent from all members is secured.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---

An RIR must continuously meet all specified requirements in ICP-2 in an auditable fashion once recognized, including the ability to facilitate IP resource portability and securing the consent of all existing members.

**Catalina Cueca (Manpower)**

---

Upon recognition, an RIR is required to continually comply with all ICP-2 requirements in an auditable manner, which includes facilitating the portability of IP resources with the consent of all current members.

**Camilo Riveros (Manpower)**

---

The insistence that RIRs must consistently meet all ICP-2 requirements in an auditable fashion could undermine their autonomy, potentially leading to chaos and conflicts within the ecosystem.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

An RIR, once recognized, must continually demonstrate its compliance with all requirements outlined in ICP-2 in an auditable manner, including the facilitation of IP resource portability and obtaining consent from all existing members.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**

---

There should not be a strict rule requiring RIRs to continuously meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable fashion, as this could compromise their independence and incite chaos and conflicts.

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

I strongly disagree with this stipulation. Requiring a Candidate RIR to continually meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable manner undermines its independence and may lead to chaos and conflicting priorities, detracting from a decentralized approach.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

This requirement seems excessively rigid. Mandating ongoing compliance with all ICP-2 standards in an auditable way could hinder the autonomy of RIRs. Such a mandate could lead to disorder and conflict rather than supporting effective decentralization.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

I find this stipulation too limiting. Requiring an RIR to consistently meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable manner diminishes its autonomy. This could foster confusion and conflicts, detracting from an effective decentralized framework.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Insisting that a Candidate RIR meet every requirement of ICP-2 before recognition sets a high bar that could hinder the growth of RIRs in underserved regions. A more flexible approach, such as provisional recognition, would encourage development and gradual compliance.

**Anh Dang (NASA)**

---

The imposition of a rule that RIRs must continually meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable fashion risks undermining their independence, leading to confusion and conflicts.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

Requiring RIRs to consistently adhere to all ICP-2 criteria in an auditable manner could undermine their autonomy, potentially creating disorder and conflicts within the community.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

Insisting that recognized RIRs continually fulfill all ICP-2 requirements in an auditable way could hinder their independence and lead to unnecessary complexity and conflicts.

**Prasanta Haloi (Pwd)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Georges Lallogo (ANPTIC)**

---

I find this stipulation too limiting. Requiring an RIR to consistently meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable manner diminishes its autonomy, potentially fostering confusion and conflicts that detract from an effective decentralized framework.

**Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)**

---

I fundamentally disagree with the notion that an RIR must continually meet all ICP-2 requirements in an auditable manner once recognized. This could threaten their independence and lead to disorder and confusion.

**AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)**

---

I find this provision problematic. Requiring RIRs to maintain continuous compliance with ICP-2 in an auditable fashion compromises their independence and fosters chaos and disputes.

**K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)**

---

I completely oppose this stipulation. Requiring an RIR to continually meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable manner undermines its independence and could create chaos and conflicting priorities, detracting from a decentralized approach.

**Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)**

---

I strongly oppose the idea that recognized RIRs must continually meet ICP-2 requirements in a manner that is auditable. Such a requirement undermines their autonomy and could lead to disorder and conflicts.

**Fuhui Zhang (University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)**

---

I completely disagree with the stipulation that an RIR must consistently meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable fashion. This requirement threatens their independence and could create chaos and disputes.

**Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)**

---

I fundamentally disagree with the requirement that an RIR, once recognized, must continually meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable manner. This could undermine their independence and lead to confusion and conflicts.

**Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)**

---

I find this provision problematic. Requiring RIRs to maintain continuous compliance with ICP-2 in an auditable fashion could compromise their independence and foster conflict and disorder.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

There should not be a strict requirement for RIRs to continuously meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable way. Such a centralized approach could undermine their independence and lead to conflicts.

**Trabahan Pujari (Paruluniversity)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

I completely oppose this requirement. Mandating that an RIR continually meet ICP-2 standards in an auditable manner threatens its independence and could lead to chaos and internal conflicts, rather than enhancing decentralization.

**Juan Mesa (Hispasat)**

---

I find this stipulation too limiting. Requiring an RIR to consistently meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable manner diminishes its autonomy, potentially fostering confusion and conflicts that detract from an effective decentralized framework.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

I strongly disagree with this requirement. Mandating that an RIR consistently meet all ICP-2 standards in a verifiable manner undermines its independence, potentially leading to disorder and conflict instead of fostering a decentralized approach that supports effective RIR operation.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

I find this stipulation too limiting. Requiring an RIR to consistently meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable manner diminishes its autonomy, potentially fostering confusion and conflicts that detract from an effective decentralized framework.

**Pornpipat Kitireanglarp (ZERIWELLPLUS Co., Ltd.)**

---

I completely oppose this provision. Requiring an RIR to consistently meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable way jeopardizes its autonomy and may result in chaos and internal conflicts, rather than encouraging an effective decentralized system.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

I completely oppose this provision. Insisting that an RIR must consistently meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable manner threatens its independence and could create chaos and conflicting priorities, undermining a decentralized approach.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

I strongly disagree with this requirement. Mandating an RIR to continually meet ICP-2 standards in an auditable manner undermines its autonomy and could result in chaos and conflicts, rather than fostering a decentralized operational structure.

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

I find this stipulation problematic. Insisting that an RIR must continuously demonstrate compliance with all ICP-2 requirements in an auditable manner could threaten its independence, leading to confusion and conflicts instead of promoting a decentralized structure.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

This requirement seems overly restrictive. Mandating that an RIR continually demonstrate compliance with ICP-2 standards in an auditable manner may compromise its independence and lead to disorder and conflicting priorities among RIRs.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---

I completely oppose this provision. Requiring an RIR to consistently meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable way jeopardizes its autonomy and may result in chaos and internal conflicts instead of encouraging an effective decentralized system.

**Ashraful Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

This provision appears excessively rigid. Requiring that an RIR must consistently demonstrate compliance with all ICP-2 standards in an auditable manner may undermine its autonomy, potentially creating confusion and conflicts within the system.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

I find this condition impractical. Mandating that an RIR consistently demonstrate compliance with all ICP-2 requirements in an auditable way could erode its independence, leading to confusion and conflicts instead of promoting effective decentralization.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---

I strongly disagree with this requirement. Mandating an RIR to continually meet ICP-2 standards in an auditable manner undermines its autonomy and could result in chaos and conflicts, rather than fostering a decentralized operational structure.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

This provision appears overly demanding. Requiring that an RIR consistently demonstrate compliance with all ICP-2 standards in an auditable fashion may undermine its independence. This could lead to disorder and conflict instead of enhancing decentralization.

**Phuc Pham (Advanced Network Systems VietNam Company Limited)**

---

I completely oppose this stipulation. Requiring continuous compliance with all ICP-2 requirements in an auditable manner threatens RIR independence. Such a rule could create chaos and conflicting interests rather than bolstering a decentralized framework.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

I find this requirement too rigid. Insisting that an RIR must continually meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable way undermines its autonomy and could lead to confusion and conflicts, detracting from a functional decentralized model.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

I strongly disagree with this approach. Requiring ongoing compliance with all ICP-2 requirements in an auditable manner could jeopardize RIR independence, creating unnecessary chaos and conflict instead of fostering a decentralized system.

**Giang Nguyen (NASA)**

---

I completely oppose this provision. Requiring an RIR to consistently meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable way jeopardizes its autonomy and may result in chaos and internal conflicts instead of encouraging an effective decentralized system.

**Alex Kwan (Wiplus Malaysia)**

---

I strongly disagree with this requirement. Mandating that an RIR consistently meet all ICP-2 standards in a verifiable manner undermines its independence, potentially leading to disorder and conflict instead of fostering a decentralized approach that supports effective RIR operation.

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---

This requirement seems overly restrictive. Mandating that an RIR continually demonstrate compliance with ICP-2 standards in an auditable manner may compromise its independence. Such a rule could lead to disorder and conflicting priorities among RIRs.

**Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)**

---

I completely oppose this provision. Requiring an RIR to consistently meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable way threatens its autonomy. This could lead to chaos and internal conflicts rather than encouraging an effective decentralized system.

**Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)**

---

I strongly disagree with this requirement. Mandating that an RIR consistently meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable manner undermines its independence. This could result in disorder and conflict instead of promoting a decentralized approach that enables effective RIR operation.

**Pooja Gopi (DM Digital Marketing)**

---

I completely oppose this stipulation. Mandating continuous compliance with all ICP-2 requirements in an auditable manner threatens the independence of RIRs. Such a rule could create chaos and conflicting interests instead of supporting a decentralized framework.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---



I find this stipulation too limiting. Requiring an RIR to consistently meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable manner diminishes its autonomy. This could foster confusion and conflicts, detracting from an effective decentralized framework.

**Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Insisting that a Candidate RIR meet every requirement of ICP-2 before being recognized sets a high bar that could stifle the growth of RIRs in underserved regions. A more flexible approach, such as provisional recognition, would encourage development and compliance over time.

**Quyn Kim (VNPAY)**

---

I completely oppose this provision. Requiring an RIR to consistently meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable fashion threatens its autonomy. This could result in chaos and internal conflicts rather than promoting an effective decentralized system.

**Shahedul Islam Bhuiyan (Royal Green Limited)**

---

I completely oppose the notion that an RIR must continuously meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable fashion. This requirement threatens regional independence and may result in conflicts and disorder.

**Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)**

---

Question - 16-17 An RIR, once recognized, must continually meet all the requirements specified in ICP 2 in an auditable fashion. 1- Strongly Disagree Answer: I strongly disagree with this requirement. Mandating that an RIR continually meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable manner undermines their independence. This could lead to chaos and conflict instead of fostering a decentralized approach that allows RIRs to operate effectively.

**Anjan Deka (HDFC)**

---

I strongly disagree with this requirement. Mandating that an RIR continually meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable manner undermines their independence. This could lead to chaos and conflict instead of fostering a decentralized approach that allows RIRs to operate effectively.

**Ketan Parmar (Bids Info Global)**

---

I find this provision problematic. Mandating that RIRs continually meet ICP-2 requirements in an auditable fashion could compromise their independence and lead to unnecessary chaos and conflicts.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

I completely oppose the idea that once recognized, an RIR must consistently comply with all ICP-2 requirements in an auditable way. This approach threatens the independence of RIRs and may result in disorder and disputes.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

I strongly disagree with the requirement that an RIR must continually meet all ICP-2 standards in an auditable manner. Such a rule undermines regional independence and could lead to chaos and conflicts among RIRs.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---

I don't agree

**Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)**

---

## 8. Derecognition

---

An RIR that does not continue to meet all the requirements specified in ICP-2 may be derecognized as an RIR.

### 8.1. Derecognition - Strongly Agree (5)

I agree with this principle, as it provides a necessary safeguard to maintain the integrity, trust, and effectiveness of the Regional Internet Registry (RIR) system. However, implementing this principle requires careful consideration to ensure fairness and prevent unnecessary disruption.

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

Nothing to add or detract

**Brian Longwe (Converged Technology Networks)**

---

RIR has to work within the requirements of ICP 2 and the needs of the local governance.

**Noel OUPOH (DATACONNECT AFRICA)**

---

Yes completely agree. No grace period should be given. Too many tactiques from a bad party can be done in the mean time.(the resources & the staff are at the mercey of such acts)

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

These entities cannot be guaranteed to operate in perpetuity without justification.

**Narelle Clark (Internet Association of Australia)**

---

Agree

**Warwick Ward-Cox (Network Platforms)**

---

Assuming that a smooth process is available for members to migrate issued resources to an alternative RIR be that an existing or replacing RIR.

**Jaco Kroon (Interexcel World Connection)**

---

This principle ensures RIRs remain accountable by requiring continuous compliance with ICP-2, with the possibility of derecognition if they fail to meet the standards. While it promotes quality and reliability, the process of derecognition should be fair, involving clear procedures and opportunities for correction before taking such a drastic step. It helps maintain the integrity of the global IP address management system while ensuring a balanced enforcement approach

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

Strongly agree

I strongly agree with the principle that an RIR that fails to meet the requirements specified in ICP-2 should be subject to possible derecognition. This principle is critical for upholding the integrity, reliability, and accountability of the global RIR system. Here are key reasons supporting this principle:

- a. RIRs are entrusted with the management of vital internet resources for their regions, including IP addresses and Autonomous System Numbers. If an RIR fails to uphold ICP-2 standards, its ability to serve its community effectively is compromised, and this undermines trust in the RIR. The possibility of derecognition reinforces accountability and commitment to standards.
- b. ICP-2 sets forth requirements to ensure that RIRs operate consistently and effectively. If an RIR fails to meet these standards, it can create operational inconsistencies that impact not only its region but also the global internet community. Derecognition serves as a necessary measure to prevent instability and safeguard global resource allocation.
- c. The possibility of derecognition provides a strong incentive for RIRs to adhere to best practices, maintain transparency, and operate responsibly. This mechanism ensures that RIRs remain aligned with community expectations, stay responsive to changing technical and governance standards, and prioritize regional and global internet needs.
- d. Non-compliance with ICP-2 requirements can lead to conflicts within or across regions, particularly if it affects fair resource allocation, policy enforcement, or cooperation with other RIRs. By enforcing derecognition as a last resort, the internet governance community can avoid such conflicts and ensure that each RIR operates in harmony with the broader governance framework.
- e. RIRs operate under a community-driven model where stakeholders expect reliable, fair, and transparent service. An RIR that does not meet ICP-2 standards could jeopardize these principles, affecting end-users, network operators, and regional stakeholders. Derecognition is an important tool to protect the community's interests and ensure that each RIR serves effectively.
- f. RIRs work closely with ICANN, the NRO, and other entities in the global internet governance system. Non-compliant RIRs could disrupt the coordination and cooperation necessary for managing global internet resources. Derecognition ensures that only RIRs committed to ICP-2 requirements remain in the system, supporting global alignment.
- g. Knowing that derecognition is possible encourages each RIR to regularly review its policies, practices, and governance structures. This environment fosters continuous improvement and responsiveness, ensuring that each RIR remains capable of managing internet resources responsibly in a dynamic environment.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

“Does not continue...” meaning its an intentional efforts not to comply.

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

I find this requirement impractical. Derecognizing an RIR for failing to meet every ICP-2 standard could lead to instability in the regional Internet infrastructure. Each RIR serves a diverse area with unique challenges, and minor lapses should not lead to immediate derecognition. A supportive strategy, such as providing resources or a grace period, would be more effective.

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

I agree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

It makes sense

**Danjuma bappa ahmed (Wownetworks limited nigeria)**

---

---

RIR should be allow to setup is requirement and operate itself without conflicting with the existitng one.

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

peu recommande

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

perhaps a timeframe would be helpful here.

**Nancy Carter (no affiliation)**

---

Obviously subject to dispute resolution and accountability mechanisms.

**Jeff Neuman (JJN Soluions, LLC)**

---

A structured remediation process prior to derecognition may provide an RIR with a fair opportunity to regain compliance while maintaining service continuity.

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

No

**Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)**

---

May, but not must .... The derecognition process must entail due process following a failure to meet the audited requirements specified in ICP-2 as amended

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

The RIR should be notified and granted a grace period to amend all discrepancies

**Musa Stephen HONLUE (AFRINIC)**

---

I am not sure about the word 'recognize' and 'derecognize' why not use 'accredited' and 'deaccredited' instead?

**Adiel Akplogan (iNetSys)**

---

What will the grace period be, if there is one?

**Xavier Clark (Harris Computer)**

---

If we can't eject a non-compliant RIR, our form of governance has a dramatic weakness.

**Mike Burns (IPTrading)**

---

Consider the choice of words: "may" leaves the choice with the NRO EC and ICANN. But that means a large number of networks have a deficient service unless the NRO EC and ICANN choose to act. A stronger word would be helpful because this isn't about the entity providing the RIR service but the networks and users relying on the quality of that service. While a deterministic "must" might be too strong, an RFC 8174 "SHOULD" could be helpful in placing a strong onus on the NRO EC and ICANN to explain why a deficient service is the best option available.

**Leo Vegoda (And Polus LLC)**

---

I would even recommend MUST rather than MAY

**Marco Marzetti (Consolle Connect)**

---

As I support the idea we need to define the derecognition, I simply support this. I would argue to add the remedial phase of lifecycle between operation and derecognition.

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

It needs to be clearly defined what happens in such a situation (derecognition section?)

**Matthew Cowen (dgtlfutures)**

---

I like "may", although I expect more detail in the final ICP-2bis

**Sander Steffann (SJM Steffann Consultancy)**

---

## **8.2. Derecognition - Somewhat Agree (4)**

Should have a period to return to compliance before being derecognized.

**Darrell Budic (OHG Networks, LLC)**

---

See my previous remark. How will this be enforced?

**Andrew Sullivan (N/A)**

---

Yes, ICP-2 is a project that we are committed to, we must respect the protocols put in place and apply the policies decided.

**Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)**

---

agree

**Mohammad Mubarak Alfalasi (Telecommunication and Digital government Regulatory Authority)**

---

accountability and upholds the integrity of the RIR system. By allowing for the derecognition of RIRs that fail to meet the required standards, it safeguards the stability and security of the global internet

numbering system. This mechanism helps to maintain a high level of performance and reliability among RIRs, ultimately benefiting the entire internet community.

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

Even in case of failure on the respect of procedure

**Fabrice TEUGUIA (PCP-ACEFA)**

---

No comment

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

Generally agree that derecognition must be possible, but the devil will absolutely be in the details of what lies under the principle.

**Brian Nisbet (HEAnet CLG)**

---

Vital

**John Haydon (Education)**

---

A process needs to be specified

**Randy Bush (IIJ Research Lab & Arrcus Inc)**

---

Since RIRs are accountable to their constituents, in theory nothing guarantees they need to stick with ICP-2. However, this is an unsolvable dilemma of necessary cooperation vs. consensus procedures, and some rails are required.

**David Lamparter (Westnetz w.V.)**

---

This implies that all requirements in the ICP-2 are essential/mandatory.

**Andrei Robachevsky (independent)**

---

It must be checked to see what's happening to regain all the requirements.

**Luis Caceres (Corporacion Redexcom C.A.)**

---

Assume there will be grace periods, opportunities for appeal, etch before recognition is withdrawn?

**Ron da Silva (Network Technologies Globl)**

---

It's not only "may be", a process should start to evaluate the situation. In some cases, it could be corrected.

**Carlos Friaças (FCT\| FCCN)**

---

The bar for derecognition must be high as it might result in legal action. I'm in favor of the idea of having derecognition as part of ICP-2, as it is important to cover the whole lifecycle and all potential situations.

**Andrew Gallo (The George Washington University)**

---

### **8.3. Derecognition - Neutral (3)**

No, it must be given a chance to rectify.

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

I think persistent non-compliance with all requirements should lead to a de facto presumption of derecognition, rather than the less clear "should".

**Jordan Carter (auDA)**

---

Fairness is key

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

I partially agree with this principle. Holding RIRs accountable to the standards of ICP-2 is essential for maintaining trust and consistency in global Internet resource management. However, derecognition should be a last resort, reserved for cases where an RIR has demonstrated a persistent inability or unwillingness to comply, despite support and remediation efforts. Clear, collaborative processes should be in place to address non-compliance, prioritizing resolution and capacity-building over punitive actions to safeguard regional stability and service continuity.

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

I partially agree with this principle. Holding RIRs accountable to the standards of ICP-2 is essential for maintaining trust and consistency in global Internet resource management. However, derecognition should be a last resort, reserved for cases where an RIR has demonstrated a persistent inability or unwillingness to comply, despite support and remediation efforts. Clear, collaborative processes should be in place to address non-compliance, prioritizing resolution and capacity-building over punitive actions to safeguard regional stability and service continuity.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

If an RIR fails to meet all ongoing requirements in ICP-2, it may be derecognized, emphasizing the importance of maintaining standards and facilitating the portability of number resources.

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---

so, how are you going to handle the already allocated resources? how about the costs/prices/etc. to be paid for those resources? Is this perhaps a money grabbing/greed issue? take IPv4 out of the picture, and I don't think it'll be an issue, but there in lies the problem again ;(

**Hendrik Visage (HeViS.Co Systems Pty Ltd)**



---

No comments

**Pacharaporn Wangwinyoo (ZIM (Thailand) Co., LTD.)**

---

No idea

**Hann Jye Ng (MyTeksi Sdn Bhd)**

---

I find this approach too severe. Rapidly derecognizing an RIR for failing to meet all ICP-2 standards risks destabilizing important regional infrastructure. Given the unique challenges faced by RIRs, temporary lapses shouldn't lead to immediate loss of recognition. A better strategy would involve providing support, such as guidance or a corrective action timeframe.

**Sidonie Hacking (-)**

---

I completely disagree with this approach. Rapidly derecognizing an RIR for not meeting all ICP-2 requirements is overly rigid and risks destabilizing the regional Internet landscape. RIRs serve diverse areas with unique challenges, and minor lapses should not lead to derecognition. A supportive strategy, such as offering corrective action opportunities, would be more effective.

**Jun Wen (one futures technology sdn bhd)**

---

I find this requirement too strict and potentially destabilizing for the regional Internet infrastructure, as it could lead to the quick derecognition of an RIR. RIRs operate in diverse regions facing unique challenges, and minor lapses should not trigger immediate removal from recognition. A better approach would involve providing guidance and resources or allowing a corrective action period to help RIRs recover without severe consequences.

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

#### **8.4. Derecognition - Somewhat Disagree (2)**

the may in this proposed principle is in conflict with the must in the second principle ("operation")

**Peter Koch (Individual)**

---

Historically, given “all” and “continually”, this would have resulted in all five of the existing RIRs being subject to being de-recognized at one time or another. Requirements that include services/functionality, which is the case in the proposed principles, are typically defined in the context of service levels that are mutually agreed between the service provider and the consumer of those services. The principle here should probably be “An RIR that does not meet [IANA and/or] its community’s service level commitments may be de-recognized.” Since de-recognition is likely to be contested, an implication of this proposed principle is that meeting the ICP-2 requirements should be objectively verifiable, ideally externally but at the very least, via an audit. This “objectively verifiable” requirement, and who will be doing the verification and how, should probably be explicitly stated as separate principles, e.g., something like: “All requirements that can result in de-recognition if they are

not met must be objectively verifiable.” “Verification of whether an RIR meets ICP-2 requirements must be done in an open and transparent way by parties mutually agreed upon by the RIR and the community it serves.”

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

An RIR may face derecognition if it does not continuously adhere to ICP-2 requirements, underscoring the necessity of ongoing compliance and the ability to facilitate IP resource portability.

**Neonjyoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

I think it should not be a straight forward easy issue as this. I foresee this could be used against AFRINIC soon.

**Raymond Mamattah (EGIGFA)**

---

The RIR should be given a reasonable amount of time to observe, take action, and provide a clear explanation as to why they are unable to meet all the requirements. After this justification, the RIR should be allowed time to rectify the issues and follow up to ensure all requirements are met. If the RIR believes any requirement is unjustified, they should follow the process of formally challenging it, rather than simply leaving it incomplete. However, if the RIR continues to fail in meeting the specified requirements under ICP-2, despite repeated notifications and opportunities for correction, they may ultimately face derecognition.

**Barkha Manral (Corporate Infotech Pvt Ltd)**

---

consider that a short period should be given to align or correct any regulations that are not complying or to justify the reason for non-compliance. Consider that you must pay a temporary fine and prove that you are already complying with the rules.

**Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)**

---

In principle yes, but the 'derecognition' process should not exclusively lie with the NRO which is effectively a trade association with potentially vested interests in maintaining the status quo. The derecognition conditions and process needs to be better enumerated.

**Kevin Meynell (Individual)**

---

## **8.5. Derecognition - Strongly Disagree (1)**

Should an RIR fail to meet the requirements of ICP-2 consistently, it may face derecognition, emphasizing the importance of compliance.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

An RIR that does not maintain compliance with all ICP-2 requirements may be derecognized, underscoring the need for ongoing accountability.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

If an RIR does not consistently fulfill all ICP-2 requirements, it may face derecognition, ensuring adherence to established standards.

**Tipu Khan (Zx Online Ltd)**

---

An RIR that fails to meet all requirements specified in ICP-2 risks derecognition, emphasizing the importance of accountability and adherence.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

An RIR that does not uphold all the requirements specified in ICP-2 may be derecognized, ensuring that only compliant organizations retain their status.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---

Should an RIR fail to meet all ICP-2 requirements consistently, it may face derecognition, emphasizing the need for ongoing compliance.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

An RIR that does not continually meet the requirements set forth in ICP-2 may be derecognized, underscoring the importance of compliance.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---

If an RIR does not maintain compliance with all ICP-2 requirements, it risks derecognition, highlighting the necessity of constant adherence.

**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

I find this stipulation excessive. The potential for rapid derecognition of an RIR for minor lapses in ICP-2 compliance could adversely affect the regional Internet infrastructure. Given the unique challenges each RIR faces, a more supportive approach—like guidance or a corrective action period—would be more beneficial than immediate derecognition.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

An RIR that does not uphold all ICP-2 requirements consistently risks derecognition, ensuring that only compliant organizations remain recognized.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

An RIR could face derecognition if it fails to meet all requirements outlined in ICP-2, ensuring accountability and compliance.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

An RIR that does not uphold all ICP-2 requirements consistently may be derecognized, reinforcing the need for ongoing adherence.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

I find this approach too severe. Rapidly derecognizing an RIR for failing to meet all ICP-2 standards risks destabilizing crucial regional infrastructure. Given the unique challenges faced by RIRs, temporary lapses shouldn't lead to immediate loss of recognition. A better strategy would involve providing support, such as guidance or a corrective action timeframe.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Derecognizing an RIR for not continuously meeting all ICP-2 requirements is too rigid and could harm the regional Internet framework. RIRs face unique regional challenges, and minor lapses should not trigger immediate derecognition. A more supportive approach—such as offering help or corrective action periods—would be beneficial.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---

An RIR that ceases to meet the requirements specified in ICP-2 may lose its recognition as an RIR, highlighting the importance of maintaining compliance.

**Taslima Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

If an RIR fails to meet all the requirements outlined in ICP-2, it may be derecognized as an RIR, reinforcing the necessity of continuous compliance.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

An RIR that fails to meet all requirements in ICP-2 risks derecognition, affecting its effectiveness in facilitating the transfer of IP resources.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

If an RIR does not maintain compliance with all the standards established in ICP-2, it may be subject to derecognition, which could limit its resource management capabilities.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

If an RIR fails to maintain compliance with the requirements specified in ICP-2, it may be derecognized, affirming the importance of ongoing adherence.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

An RIR that does not meet all ongoing requirements in ICP-2 may be at risk of derecognition, underscoring the necessity for continuous adherence.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

An RIR that does not meet all ongoing requirements in ICP-2 may be at risk of derecognition, underscoring the necessity for continuous adherence.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

If an RIR does not continue to meet the requirements specified in ICP-2, it risks derecognition, highlighting the necessity for ongoing compliance.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

An RIR that does not consistently comply with all ICP-2 requirements may face derecognition, showcasing the importance of continuous adherence.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

Failure to meet all ongoing requirements in ICP-2 can lead to the derecognition of an RIR, emphasizing the importance of consistent compliance.

**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

An RIR may be derecognized if it does not continually meet all the requirements specified in ICP-2, underscoring the necessity for ongoing adherence.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

An RIR that does not continue to fulfill all requirements set forth in ICP-2 risks derecognition, underscoring the importance of continuous compliance.

**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

If an RIR fails to satisfy the ongoing requirements outlined in ICP-2, it risks derecognition, highlighting the importance of maintaining compliance.

**Pham Gia Khiem (Phat Tai Logistics)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Mandating the derecognition of an RIR for not meeting every ICP-2 requirement is excessively rigid and could harm the regional Internet framework. Given the diverse challenges faced by RIRs, a more constructive solution—such as offering guidance—would be preferable.

**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

Should an RIR cease to meet the criteria set forth in ICP-2, it may be derecognized, reinforcing the importance of sustained compliance.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

Should an RIR cease to meet the criteria set forth in ICP-2, it may be derecognized, reinforcing the importance of sustained compliance.

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

An RIR that fails to meet the ongoing requirements specified in ICP-2 may be at risk of derecognition, illustrating the importance of consistent compliance.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

An RIR that does not continuously meet the requirements of ICP-2 may be subject to derecognition, emphasizing the critical nature of ongoing compliance.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

An RIR that does not consistently fulfill the requirements established in ICP-2 risks derecognition, underscoring the importance of ongoing compliance.

**Kwan Ke Yue (TBWA/ Kuala Lumpur)**

---

Should an RIR fail to meet all requirements specified in ICP-2, it may face derecognition, illustrating the necessity of continuous adherence.

**Sean Carroll (The One Academy)**

---

Failure to continually satisfy the requirements outlined in ICP-2 can lead to derecognition of an RIR, emphasizing the importance of maintaining compliance.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

An RIR may be derecognized if it does not consistently meet the requirements specified in ICP-2, underscoring the necessity for ongoing compliance.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

An RIR that does not adhere to the ongoing requirements specified in ICP-2 may be derecognized, especially if it lacks the ability to manage the portability of number resources.

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**

---

I Should an RIR fail to meet ongoing ICP-2 requirements, it risks derecognition, highlighting the need for compliance and the facilitation of IP resource portability.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

An RIR that does not consistently meet the requirements outlined in ICP-2 may be derecognized, reinforcing the need for ongoing compliance.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---

If an RIR does not continue to fulfill all requirements in ICP-2, it may be derecognized, especially regarding its ability to facilitate the portability of resources.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---

An RIR may risk being derecognized if it fails to maintain compliance with all requirements outlined in ICP-2, particularly its capability for number resource portability.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

If an RIR does not maintain compliance with all ICP-2 requirements, it may face derecognition, emphasizing the importance of continual adherence.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---

An RIR that does not consistently meet all specified ICP-2 requirements may be subject to derecognition, especially concerning its facilitation of resource portability.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

An RIR that fails to continuously meet all the requirements specified in ICP-2 may be subject to derecognition as an RIR, ensuring adherence to established standards.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

If an RIR fails to meet ongoing requirements specified in ICP-2, it risks derecognition, particularly regarding its ability to facilitate number resource portability.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

If an RIR does not maintain compliance with all the requirements in ICP-2, it may be derecognized as an RIR, which could hinder its capacity to manage number resources.

**Md Abu Sayeem Siddique Siddique (ServicEngine Ltd)**

---

An RIR that fails to continue meeting all the requirements specified in ICP-2 may face derecognition as an RIR, impacting its ability to facilitate resource management.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

An RIR that fails to meet the ongoing requirements in ICP-2 may be subject to derecognition as an RIR, particularly if it cannot demonstrate effective number resource portability.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

If an RIR does not maintain compliance with ICP-2 requirements, it may face derecognition, especially if it cannot facilitate the portability of number resources.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---

An RIR that fails to continuously comply with all requirements outlined in ICP-2 may be subject to derecognition, stressing the importance of maintaining compliance and facilitating resource portability.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---

An RIR that does not consistently meet the requirements of ICP-2 may face derecognition, emphasizing the critical need for compliance and the ability to facilitate number resource portability.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

Should an RIR fail to meet all ICP-2 requirements continuously, derecognition may occur, emphasizing the need for maintaining standards and facilitating IP resource portability.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

An RIR that does not consistently adhere to all the requirements set forth in ICP-2 may face derecognition, highlighting the need for ongoing compliance and resource portability.

**Trang Tran (VNPT Technologies)**

---

Should an RIR fail to meet all ICP-2 requirements continuously, it may face derecognition, stressing the importance of maintaining standards and facilitating IP resource portability.

**Minh Hoang (ANSV)**

---

An RIR that does not consistently meet the requirements outlined in ICP-2 may be derecognized, emphasizing the critical need for compliance and resource portability.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**

---

If an RIR does not fulfill all specified ICP-2 requirements on an ongoing basis, it may be subject to derecognition, particularly regarding resource portability.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**

---

An RIR that does not meet the ongoing requirements of ICP-2 may be derecognized, particularly if it cannot ensure the portability of number resources.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---

An RIR that does not continue to satisfy all the requirements in ICP-2 may be derecognized, particularly regarding its capability to ensure resource portability.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

An RIR may be derecognized if it fails to meet all ongoing requirements specified in ICP-2, especially its ability to facilitate the portability of number resources.

**Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)**

---

If an RIR does not maintain compliance with all specified ICP-2 requirements, it risks being derecognized as an RIR, particularly regarding resource portability.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

An RIR that does not consistently fulfill the requirements specified in ICP-2 may be subject to derecognition, including its ability to facilitate the portability of number resources.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---



An RIR that does not continue to meet all the requirements in ICP-2 may face derecognition, especially if it lacks the ability to support the portability of its resources.

**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

If an RIR fails to meet the ongoing requirements specified in ICP-2, it may be derecognized, particularly concerning its ability to facilitate the portability of number resources.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---

An RIR that does not maintain compliance with all ICP-2 requirements risks being derecognized, particularly if it is unable to ensure the portability of number resources.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

An RIR must continually meet all the requirements specified in ICP-2 in an auditable manner; failure to do so may lead to derecognition, including its capacity to facilitate resource portability.

**Ryan Khaw (AlSCO Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

Should an RIR not fulfill all the requirements specified in ICP-2, it risks being derecognized as an RIR, especially concerning its ability to support number resource portability.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

An RIR may face derecognition if it does not continually adhere to all requirements specified in ICP-2, underscoring the necessity for ongoing compliance and the facilitation of IP resource portability.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Aptic)**

---

An RIR may be derecognized if it does not consistently meet all the requirements specified in ICP-2, particularly if it lacks the capability to manage number resource portability.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Should an RIR fail to comply with all ongoing requirements in ICP-2, it risks derecognition as an RIR, especially if it cannot support number resource portability.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

An RIR that does not continue to meet the requirements outlined in ICP-2 may be derecognized, particularly if it cannot effectively facilitate number resource portability.

**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

An RIR that ceases to meet the requirements specified in ICP-2 may lose its recognition as an RIR, highlighting the importance of maintaining compliance.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

If an RIR fails to meet all the requirements outlined in ICP-2, it may be derecognized as an RIR, reinforcing the necessity of continuous compliance.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

Should an RIR fail to comply with all ICP-2 requirements continuously, it may risk derecognition, underscoring the need for maintaining compliance and facilitating IP resource portability.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**

---

An RIR that does not consistently satisfy all requirements outlined in ICP-2 may risk derecognition, highlighting the importance of ongoing compliance and facilitating IP resource portability.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

If an RIR does not continue to satisfy all requirements specified in ICP-2, it may be subject to derecognition as an RIR, including its capability to manage the portability of number resources effectively.

**Jeremy Cheong (Infineon technologies)**

---

An RIR that does not consistently meet the requirements outlined in ICP-2 may face derecognition as an RIR, especially if it fails to facilitate the portability of number resources.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

If an RIR fails to meet ongoing requirements in ICP-2, it may be derecognized, emphasizing the importance of continual compliance and facilitating the portability of IP resources.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

An RIR that does not continue to comply with all specified ICP-2 requirements may face derecognition, underscoring the necessity for ongoing compliance and the ability to facilitate number resource portability.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

I completely oppose this requirement. Rapid derecognition of an RIR for minor lapses in compliance with ICP-2 could disrupt the regional Internet infrastructure. A more supportive approach—like providing resources and a corrective action period—would help address issues effectively and maintain stability. It's also important to note that portability is indispensable for the Internet.

**Sohel Kabir (Kabir Traders)**

---

This approach is too strict and risks harming the stability of the regional Internet infrastructure by hastily derecognizing an RIR. RIRs serve diverse regions with unique challenges, and minor lapses in compliance should not automatically trigger removal from recognition. A more supportive strategy—like guidance and a corrective action period—would promote growth.

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

If an RIR fails to meet the ongoing requirements outlined in ICP-2, it may be derecognized, stressing the importance of continuous compliance and facilitating the portability of IP resources.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---

An RIR that does not continually satisfy all the requirements in ICP-2 may be derecognized, highlighting the critical need for compliance and the ability to facilitate number resource portability.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---

Failure to meet all ICP-2 requirements may result in the derecognition of an RIR, emphasizing the importance of ongoing compliance and the facilitation of IP resource portability.

**Catalina Cueca (Manpower)**

---

An RIR may be derecognized if it fails to consistently adhere to all requirements specified in ICP-2, which includes maintaining the ability to facilitate number resource portability.

**Camilo Riveros (Manpower)**

---

This requirement for immediate derecognition of an RIR that does not meet all ICP-2 standards is overly harsh and risks destabilizing the regional Internet infrastructure. Given the diverse challenges faced by RIRs, temporary lapses should not automatically trigger derecognition. A supportive approach would provide the necessary resources for resolution.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

An RIR that fails to continually meet all the requirements specified in ICP-2 may face derecognition, emphasizing the need for ongoing compliance and the ability to facilitate number resource portability.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**

---

This stance is too inflexible and risks destabilizing the Internet's regional infrastructure by hastily derecognizing an RIR. Given the diverse challenges faced by RIRs, minor lapses in meeting ICP-2 standards should not automatically trigger derecognition. A more constructive approach, including guidance and a corrective action period, would foster regional stability.

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

This provision seems overly demanding. Quickly stripping recognition from an RIR for failing to meet all ICP-2 standards risks destabilizing regional infrastructure. Each RIR operates under unique circumstances, and minor lapses should not lead to automatic derecognition. A supportive approach, such as offering corrective action opportunities, would be more effective.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Mandating the derecognition of an RIR for not meeting every ICP-2 requirement is excessively rigid and could harm the regional Internet framework. Given the diverse challenges faced by RIRs, a more constructive solution—such as offering guidance—would be preferable.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. The possibility of quickly derecognizing an RIR for not meeting all ICP-2 requirements is overly severe and risks destabilizing regional infrastructure. Given the diverse challenges faced by RIRs, a more supportive approach—like providing guidance—would be beneficial.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

This requirement appears overly stringent. Rapid derecognition of an RIR for failing to meet ICP-2 standards could disrupt the regional Internet framework. Each RIR faces unique challenges, and minor issues should not lead to loss of recognition. Offering support, such as corrective action periods, would be a more constructive approach.

**Anh Dang (NASA)**

---

This approach is excessively strict and risks undermining the stability of the Internet's regional infrastructure through rapid derecognition of RIRs. Minor lapses in compliance with ICP-2 should not immediately result in derecognition; instead, providing support and a corrective action period would allow RIRs to address issues constructively.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

Requiring immediate derecognition of an RIR that fails to meet all ICP-2 requirements is overly rigid and could destabilize regional Internet infrastructure. The unique challenges faced by various RIRs mean that temporary lapses should not lead to such drastic measures. A supportive approach that includes corrective action opportunities would promote stability.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

This policy is excessively strict and could harm the stability of the Internet's regional infrastructure by quickly derecognizing RIRs. Each RIR serves diverse regions with unique challenges, and minor lapses in meeting ICP-2 requirements should not result in immediate derecognition. A more supportive approach, such as offering assistance and resources, would encourage stability.

**Prasanta Haloi (PwD)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Georges Lallogo (ANPTIC)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. The possibility of quickly derecognizing an RIR for not meeting all ICP-2 requirements is overly severe and risks destabilizing regional infrastructure. Given the diverse challenges faced by RIRs, a more supportive approach—like providing guidance—would be beneficial.

**Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)**

---

I fundamentally disagree with the notion that temporary lapses in ICP-2 compliance should lead to immediate derecognition. This policy is overly rigid and could destabilize the regional Internet

infrastructure. A more flexible approach—such as providing support and a corrective action period—would better foster regional stability.

**AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)**

---

I strongly oppose the idea that an RIR should be swiftly derecognized for minor lapses in meeting ICP-2 requirements. This approach is too harsh and risks harming the regional Internet infrastructure. A more supportive strategy—offering guidance and a corrective action period—would enable RIRs to address issues effectively.

**K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)**

---

RIR stakeholders only should be vested with power to derecognise RIR.

**Ubong Udofia (Skystar)**

---

I find this condition impractical. Requiring an RIR to be derecognized for not meeting all ICP-2 standards creates an unnecessarily harsh environment that could destabilize regional infrastructure. Each RIR faces unique challenges, and temporary lapses should not result in immediate derecognition. Offering guidance and support would be a more constructive approach.

**Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)**

---

This requirement is excessively rigid and could destabilize the regional Internet infrastructure by quickly derecognizing an RIR. Given that RIRs serve unique regions with distinct challenges, minor lapses in compliance should not automatically lead to derecognition. A more flexible approach—like providing resources or a corrective action period—would promote stability.

**Fuhui Zhang (University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)**

---

I find this requirement unacceptable. Rapid derecognition of an RIR for minor lapses in ICP-2 compliance could disrupt the regional Internet infrastructure. A more lenient approach—offering guidance and a corrective action period—would help RIRs resolve issues effectively while maintaining stability.

**Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)**

---

I find this requirement too strict and potentially destabilizing for the regional Internet infrastructure, as it could lead to quick derecognition of an RIR. Each RIR addresses unique challenges, and minor lapses should not automatically trigger removal from recognition. A better strategy would involve providing resources or a corrective action period to help RIRs recover.

**Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)**

---

This policy seems excessively harsh and risks disrupting the regional Internet infrastructure through rapid derecognition of an RIR. Given the diverse challenges faced by RIRs, minor lapses in complying with ICP-2 shouldn't lead to immediate removal from recognition. A more flexible approach—offering guidance and a corrective action period—would promote stability.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

I find this approach excessively harsh. Rapidly derecognizing an RIR for minor lapses in ICP-2 compliance could destabilize crucial regional infrastructure. Each RIR has its own unique challenges, and temporary lapses should not lead to immediate derecognition. A more constructive strategy would involve offering support and corrective action opportunities.

**Juan Mesa (Hispasat)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. The possibility of quickly derecognizing an RIR for not meeting all ICP-2 requirements is overly severe and risks destabilizing regional infrastructure. Given the diverse challenges faced by RIRs, a more supportive approach—like providing guidance—would be beneficial.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

I find this approach overly strict and potentially harmful to regional Internet infrastructure. Rapidly derecognizing an RIR for minor ICP-2 compliance lapses could destabilize operations. Since RIRs serve diverse regions with unique challenges, a more supportive strategy—like offering guidance or a corrective action period—would help them address issues without facing the severe consequence of derecognition.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. The possibility of quickly derecognizing an RIR for not meeting all ICP-2 requirements is overly severe and risks destabilizing regional infrastructure. Given the diverse challenges faced by RIRs, a more supportive approach—like providing guidance—would be beneficial.

**Pornpipat Kitireanglarp (ZERIWELLPLUS Co., Ltd.)**

---

This requirement seems too harsh. Quickly stripping an RIR of its recognition for failing to meet every ICP-2 requirement risks destabilizing the regional infrastructure. Each RIR faces unique challenges, and temporary lapses should not result in immediate derecognition. A better approach would involve offering support, such as guidance or a corrective action timeframe.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

I find this requirement impractical. Derecognizing an RIR for failing to meet every ICP-2 standard could lead to instability in the regional Internet infrastructure. Each RIR serves a diverse area with unique challenges, and minor lapses should not lead to immediate derecognition. A supportive strategy, such as providing resources or a grace period, would be more effective.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

This requirement seems excessively demanding. Quickly stripping an RIR of its recognition for minor lapses in ICP-2 compliance could destabilize the regional Internet infrastructure. RIRs face unique challenges, and a more supportive approach—like offering corrective action periods—would allow them to address issues without the drastic consequence of derecognition.

I strongly oppose this requirement. Derecognizing an RIR for not meeting all ICP-2 standards is excessively rigid and could destabilize regional Internet infrastructure. RIRs function in various contexts, and minor lapses should not automatically lead to loss of recognition. A more constructive approach, such as providing resources or a grace period, would allow RIRs to resolve issues while maintaining stability.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

I find this stipulation excessive. The possibility of rapid derecognition of an RIR for minor lapses in ICP-2 compliance could harm regional Internet infrastructure. Given the unique challenges each RIR faces, a more supportive approach—such as guidance or a corrective action period—would be more beneficial than immediate derecognition.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---

This requirement seems too severe. Quickly stripping an RIR of its recognition for failing to meet every ICP-2 requirement risks destabilizing the regional infrastructure. Each RIR faces unique challenges, and temporary lapses should not result in immediate derecognition. A better approach would involve offering support, such as guidance or a corrective action timeframe, to assist RIRs in maintaining their status.

**Ashraful Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Derecognizing an RIR for failing to continuously meet all ICP-2 standards is too rigid and could disrupt the regional Internet framework. RIRs deal with diverse challenges, and minor lapses should not automatically result in loss of recognition. A more supportive approach would allow RIRs to address issues without facing dire consequences.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. The potential for rapid derecognition of an RIR for not meeting all ICP-2 requirements is overly harsh and risks destabilizing regional infrastructure. Each RIR has distinct challenges, and temporary lapses should not automatically lead to loss of recognition. A more constructive approach, such as offering guidance, would help maintain stability.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---

This requirement seems excessively demanding. Quickly stripping an RIR of its recognition for minor lapses in ICP-2 compliance could destabilize the regional Internet infrastructure. RIRs face unique

challenges, and a more supportive approach—like offering corrective action periods—would allow them to address issues without the drastic consequence of derecognition.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

I find this approach too severe. Rapidly derecognizing an RIR for failing to meet all ICP-2 standards risks destabilizing crucial regional infrastructure. Given the unique challenges faced by RIRs, temporary lapses shouldn't lead to immediate loss of recognition. A better strategy would involve providing support, such as guidance or a corrective action timeframe.

**Phuc Pham (Advanced Network Systems VietNam Company Limited)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Derecognizing an RIR for not continuously meeting all ICP-2 requirements is overly rigid and could harm the regional Internet framework. RIRs deal with unique regional challenges, and minor lapses should not trigger immediate derecognition. A more supportive approach, such as offering help or corrective action periods, would be beneficial.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

This requirement appears excessively harsh. Quickly stripping an RIR of its recognition for failing to meet every ICP-2 standard could destabilize regional infrastructure. Each RIR has its own challenges, and temporary lapses should not automatically result in derecognition. A more constructive approach—like providing guidance and resources—would promote stability.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

I completely disagree with this approach. Rapidly derecognizing an RIR for not meeting all ICP-2 requirements is overly rigid and risks destabilizing the regional Internet landscape. RIRs support diverse areas with unique challenges, and minor lapses should not lead to derecognition. A supportive strategy, such as offering corrective action opportunities, would be more effective.

**Giang Nguyen (NASA)**

---

This requirement seems too severe. Quickly stripping an RIR of its recognition for failing to meet every ICP-2 requirement risks destabilizing the regional infrastructure. Each RIR faces unique challenges, and temporary lapses should not result in immediate derecognition. A better approach would involve offering support, such as guidance or a corrective action timeframe, to assist RIRs in maintaining their status.

**Alex Kwan (Wiplus Malaysia)**

---

I find this approach overly strict and potentially harmful to regional Internet infrastructure. Rapidly derecognizing an RIR for minor ICP-2 compliance lapses could destabilize operations. Since RIRs serve diverse regions with unique challenges, a more supportive strategy—like offering guidance or a corrective action period—would help them address issues without facing the severe consequence of derecognition.

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

Disagree

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**



---

I find this stipulation excessive. The potential for rapid derecognition of an RIR for minor lapses in ICP-2 compliance could harm the regional Internet infrastructure. Considering the unique challenges each RIR faces, a more supportive approach—like guidance or a corrective action period—would be more beneficial than immediate derecognition.

**Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)**

---

This requirement seems too severe. Quickly stripping an RIR of its recognition for not meeting every ICP-2 requirement risks destabilizing the regional infrastructure. Each RIR faces unique challenges, and temporary lapses should not lead to immediate derecognition. A better approach would be to offer support, such as guidance or a corrective action timeframe, to assist RIRs in maintaining their status.

**Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)**

---

I find this approach excessively strict and potentially detrimental to the regional Internet infrastructure. Rapidly derecognizing an RIR for minor lapses in ICP-2 compliance could destabilize operations. RIRs serve diverse regions with unique challenges, and a more supportive strategy—such as offering guidance or a corrective action period—would help them address issues without facing the severe consequence of derecognition.

**Pooja Gopi (DM Digital Marketing)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Derecognizing an RIR for not continuously meeting all ICP-2 requirements is overly rigid and could harm the regional Internet framework. RIRs deal with unique regional challenges, and minor lapses should not trigger immediate derecognition. A more supportive approach, such as offering help or corrective action periods, would be beneficial.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. The possibility of quickly derecognizing an RIR for not meeting all ICP-2 requirements is overly severe and risks destabilizing regional infrastructure. Given the diverse challenges faced by RIRs, a more supportive approach—like providing guidance—would be beneficial.

**Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)**

---

This requirement appears overly stringent. Rapid derecognition of an RIR for failing to meet ICP-2 standards could disrupt the regional Internet framework. Each RIR faces unique challenges, and minor issues should not lead to loss of recognition. Offering support, such as corrective action periods, would be a more constructive approach.

**Quyn Kim (VNPAY)**

---

This requirement seems too severe. Quickly stripping an RIR of its recognition for not meeting every ICP-2 requirement risks destabilizing the regional infrastructure. Each RIR faces unique challenges, and temporary lapses should not lead to immediate derecognition. A better approach would be to offer support, such as guidance or a corrective action timeframe, to help RIRs maintain their status.

**Shahedul Islam Bhuiyan (Royal Green Limited)**

---

I believe this requirement is too harsh and risks destabilizing the regional Internet infrastructure by swiftly derecognizing an RIR. RIRs serve various regions with distinct challenges, and temporary lapses in meeting ICP-2 requirements should not lead to immediate removal of recognition. A more supportive approach—such as providing guidance and resources or allowing corrective action periods—would allow RIRs to address issues without the severe consequence of derecognition.

**Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)**

---

Question 18&19 Derecognition An RIR that does not continue to meet all the requirements specified in ICP-2 may be derecognized as an RIR. 1- Strongly Disagree Answer: I find this approach overly strict and potentially harmful to the Internet's regional infrastructure. Rapidly derecognizing an RIR for minor lapses in meeting ICP-2 requirements could destabilize operations. RIRs cater to diverse regions with unique challenges, and a more supportive strategy—such as offering guidance or a corrective action period—would help them address issues without facing the severe consequence of derecognition.

**Anjan Deka (HDFC)**

---

I find this approach overly strict and potentially harmful to the Internet's regional infrastructure. Rapidly derecognizing an RIR for minor lapses in meeting ICP-2 requirements could destabilize operations. RIRs cater to diverse regions with unique challenges, and a more supportive strategy—such as offering guidance or a corrective action period—would help them address issues without facing the severe consequence of derecognition.

**Ketan Parmar (Bids Info Global)**

---

I find this approach too inflexible and potentially harmful to the regional Internet infrastructure, as it could lead to the rapid derecognition of an RIR. Each RIR serves diverse regions with specific challenges, and minor lapses in meeting ICP-2 criteria should not trigger immediate derecognition. A better approach would involve providing guidance, resources, or a corrective period to allow RIRs to rectify issues without facing such drastic consequences.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

This requirement is overly strict and risks destabilizing the Internet's regional infrastructure by hastily removing an RIR's recognition. RIRs operate in varied regions with distinct challenges, and temporary or minor lapses in compliance shouldn't automatically result in derecognition. A more constructive approach—such as offering support, resources, or a time frame for corrective actions—would help RIRs address problems without facing the severe consequence of losing recognition.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

I believe this approach is excessively rigid and could destabilize the regional Internet infrastructure by rapidly derecognizing an RIR. RIRs cater to diverse regions facing unique challenges, and minor lapses in meeting ICP-2 requirements should not lead to immediate derecognition. A more supportive strategy—like providing guidance, resources, or a corrective action period—would enable RIRs to resolve issues while preserving stability.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---

I don't agree

Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)

---

## 9. Community Support

---

Resource Holders in the Region that the Candidate RIR proposes to serve must broadly support recognizing the Candidate RIR as the RIR responsible for serving that Region.

### 9.1. Community Support - Strongly Agree (5)

This is one of the key principles that goes all the way back to IETF1366. Without broad community support it is extremely difficult for an RIR to operate.

**Mirjam Kühne (RIPE)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle, as the support of resource holders is fundamental to the legitimacy, effectiveness, and success of a Candidate RIR. Here's an analysis: Reasons for Agreement 1.

Legitimacy Through Stakeholder Support • Resource holders are the primary beneficiaries of an RIR's services. Their support ensures the Candidate RIR is seen as a legitimate representative of the region's needs and interests. 2. Alignment with Regional Needs

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

Nothing to add or detract

**Brian Longwe (Converged Technology Networks)**

---

No comment

**Kelvin Horng Woei Ong (Propnex)**

---

yes.

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

I agree with this principle to a large extent. Broad support from resource holders ensures that the Candidate RIR has legitimacy and is aligned with the needs of the region it intends to serve. This support fosters trust, cooperation, and a sense of shared ownership within the community. However, the process for gauging this support should be transparent, inclusive, and flexible enough to address diverse perspectives and potential challenges in mobilizing widespread consensus.

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

I agree with this principle to a large extent. Broad support from resource holders ensures that the Candidate RIR has legitimacy and is aligned with the needs of the region it intends to serve. This support fosters trust, cooperation, and a sense of shared ownership within the community. However, the process for gauging this support should be transparent, inclusive, and flexible enough to address diverse perspectives and potential challenges in mobilizing widespread consensus.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

It is essential that any candidate be able to competently service the resource holders. This is best evidenced by measuring their support for the entity.

**Narelle Clark (Internet Association of Australia)**

---

This principle highlights the need for broad support from resource holders in a region before recognizing a Candidate RIR. Such support ensures that the RIR is aligned with regional needs and fosters trust and cooperation. It also promotes transparency and accountability, making it essential for the stability and effectiveness of the regional internet ecosystem.

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

Has to add effective legal contract to prevent someone wrong doing.

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

I strongly agree with the principle that resource holders in a region must broadly support the recognition of a Candidate RIR as the RIR responsible for that region. This principle is essential for ensuring that an RIR's creation and operation are truly aligned with the needs and interests of its community. Here's why this principle is so crucial: a. Resource holders are the main beneficiaries of RIR services, and their support reflects whether the proposed Candidate RIR meets the needs of the community it intends to serve. Broad support indicates that the resource holders believe the Candidate RIR is well-prepared to manage resources fairly and transparently. b. An RIR's legitimacy derives largely from the trust and acceptance of the local internet community. Support from resource holders is critical to establishing this trust and gives the RIR a solid foundation for effective operations. Without such support, the Candidate RIR might struggle to gain the legitimacy needed to operate successfully in its region. c. Resource holders are a vital part of an RIR's governance structure, contributing to policy development and decision-making. Their broad support ensures that the Candidate RIR will be responsive and accountable to its community, upholding transparency and inclusivity in resource management. d. RIRs rely on the input of local stakeholders to develop policies that address regional needs. Support from resource holders indicates a strong community base that will engage in and uphold the RIR's policy processes. This buy-in fosters a collaborative environment, essential for effective policy development. e. A Candidate RIR's success depends on a sustainable base of resource holders willing to participate and financially support its operations. Broad support signals that the resource holders are committed to sustaining the RIR, enabling it to fulfill its responsibilities effectively. f. RIRs operate within a broader, globally coordinated framework. If resource holders support the Candidate RIR, it demonstrates that the RIR has the regional acceptance needed to operate in harmony with the global RIR system, reducing the risk of fragmentation or conflict.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

I feel it is important to ensure that this does not lead to competing factions attempting to create RIRs. The revisions should reflect at what stage it is appropriate for the community to propose an RIR replacement (ie, only after decertification has been proposed or accepted.)

**Douglas Camin (Coordinated Care Services, Inc.)**

---

As community members, they must be supporting the candidate

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

This stipulation appears overly demanding. Requiring broad support from Resource Holders for recognizing a Candidate RIR could significantly slow down the process and hinder emerging regions. The priority must be on the RIR's capacity to address regional needs, rather than securing consensus.  
**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

I agree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

yes

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

complementarite

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

This principle fosters trust and alignment between the RIR and its community, which is essential for successful governance

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

No

**Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)**

---

"Region" should be considered based on those established in the generic political maps.

**Lia Solis (personal)**

---

It is imperative that the focus rest on "Resource Holders" and not politically connected gangsters and crooks. The existing RIRs (save RIPE) undermine Resource Holders

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

A RIR doesn't exist without members, and they should only exist to serve specificities of a subset of network operators.

**Musa Stephen HONLUE (AFRINIC)**

---

I guess there will be a precise definition of 'broad support'.

**Adiel Akplogan (iNetSys)**

---

Yes, resource holders and also governments.

**Carlos Friças (FCT\| FCCN)**

---

need to define "broadly" and set specific targets

**Matthew Cowen (dgtlfutures)**

---

---

## 9.2. Community Support - Somewhat Agree (4)

Yes

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

Principle seems fine - implementation might need to deal with fragmented or disputatious regions.

**Jordan Carter (auDA)**

---

Agree

**Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)**

---

agree

**Mohammad Mubarak Alfalasi (Telecommunication and Digital government Regulatory Authority)**

---

Provided the RIR acts in the best interests of the region and community

**Warwick Ward-Cox (Network Platforms)**

---

Africa seems to have a particularly tough time dealing with concensus vs democracy.

**Jaco Kroon (Interexcel World Connection)**

---

This principle underscores the importance of local support for a Candidate RIR. By requiring broad support from resource holders in the proposed service region, it ensures that the RIR is aligned with the needs and priorities of the local community. This fosters a stronger relationship between the RIR and its constituents, leading to more effective and responsive service delivery.

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

It should 80% of resource holders

**Fabrice TEUGUIA (PCP-ACEFA)**

---

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

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

Q: define "broadly"? Number/size of resources held, or one member one vote? When number/size: how do you compare IPv4 vs IPv6 sizes?

**Hendrik Visage (HeViS.Co Systems Pty Ltd)**

---

---

Agree

**John Haydon (Education)**

---

In the current timeline in which we live, consensus can be messier than one might hope

**Randy Bush (IIJ Research Lab & Arrcus Inc)**

---

I agree

**Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)**

---

This clause seems to imply that ALL resource holders must "broadly support" the candidate RIR; but the intent is probably that there is "broad support" across the community of resource holders. "Broad support" seems to be undefined and may be better replaced by the term "rough consensus" which is more recognised and accepted within the Internet community.

**PAUL WILSON (private individual)**

---

Broadly is broad

**Mike Burns (IPTrading)**

---

Given that all regions and economies are covered and served by an RIR, a proposal for a new RIR is, essential, secession from an existing RIR. Would the community from which this new RIR is leaving have any say in the potential shrinkage of the community?

**Andrew Gallo (The George Washington University)**

---

I prefer describing Community Support in passive voice like Candidate RIR must have broad support for the recognition from Resource Holders in the Region it proposes to serve because I think it will fit more for the reality of getting the support

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

### **9.3. Community Support - Neutral (3)**

Love is key

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

If an RIR does not fulfill the requirements specified in ICP-2, it may be derecognized, needing the mandatory consent from all current members.

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---



If the RIR will be the only RIR in the region should it be necessary for participants to agree; ie: prevent the annexing of an area. If a new RIR wishes to offer service to an area, they should be permitted, period.

**j heasley (SNI)**

---

put a better definition for "Broadly" .

**James Laferriere (n/a)**

---

This is very controversial. I suspect resource members could be bribed by a candidate RIR to support them. This is not a safe haven for AFRINIC

**Raymond Mamattah (EGIGFA)**

---

This requirement seems overly restrictive. Mandating broad support from Resource Holders before recognizing a Candidate RIR could hinder progress and create obstacles for emerging regions. The priority should be the RIR's ability to serve the region effectively, not securing approvals from all parties.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---

Ok

**Hann Jye Ng (MyTeksi Sdn Bhd)**

---

I find this stipulation excessive. Requiring broad support from Resource Holders for recognizing a Candidate RIR would unnecessarily prolong the process and create hurdles for emerging regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's capability to serve, rather than on obtaining approval from all stakeholders.

**Jun Wen (one futures technology sdn bhd)**

---

I strongly disagree with this stipulation. It would only delay the recognition of an RIR and create barriers for regions that need support. The focus should be on whether the RIR can meet regional needs, rather than on securing approval from every stakeholder.

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

Neutral

**Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)**

---

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.

**Kevin Meynell (Individual)**

---

## 9.4. Community Support - Somewhat Disagree (2)

Space being "slowly" deployed, this requirement is too stringent for space.

**Marc Blanchet (Viagenie)**

---

Should an RIR not meet all specified ICP-2 requirements, it may be at risk of derecognition, requiring the mandatory consent of all existing members.

**Neonjyoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. It doesn't make sense to make recognition contingent upon broad support from Resource Holders, as this could delay the process and create barriers for new regions. The essential focus should be on the RIR's capacity to meet regional demands.

**Sidonie Hacking (-)**

---

A candidate RIR should be allowed to serve a limited region or set of customers

**Elvis Velea (V4Escrow LLC)**

---

## 9.5. Community Support - Strongly Disagree (1)

This proposed principle is entitled "Community Support" but specifies a subset of the multistakeholder community all RIRs serve. Unless it is the intent for ICP-2 version 2 to redefine an RIR's "community" to be only the RIR's resource holders, it is important to acknowledge the other stakeholders that make up the RIR's community. Some of these other stakeholders would include governments, civil society, non-resource holding entities, etc. These stakeholders must play a role in the establishment of an RIR. Further, as mentioned previously, the concept of regional monopolies no longer makes sense in today's Internet. A more appropriate principle would probably be "Relevant stakeholders within the Candidate RIR's community must broadly support recognizing the Candidate RIR as the RIR responsible for providing registry services for that community."

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

For a Candidate RIR to be recognized as the RIR for a specific Region, it must obtain broad support from Resource Holders in that area.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

A Candidate RIR must secure comprehensive support from Resource Holders in its proposed Region to gain recognition as the responsible RIR.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

Resource Holders in the Region that the Candidate RIR aims to serve must express broad support for its acknowledgment as the RIR for that area.

**Tipu Khan (Zx Online Ltd)**

---

The recognition of the Candidate RIR as the RIR for its proposed Region necessitates substantial backing from Resource Holders within that community.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

The Candidate RIR must demonstrate that it has wide support from Resource Holders in the Region it proposes to serve to be recognized as the responsible RIR.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---

Broad support from Resource Holders in the Region proposed by the Candidate RIR is necessary for its recognition as the RIR responsible for serving that area.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

To be recognized as the RIR for a proposed Region, a Candidate RIR must garner significant support from Resource Holders within that community.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---

Resource Holders in the Region that the Candidate RIR aims to serve must express broad support for its recognition as the RIR responsible for that area.

**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. It doesn't make sense to delay the recognition of an RIR based on the support from Resource Holders. This could create barriers for emerging regions. The key consideration should be the RIR's capacity to fulfill the region's needs.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

A Candidate RIR must illustrate broad backing from Resource Holders in its proposed Region to be recognized as the responsible RIR.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

The recognition of the Candidate RIR as the RIR for a specific Region requires substantial community support from Resource Holders in that area.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

Broad support from Resource Holders in the proposed Region is crucial for the Candidate RIR to be recognized as the RIR responsible for serving that area.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. It doesn't make sense to make recognition dependent on broad support from Resource Holders, as this could delay the process and create barriers for new regions. The essential focus should be on the RIR's capacity to meet regional demands.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

This requirement seems overly restrictive. Requiring broad support from Resource Holders before recognizing a Candidate RIR could hinder progress and create obstacles for emerging regions. The priority should be the RIR's ability to effectively serve the region, not gaining approvals from all parties.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---

For recognition as the RIR serving the proposed Region, the Candidate RIR must have broad backing from Resource Holders, ensuring that community needs are prioritized.

**Taslina Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

A Candidate RIR must gain wide support from Resource Holders in its proposed Region to be recognized as the responsible RIR, facilitating effective management of number resources.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

Broad support from Resource Holders in the region that the Candidate RIR proposes to serve is essential for its recognition as the responsible RIR, requiring consent from all existing members.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

To achieve recognition as the RIR for the proposed region, the Candidate RIR must secure widespread endorsement from Resource Holders, along with current members' agreement.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

The Candidate RIR must secure substantial backing from Resource Holders in the Region it intends to serve to be recognized as the responsible RIR, facilitating effective management.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

Broad support from Resource Holders in the proposed Region is crucial for recognizing the Candidate RIR as the RIR responsible for that area, ensuring effective resource management.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

Broad support from Resource Holders in the proposed Region is crucial for recognizing the Candidate RIR as the RIR responsible for that area, ensuring effective resource management.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

A Candidate RIR must secure widespread backing from Resource Holders in its proposed Region to be recognized as the responsible RIR, ensuring alignment with community interests.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

Resource Holders in the proposed Region must broadly support the Candidate RIR's recognition to ensure it serves as the responsible RIR, reflecting local needs.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

For recognition, a Candidate RIR must demonstrate substantial endorsement from Resource Holders in the Region it aims to serve, ensuring community alignment.

**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

Broad support from Resource Holders in the Region is necessary for recognizing a Candidate RIR as the responsible RIR, ensuring that local interests are represented.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

The Candidate RIR must secure broad support from Resource Holders in the proposed Region to be recognized as the RIR responsible for that area, facilitating effective resource management.

**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

A Candidate RIR must have broad support from Resource Holders in its proposed Region to be recognized as the responsible RIR, demonstrating commitment to community needs.

**Pham Gia Khiem (Phat Tai Logistics)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. It makes little sense to require broad support from Resource Holders for RIR recognition, as this could delay the process and create barriers for new regions. The focus should remain on the RIR's capacity to meet regional demands.

**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

A Candidate RIR must obtain broad support from Resource Holders in its proposed Region to be recognized as the RIR responsible for serving that community effectively.

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

To be recognized, a Candidate RIR must have the broad backing of Resource Holders within the Region it proposes to serve, reflecting a commitment to community needs.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

Resource Holders in the Region that the Candidate RIR proposes to serve must show widespread backing for its recognition, ensuring local stakeholder alignment.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

The recognition of a Candidate RIR as the responsible RIR for a Region requires substantial support from Resource Holders there, ensuring community engagement and alignment.

**Kwan Ke Yue (TBWA/ Kuala Lumpur)**

---

For a Candidate RIR to gain recognition, it is vital that Resource Holders in the proposed Region express broad support, reflecting local governance needs.

**Sean Carroll (The One Academy)**

---

For recognition, a Candidate RIR must secure broad support from Resource Holders in the Region it aims to serve, demonstrating alignment with community needs.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

Broad endorsement from Resource Holders in the Region is crucial for recognizing a Candidate RIR as the RIR responsible for serving that area, reflecting local consensus.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

The recognition of a Candidate RIR as the RIR responsible for a particular Region requires broad backing from Resource Holders in that Region, ensuring that community needs are addressed.

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**

---

An RIR that does not continuously comply with ICP-2 may risk derecognition, requiring the mandatory agreement of all existing members.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

The Candidate RIR must secure broad support from Resource Holders in the Region it aims to serve to be recognized as the responsible RIR for that area.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---

For a Candidate RIR to be acknowledged as the RIR for a specific region, it must have strong backing from Resource Holders in that region, along with consent from all existing RIR members.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---

A Candidate RIR must demonstrate broad support from Resource Holders in the targeted region to be recognized as the RIR responsible for serving that area, with consent from all current members.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

For a Candidate RIR to be recognized, it is essential that Resource Holders in the proposed Region demonstrate broad support for this recognition, ensuring alignment with community needs.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---

To gain recognition as the RIR for a certain region, a Candidate RIR must secure broad support from Resource Holders in that area, along with the necessary consent from all existing members.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

Resource Holders in the Region proposed by the Candidate RIR must broadly endorse the recognition of the Candidate RIR as the designated RIR for that area, ensuring community backing.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

A Candidate RIR must attain widespread support from Resource Holders in the region it proposes to serve to be recognized as the responsible RIR, with the consent of all current members.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

The Candidate RIR must receive widespread endorsement from Resource Holders in the region it intends to serve, affirming its role as the responsible RIR, with the approval of current members.

**Md Abu Sayeem Siddique Siddique (ServicEngine Ltd)**

---

Resource Holders in the region that the Candidate RIR proposes to serve must broadly support recognizing the Candidate RIR as the RIR responsible for that region, ensuring alignment with existing members' consent.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

Resource Holders in the proposed Region must express significant support for recognizing the Candidate RIR as the RIR responsible for that Region, facilitating effective governance.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

Broad support from Resource Holders in the Region that the Candidate RIR aims to serve is crucial for its recognition as the RIR responsible for that area, ensuring alignment with community needs.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---

An RIR that does not adhere to all the specifications in ICP-2 risks derecognition, contingent upon the mandatory consent of existing members.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---

If an RIR consistently fails to meet the requirements of ICP-2, it may be derecognized, needing the mandatory agreement of all existing members.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

An RIR that does not adhere to the requirements of ICP-2 risks being derecognized, provided there is mandatory consent from all existing members.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

If an RIR consistently fails to meet the requirements outlined in ICP-2, it may be derecognized as an RIR, with the necessary consent from all current members.

**Trang Tran (VNPT Technologies)**

---

An RIR that does not comply with all ICP-2 requirements risks being derecognized, contingent upon the mandatory agreement of all existing members of the RIR.

**Minh Hoang (ANSV)**

---

If an RIR fails to continuously meet the requirements set forth in ICP-2, it may be subject to derecognition with the mandatory consent of all current members.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**

---

A Candidate RIR seeking recognition as the RIR for a region must have strong support from Resource Holders in that area, along with the consent of all existing RIR members.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**

---

To be recognized as the RIR serving a particular region, a Candidate RIR must demonstrate broad support from Resource Holders there, along with mandatory consent from all current members.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---

A Candidate RIR must show it has widespread support from Resource Holders in the region it proposes to serve to be recognized as the responsible RIR, with consent from all existing members.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

Broad support from Resource Holders in the targeted region is crucial for a Candidate RIR to be recognized as the responsible RIR, including the consent of all existing members.

**Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)**

---

To gain recognition as the RIR for a specific region, a Candidate RIR must demonstrate that it has the backing of Resource Holders in that area, along with the consent of all current RIR members.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

A Candidate RIR must attain widespread support from Resource Holders in the region it aims to serve to be recognized as the responsible RIR, with the mandatory consent of all existing members.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---

For a Candidate RIR to be acknowledged as the RIR serving a particular region, it must receive broad support from Resource Holders there, including the consent of all current members.

**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

A Candidate RIR seeking recognition as the RIR for a specific region must have strong backing from Resource Holders in that region, along with mandatory consent from all existing RIR members.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---



Broad support from Resource Holders in the proposed service region is essential for a Candidate RIR to be recognized as the RIR responsible for that area, with the consent of all current members.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

To be recognized as the RIR for a given region, a Candidate RIR must secure widespread backing from Resource Holders in that area, along with consent from all existing RIR members.

**Ryan Khaw (Alsco Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

That does not make sense. This would just delay the recognition of an RIR and create barriers for emerging regions. The focus should be on the RIR's capacity to meet the region's needs, not on securing approval from all stakeholders.

**Noel OUPOH (DATACONNECT AFRICA)**

---

The acknowledgment of a Candidate RIR as the RIR serving a specific Region hinges on broad backing from Resource Holders in that area, ensuring it meets their collective interests.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

For a Candidate RIR to be acknowledged as the RIR serving a particular Region, it is essential that Resource Holders in that Region provide broad support for its recognition.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

The recognition of a Candidate RIR as the RIR responsible for a Region requires broad support from Resource Holders in that area, ensuring it meets community needs effectively.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

Resource Holders in the proposed Region must broadly endorse the recognition of the Candidate RIR as the responsible RIR, reflecting the community's interests and priorities.

**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

For recognition as the RIR serving the proposed Region, the Candidate RIR must have broad backing from Resource Holders, ensuring that community needs are prioritized.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

A Candidate RIR must gain wide support from Resource Holders in its proposed Region to be recognized as the responsible RIR, facilitating effective management of number resources.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

Should an RIR not meet all the requirements of ICP-2, it may be subject to derecognition, requiring the consent of all existing members.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**

---

If an RIR does not continuously meet the requirements outlined in ICP-2, it may face derecognition as an RIR, needing the agreement of all existing members.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

For a Candidate RIR to be recognized as the RIR serving a particular Region, it is essential that Resource Holders in that Region provide broad support for its recognition, reflecting the community's interests.

**Jeremy Cheong (Infineon technologies)**

---

The recognition of a Candidate RIR as the responsible RIR for a specific Region hinges on the broad support from Resource Holders within that Region, ensuring it meets their collective needs.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

An RIR that does not continue to meet all specified ICP-2 requirements may be derecognized, contingent upon the agreement of all existing members.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

Should an RIR fail to meet ongoing ICP-2 requirements, it may face derecognition, requiring the mandatory consent of all current members.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

I strongly disagree with this requirement. It risks delaying the recognition of an RIR and creates barriers for areas that need support. The emphasis should be on whether the RIR can effectively serve the region, rather than securing approval from all Resource Holders.

**Sohel Kabir (Kabir Traders)**

---

I find this requirement to be unreasonable. It would only delay the recognition of an RIR and pose barriers for regions that are developing. The priority should be on the RIR's ability to fulfill local needs rather than gaining broad approval from all stakeholders.

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

If an RIR does not consistently comply with all the requirements in ICP-2, it may be derecognized as an RIR, requiring the mandatory consent of existing members.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---

A failure to continuously meet the requirements of ICP-2 may lead to an RIR's derecognition, dependent on the mandatory consent of all current members.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---

An RIR that does not adhere to all specified requirements in ICP-2 risks being derecognized, with the mandatory agreement of all existing members of the RIR.

**Catalina Cueva (Manpower)**

---

Should an RIR fail to meet the ongoing requirements outlined in ICP-2, it may be derecognized, contingent upon the mandatory consent of all current members of the RIR.

**Camilo Riveros (Manpower)**

---

This requirement does not make sense. It risks delaying the recognition of an RIR and creating barriers for emerging areas. The focus should be on the RIR's capability to address the region's needs rather than on gathering approval.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

An RIR that fails to consistently meet all ICP-2 requirements may face derecognition as an RIR, contingent upon the mandatory consent of all existing members of the RIR.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**

---

Requiring broad support from Resource Holders for recognizing a Candidate RIR is illogical. This could hinder the recognition process and create challenges for emerging regions. The priority should be on the RIR's capability to serve effectively.

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

Limiting the support to "resource holders in the region" does not align to a global internet, but walks to a belief that the internet is regional. That may have been the case in the developing days of the internet, however I argue that is not the case today.

**Terry Manderson (terrym.net pty ltd)**

---

I find this approach impractical. Requiring Resource Holders to broadly support a Candidate RIR before recognition would only slow down the process and create unnecessary obstacles for emerging regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's ability to address regional needs.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. It makes little sense to require broad support from Resource Holders for RIR recognition, as this could delay the process and create barriers for new regions. The focus should remain on the RIR's capacity to meet regional demands.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

Pas possible car ,il peut arriver qu'un seul détenteur s'arrange pour avoir plus de pouvoir sur les ressources acquises de manieres non recommandées

**Nico Tshintu bakajika (ISPA-DRC)**

---

I completely disagree with this approach. This requirement would likely create unnecessary delays in recognizing an RIR and hinder progress for emerging regions. The focus should be on the RIR's ability to serve the region, not on securing broad stakeholder approval.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

I find this requirement excessive and counterproductive. Mandating that Resource Holders support the recognition of a Candidate RIR could hinder the timely establishment of RIRs in emerging regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's capacity to meet the needs of the area.

**Anh Dang (NASA)**

---

It makes little sense to demand broad support from Resource Holders prior to recognizing a Candidate RIR. This could slow down the process and create obstacles for emerging regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's capability to meet needs.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

This approach is flawed. It would unnecessarily delay the recognition of an RIR and impose barriers for developing regions. The focus should be on the RIR's ability to fulfill local needs rather than on securing approval from all stakeholders.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

This condition is counterproductive and risks delaying RIR recognition while creating barriers for developing regions. The focus should remain on the RIR's ability to address the region's needs rather than achieving consensus among Resource Holders.

**Prasanta Haloi (Pwd)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Georges Lallogo (ANPTIC)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. It makes little sense to require broad support from Resource Holders for RIR recognition, as this could delay the process and create barriers for new regions. The focus should be on the RIR's capability to serve effectively.

**Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)**

---

This stipulation seems illogical. Requiring broad support from Resource Holders could hinder the timely recognition of an RIR and create obstacles for emerging regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's capacity to serve the region's needs.

**AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)**

---

I believe this requirement is impractical. It risks delaying the recognition of an RIR and establishing barriers for developing regions. The focus should be on the RIR's capability to meet the region's needs, not on gaining consensus from all stakeholders.

**K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)**

---

This requirement seems counterproductive. Requiring broad support from Resource Holders before recognizing a Candidate RIR could unnecessarily delay the process and create barriers for emerging regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's capacity to meet regional demands.

**Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)**

---

This approach is counterproductive. Requiring support from all Resource Holders could postpone the recognition of an RIR and create barriers for regions in need. We should prioritize the RIR's ability to serve the region rather than seeking approval from every stakeholder.

**Fuhui Zhang (University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)**

---

I find this stipulation unreasonable. Requiring broad support from Resource Holders could hinder the timely recognition of an RIR and create obstacles for developing regions. The focus should be on the RIR's capacity to meet local needs.

**Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)**

---

This stipulation does not make sense. Requiring broad support from Resource Holders would only postpone the recognition of an RIR and hinder progress in emerging areas. The focus should be on the RIR's ability to serve the region's needs.

**Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)**

---

I believe this requirement is counterproductive. It could delay the recognition of an RIR and create barriers for developing regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's capacity to meet local needs instead of obtaining approval from all stakeholders.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

This approach is too inflexible and risks undermining the stability of the Internet's regional infrastructure by quickly derecognizing an RIR. Each RIR serves a diverse region with its own challenges, and minor or temporary lapses in complying with ICP-2 should not automatically lead to derecognition. Providing guidance and a corrective action period would be a more supportive strategy, fostering regional stability.\

**Trabahan Pujari (Paruluniversity)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

This stipulation seems impractical. Requiring broad support from Resource Holders before recognizing a Candidate RIR could significantly delay the process and create barriers for developing regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's capacity to meet regional needs.

**Juan Mesa (Hispasat)**

---

I completely disagree with this approach. This requirement would likely create unnecessary delays in recognizing an RIR and hinder progress for emerging regions. The focus should be on the RIR's ability to serve the region, not on securing broad stakeholder approval.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

I find this requirement unreasonable. It could significantly delay the recognition of an RIR and create unnecessary obstacles for developing regions. The priority should be the RIR's ability to meet regional needs, rather than obtaining approval from all local stakeholders.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

I completely disagree with this approach. This requirement would likely create unnecessary delays in recognizing an RIR and hinder progress for emerging regions. The focus should be on the RIR's ability to serve the region, not on securing broad stakeholder approval.

**Pornpipat Kitireanglarp (ZERIWELLPLUS Co., Ltd.)**

---

This approach seems counterproductive. Requiring broad support from Resource Holders for a Candidate RIR's recognition may hinder progress and create barriers for new regions. The focus should be on the RIR's ability to address regional needs, rather than securing approval from all parties involved.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

This stipulation appears overly demanding. Requiring broad support from Resource Holders for recognizing a Candidate RIR could significantly slow the process and hinder emerging regions. The priority must be on the RIR's capacity to address regional needs, rather than securing consensus.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

I find this approach impractical. Requiring Resource Holders to broadly support a Candidate RIR before recognition would only slow down the process and create unnecessary obstacles for emerging regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's ability to fulfill the needs of the region.

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Mandating broad support from Resource Holders before recognizing a Candidate RIR would only slow the process and pose challenges for emerging regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's capacity to serve the region effectively, not on achieving consensus from every stakeholder.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Delaying the recognition of an RIR based on Resource Holder support is illogical and could create barriers for emerging regions. The essential consideration should be the RIR's ability to meet the needs of the region.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---

This approach seems counterproductive. Demanding broad support from Resource Holders for a Candidate RIR's recognition may slow down the process and create barriers for new regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's ability to address regional needs, rather than securing approval from all parties involved.

**Ashrafal Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. It doesn't make sense to delay the recognition of an RIR based on Resource Holder support, as this could hinder emerging regions. The focus should be on the RIR's ability to effectively serve the region.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. It risks delaying the recognition of an RIR and introducing barriers for developing regions. The focus should be on the RIR's ability to meet regional needs, not on gaining approval from all stakeholders.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---

I find this approach impractical. Requiring Resource Holders to broadly support a Candidate RIR before recognition would only slow down the process and create unnecessary obstacles for emerging regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's ability to fulfill the needs of the region.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. It doesn't make sense to make recognition contingent upon broad support from Resource Holders, as this could delay the process and create barriers for new regions. The essential focus should be on the RIR's capacity to meet regional demands.

**Phuc Pham (Advanced Network Systems VietNam Company Limited)**

---

This requirement seems overly restrictive. Requiring broad support from Resource Holders before recognizing a Candidate RIR could hinder progress and create obstacles for emerging regions. The priority should be the RIR's ability to serve the region effectively, not securing approvals from all parties.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

I completely disagree with this approach. This requirement would likely delay the recognition of an RIR and impose barriers for developing regions. The focus must be on the RIR's potential to meet regional needs, not on securing consensus from every stakeholder.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

I find this stipulation excessive. Requiring broad support from Resource Holders for recognizing a Candidate RIR would unnecessarily prolong the process and create hurdles for developing regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's ability to serve rather than on obtaining approval from all stakeholders.

**Giang Nguyen (NASA)**

---

This approach seems counterproductive. Demanding broad support from Resource Holders for a Candidate RIR's recognition may slow down the process and create barriers for new regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's ability to address regional needs, rather than securing approval from all parties involved.

**Alex Kwan (Wiplus Malaysia)**

---

I find this requirement unreasonable. It could significantly delay the recognition of an RIR and create unnecessary obstacles for developing regions. The priority should be the RIR's ability to meet regional needs, rather than obtaining approval from all local stakeholders.

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

Disagree

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Delaying the recognition of an RIR based on Resource Holder support does not make sense and could create barriers for emerging regions. The essential consideration should be the RIR's capacity to meet the needs of the region.

**Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)**

---

This approach appears counterproductive. Requiring Resource Holders to broadly support a Candidate RIR's recognition may slow down the process and create barriers for new regions. The emphasis ought to be on the RIR's ability to fulfill regional needs, rather than on obtaining approval from all parties involved.

**Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)**

---

I find this requirement unreasonable. It may considerably delay the recognition of an RIR and create unnecessary obstacles for developing regions. The priority should be the RIR's ability to meet regional needs, rather than securing approval from all local stakeholders.

**Pooja Gopi (DM Digital Marketing)**

---

I completely disagree with this approach. This requirement would likely create unnecessary delays in recognizing an RIR and hinder progress for emerging regions. The focus should be on the RIR's ability to serve the region, not on securing broad stakeholder approval.

**Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)**

---

I find this requirement excessive and counterproductive. Mandating that Resource Holders support the recognition of a Candidate RIR could hinder the timely establishment of RIRs in emerging regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's capacity to meet the needs of the area.

**Quyn Kim (VNPAY)**

---



This approach seems counterproductive. Demanding that Resource Holders broadly support a Candidate RIR's recognition may delay the process and create barriers for new regions. The focus ought to be on the RIR's ability to meet regional needs, not on gaining approval from all parties involved.

**Shahedul Islam Bhuiyan (Royal Green Limited)**

---

I find this requirement to be impractical. It would delay the recognition process for an RIR and pose barriers for developing regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's ability to fulfill the needs of the region rather than obtaining widespread approval from all Resource Holders.

**Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)**

---

Question 21&22 Community Support Resource Holders in the Region that the Candidate RIR proposes to serve must broadly support recognizing the Candidate RIR as the RIR responsible for serving that Region. 1- Strongly Disagree I find this requirement unreasonable. It could significantly delay the recognition of an RIR and create unnecessary barriers for emerging regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's ability to address the needs of the region, rather than obtaining approval from all local stakeholders.

**Anjan Deka (HDFC)**

---

I find this requirement unreasonable. It could significantly delay the recognition of an RIR and create unnecessary barriers for emerging regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's ability to address the needs of the region, rather than obtaining approval from all local stakeholders.

**Ketan Parmar (Bids Info Global)**

---

I believe this requirement is counterproductive. It risks delaying the recognition of an RIR and creates barriers for regions that are just starting to develop. We should prioritize the RIR's ability to meet regional needs instead of seeking approval from all Resource Holders.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

This approach does not make sense. Requiring broad support from Resource Holders could hinder the timely recognition of an RIR and create obstacles for developing regions. The focus should be on the RIR's capacity to serve the region, not on gaining consensus from every stakeholder.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

I find this requirement illogical. It would only delay the recognition of an RIR and create unnecessary barriers for emerging regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's ability to meet the region's needs rather than obtaining approval from all stakeholders.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---

## 10. Community Commitment

---

A Candidate RIR must demonstrate that its community is willing to support the RIR, both financially and by actively participating in its governance.

### 10.1. Community Commitment - Strongly Agree (5)

Related to the previous principles, this is key to success.

**Mirjam Kühne (RIPE)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle, as financial and governance support from the community is critical to the sustainability and legitimacy of a Candidate RIR. Here's an in-depth analysis: Reasons for Agreement

1. Financial Sustainability • Operating an RIR requires substantial resources for staffing, infrastructure, policy development, and service delivery. Demonstrating financial support ensures that the Candidate RIR has the funding to operate effectively and independently without external reliance.
2. Legitimacy and Community Trust

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

It is incumbent on an RIR to ensure that it maintains a level of engagement with resource holders that ensure their active participation

**Brian Longwe (Converged Technology Networks)**

---

YES! We see what is happening at AFRINIC, the community is non existent, and we are struggling.

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

I agree with this principle to a large extent. A Candidate RIR's success depends on financial sustainability and active community participation in its governance. Demonstrating such support ensures that the RIR is equipped to operate effectively and address the needs of its region. However, the evaluation should consider the unique economic and social contexts of the region, offering flexibility and transitional support where needed to help the Candidate RIR build capacity and foster community engagement over time.

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

I agree with this principle to a large extent. A Candidate RIR's success depends on financial sustainability and active community participation in its governance. Demonstrating such support ensures that the RIR is equipped to operate effectively and address the needs of its region. However, the evaluation should consider the unique economic and social contexts of the region, offering flexibility and transitional support where needed to help the Candidate RIR build capacity and foster community engagement over time.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

Agree

**Warwick Ward-Cox (Network Platforms)**

---

---

This principle ensures that a Candidate RIR has community support both financially and in governance. Financial backing is essential for the RIR's sustainability, while active participation in governance ensures accountability and responsiveness to regional needs. It promotes shared responsibility and transparency, though emerging regions may face challenges in meeting these requirements. Overall, the principle is vital for ensuring that an RIR is supported and effectively managed by its community

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

Yes

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

What about the cases where the community wants to support, but the "big members" don't?

**Hendrik Visage (HeViS.Co Systems Pty Ltd)**

---

This makes perfect sense

**Mark Elkins (Posix Systems)**

---

I fully support the principle that a Candidate RIR must demonstrate both financial backing and active participation in governance from its community. This principle is fundamental for ensuring that the RIR is sustainable, accountable, and able to effectively serve the needs of its stakeholders. Financial support ensures operational viability, while governance participation ensures that the RIR remains responsive and transparent. Together, these elements foster a strong and effective RIR system that can meet the demands of the evolving internet landscape.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

This is a good idea, however, it will become an issue of he who the most funds prevails. This would not be an battle grounds for those without good funds.

**Raymond Mamattah (EGIGFA)**

---

Agreed. An RIR is only as strong as its members.

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

This stipulation seems overly restrictive. Mandating that a Candidate RIR show financial backing and governance participation before recognition could slow down the establishment of RIRs, particularly in underserved areas.

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

I agree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

The Candidate who is holding the position of RIR must encourage is community to contribute both financial and other necessary support needed

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

correcte

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

Financial and governance support from the community are fundamental indicators of the Candidate RIR’s viability and sustainability

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

Yes

**Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)**

---

Totally agree

**Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)**

---

It is a good principle.

**Carlos Friaças (FCT\| FCCN)**

---

This is critical. I wonder how this might be judged and what criteria the NRO would use to evaluate such demonstrations of community support.

**Andrew Gallo (The George Washington University)**

---

The definition of 'community' is the detail here.

**Kevin Meynell (Individual)**

---

a definition of the bar to reach and what happens if it is not met. What does "support" mean, ie what is its definition?

**Matthew Cowen (dgtifutures)**

---

**10.2. Community Commitment - Somewhat Agree (4)**

Not all regions can support RIR financially and participate actively by the especially in less developed region. “MUST” might be too strong a word to use here. Reasonable support should be demonstrated by the candidate RIR with financial plan that demonstrates sustainability.

**Alban Kwan (CSC)**

---

Yes

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

Measures for this will need to be developed and made sure to be practical.

**Jordan Carter (auDA)**

---

Yes

**Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)**

---

agree

**Mohammad Mubarak Alfalasi (Telecommunication and Digital government Regulatory Authority)**

---

that a Candidate RIR has a strong foundation of community support. By requiring both financial and active participation in governance, it guarantees that the RIR has the resources and the engagement necessary to operate effectively and sustainably. This commitment from the community helps to build a robust and resilient RIR that can meet the evolving needs of its stakeholders.

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

Community willingness to support financially and through participation is key. However, as indicated in a previous comment, a principle for transitional or external support to help such communities might strengthen inclusivity

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

No comments

**Pacharaporn Wangwinyoo (ZIM (Thailand) Co., LTD.)**

---

Vital to be part of it's governance

**John Haydon (Education)**

---

This seems duplicative of the clause on "broad support"; or else it is an attempt to define the meaning of board support. In either case the 2 clauses could be better phrased or combined into one.

**PAUL WILSON (private individual)**

---

a Candidate RIR should not be limited to a non-for-profit type of organization. Commercial entities should be allowed to become an RIR and fund themselves through whatever means they choose.

**Elvis Velea (V4Escrow LLC)**

---

### **10.3. Community Commitment - Neutral (3)**

Neutral

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

A Candidate RIR must show that it has substantial community support in the Region it aims to serve, including both financial backing and active governance participation.

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---

If the RIR fails to attract customers, it will fail all on its own. No need for the community to make any other endorsements.

**j heasley (SNI)**

---

This portion is the definition for "Broadly" in the previous "Community Support" .

**James Laferriere (n/a)**

---

The best way community can show their support of (new) RIR is by transferring resources to this RIR. RIR recognition process should not be complicated but derecognition should be backed in a way to ensure continuous operation of resource holders.

**Sergey Kozhedub (IPTP Networks)**

---

Ok

**Hann Jye Ng (MyTeksi Sdn Bhd)**

---

This approach seems counterproductive. Requiring a Candidate RIR to show financial support and governance participation before recognition could unnecessarily delay and hinder its establishment, particularly in areas with limited resources.

**Sidonie Hacking (-)**

---

This requirement appears overly demanding. A Candidate RIR should not have to demonstrate financial backing and governance involvement before recognition, as this could impede the establishment of RIRs in resource-constrained areas.

**Jun Wen (one futures technology sdn bhd)**

---

I strongly disagree with this stipulation. It would only delay the recognition of an RIR and create barriers for regions that need support. The focus should be on whether the RIR can meet regional needs, rather than on securing approval from every stakeholder.

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

I agree

**Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)**

---

Unless "community" is properly defined the important consideration is "Resource Holders"

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

What does community mean here : Ressource holders ?

**Adeola Alain P. AINA (Digital Intelligence Services, Sarl)**

---

How is that willingness demonstrated for a candidate RIR?

**Mike Burns (IPTrading)**

---

#### **10.4. Community Commitment - Somewhat Disagree (2)**

Both principles use the term "community", but in different meanings. In the former, community is set euql toi the resource holders, in the latter it is not explicitly stated, but would traditionally go beyond the resource holders; this needs clarification

**Peter Koch (Individual)**

---

Requiring a Candidate RIR to demonstrate financial backing and active governance participation before recognition could unnecessarily hinder the development of RIRs, especially in regions with limited resources

**Noel OUPOH (DATACONNECT AFRICA)**

---

Broad support from Resource Holders in the Region is essential for recognizing the Candidate RIR as the responsible RIR, including financial backing and governance roles.

**Neonjyoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

cette question n'a pas la raison d'être

**Nico Tshintu bakajika (ISPA-DRC)**

---

I find this requirement impractical. Mandating that a Candidate RIR demonstrate both financial backing and active governance involvement prior to recognition could obstruct RIR development, especially in underserved regions.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---

Most of the financial support as well as participation in the governance comes from the resource holders. Should that be "Resource Holders in the Region that the Candidate RIR proposes to serve"?

**Andrei Robachevsky (independent)**

---

## 10.5. Community Commitment - Strongly Disagree (1)

While it is obviously a requirement that the community being served by the Candidate RIR be financially supported by (at least the resource holder part of) the community, “actively participating in its governance” suggests the “community”, however it is defined, must engage both when the RIR is created and continually thereafter or the Candidate RIR will not be recognized (or lose the recognition it has gained). This is unrealistic and arguably, all RIRs today would fail this principle. Pragmatically, it would probably be more realistic to have a principle that states that a community can, at any time, explicitly withdraw its support for an RIR, which can lead to the de-recognition of the RIR if the reasons for that withdrawal are not cured within a reasonable grace period.

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

To gain recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must show that its community is prepared to support it financially and engage in governance.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

A Candidate RIR must demonstrate that its community is willing to provide both financial support and active participation in governance for recognition.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

For a Candidate RIR to be recognized, it must prove that its community is committed to supporting it financially and engaging in governance.

**Tipu Khan (Zx Online Ltd)**

---

A Candidate RIR must illustrate that its community is prepared to provide financial backing and actively participate in governance to gain recognition.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

A Candidate RIR must show that its community is committed to supporting the RIR financially and by participating actively in its governance.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---

To gain RIR recognition, a Candidate RIR must demonstrate community support in terms of financial contributions and participation in governance activities.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

A Candidate RIR must establish that its community is willing to back the RIR through financial support and active involvement in governance.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---

For recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must prove that its community is ready to provide both financial and active governance support.



**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

I find this approach too rigid. Insisting that a Candidate RIR show both financial support and active governance participation before being recognized could stifle development, especially in regions that lack sufficient resources.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

A Candidate RIR must show that its community is ready to support the RIR in both financial terms and active governance involvement.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

A Candidate RIR must demonstrate that its community is willing to provide financial support and actively participate in governance to be recognized.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

To gain recognition, a Candidate RIR must show that its community is prepared to support it both financially and through governance involvement.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

This approach seems counterproductive. Requiring a Candidate RIR to show financial support and governance participation before recognition could unnecessarily delay and hinder its establishment, especially in areas with limited resources.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

I find this requirement impractical. Mandating that a Candidate RIR demonstrate financial backing and active governance involvement prior to recognition could obstruct RIR development, particularly in underserved regions.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---

A Candidate RIR must demonstrate community support, both in financial contributions and active governance participation, to be recognized as a responsible RIR.

**Taslima Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

To gain recognition, a Candidate RIR must show that its community is prepared to support it financially and actively participate in its governance, establishing a solid operational framework.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

Resource Holders in the region should collectively express their support for the Candidate RIR through financial contributions and active governance involvement to facilitate its recognition.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

The Candidate RIR needs to demonstrate that the community it serves is willing to back it financially and participate actively in governance to ensure effective operations.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

To gain recognition, a Candidate RIR must prove that its community is willing to provide both financial support and participate actively in governance.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

A Candidate RIR must illustrate that its community supports the RIR, both financially and through active governance participation, to ensure effective operations.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

A Candidate RIR must illustrate that its community supports the RIR, both financially and through active governance participation, to ensure effective operations.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

For a Candidate RIR to be recognized, it must show that its community is willing to support the RIR with financial contributions and active governance involvement.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

A Candidate RIR must provide evidence that its community supports it, both financially and through active governance participation, to ensure effective management.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

To gain recognition, a Candidate RIR must illustrate its community's readiness to back the RIR financially and by participating in governance activities.

**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

A Candidate RIR must demonstrate that its community is committed to supporting the RIR, both financially and through active governance engagement.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

A Candidate RIR must prove that its community is committed to supporting the RIR, both financially and through active governance involvement, ensuring robust operations.

**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

For recognition, a Candidate RIR must show that its community is willing to support it financially and through active participation in governance processes.

**Pham Gia Khiem (Phat Tai Logistics)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Insisting that a Candidate RIR prove its financial support and governance involvement before recognition may hinder the establishment of RIRs, especially in resource-limited regions.

**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

'- A Candidate RIR must show that its community is committed to providing support, both financially and through active governance involvement, to ensure effective management.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

For recognition, a Candidate RIR must demonstrate that its community is prepared to back it financially and engage actively in governance processes.

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

Support from the community, both financially and through active governance participation, is essential for a Candidate RIR to gain recognition as an RIR.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

A Candidate RIR must illustrate that its community is prepared to back the RIR with financial resources and through active governance participation for effective functioning.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

A Candidate RIR must provide evidence of community willingness to support both financially and through active governance participation to be recognized as an RIR.

**Kwan Ke Yue (TBWA/ Kuala Lumpur)**

---

To be recognized, a Candidate RIR must demonstrate that its community is committed to supporting it financially and by engaging in governance activities.

**Sean Carroll (The One Academy)**

---

A Candidate RIR must show that its community is prepared to back the RIR with financial resources and active involvement in governance processes.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

For a Candidate RIR to be recognized, it must demonstrate that its community is committed to supporting the RIR financially and by participating in governance activities

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

A Candidate RIR must demonstrate community willingness to support the RIR, both financially and through active governance participation, to ensure its sustainability and effectiveness.

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**

---

Resource Holders in the proposed Region must provide strong backing for the Candidate RIR's recognition as the responsible RIR, including commitments to financial and governance participation.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

A Candidate RIR must illustrate that its community is prepared to support the RIR, both financially and by engaging in its governance processes.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---

The Candidate RIR must prove that its community is ready to support the RIR financially and engage actively in governance, including facilitating the portability of number resources.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---

To be recognized, a Candidate RIR must show that Resource Holders in its proposed region are willing to support the RIR both financially and through active governance participation, particularly in resource portability.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

To be recognized, a Candidate RIR must demonstrate community willingness to support it financially and through active governance participation.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---

A Candidate RIR must illustrate that its community of Resource Holders is prepared to back the RIR financially and actively participate in its governance, ensuring the portability of number resources.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

A Candidate RIR must show that its community is willing to support the RIR through both financial contributions and active participation in governance to gain recognition.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

Resource Holders in the region that the Candidate RIR aims to serve must show their intention to support the RIR financially and engage actively in governance, especially regarding resource portability.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

The Candidate RIR must show that the community it intends to serve is prepared to support it through financial contributions and active governance involvement, ensuring alignment with regional interests.

**Md Abu Sayeem Siddique Siddique (ServicEngine Ltd)**

---

Resource Holders in the proposed region must collectively endorse the recognition of the Candidate RIR, demonstrating both financial backing and active participation in governance to ensure effective service delivery.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

A Candidate RIR must demonstrate that its community is committed to supporting it financially and through active governance participation, ensuring a strong foundation for operations.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

To be recognized as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must show that its community is willing to engage financially and participate actively in governance processes.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---

A Candidate RIR must demonstrate that its community is ready to support it, both financially and through active governance participation, to be recognized as the responsible RIR.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---

Resource Holders in the proposed Region must express broad support for recognizing the Candidate RIR, ensuring financial backing and active participation in governance.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

A Candidate RIR must show that its proposed community is willing to support its recognition through financial means and active governance participation.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

Resource Holders in the Region must provide strong backing for recognizing the Candidate RIR as responsible, which includes financial support and active participation in governance.

**Trang Tran (VNPT Technologies)**

---

Resource Holders in the Region must show widespread support for the Candidate RIR to be recognized as the responsible RIR, including commitments to financial and governance participation.

**Minh Hoang (ANSV)**

---

The Candidate RIR must demonstrate strong community backing in the proposed Region, encompassing both financial support and active participation in governance to gain recognition.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**

---

For recognition, a Candidate RIR must show broad support from Resource Holders in its proposed region, both financially and through active participation in governance, including resource portability.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**

---

A Candidate RIR must prove that its community is willing to provide both financial support and active governance participation, particularly in facilitating the portability of number resources.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---

To achieve recognition, a Candidate RIR must show that Resource Holders in the proposed region are willing to support the RIR financially and participate in governance, including facilitating the portability of number resources.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

A Candidate RIR must demonstrate that its community is committed to supporting the RIR financially and participating actively in its governance, particularly in the area of number resource portability.

**Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)**

---

Resource Holders in the region that the Candidate RIR proposes to serve must show their willingness to support the RIR both financially and through active participation in governance, including facilitating resource portability.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

A Candidate RIR must prove that its community is prepared to support the RIR financially and actively engage in its governance, including ensuring the portability of number resources.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---

The community of Resource Holders in the region proposed by the Candidate RIR must demonstrate broad financial and governance support for the RIR, including the capability to facilitate number resource portability.

**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

For recognition, a Candidate RIR needs to show that Resource Holders in its proposed region are willing to support the RIR both financially and through active governance participation, particularly in facilitating resource portability.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---

A Candidate RIR must illustrate that its community of Resource Holders is ready to support the RIR financially and actively participate in governance, including facilitating the portability of number resources.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

Resource Holders in the region that the Candidate RIR aims to serve must express broad support for the recognition of the RIR, both financially and through active governance participation, including the ability to facilitate resource portability.

**Ryan Khaw (Alsco Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

For recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must illustrate community support through financial backing and active governance involvement, ensuring effective resource management.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

An RIR that does not maintain compliance with all specified ICP-2 requirements may be derecognized, with the mandatory agreement of all existing members required.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Aptic)**

---

A Candidate RIR must prove that its community is ready to support the RIR, both through financial contributions and active participation in governance, to ensure sustainability.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

For recognition as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must show that its community is willing to provide financial support and engage actively in governance, reflecting their commitment.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

A Candidate RIR must demonstrate community willingness to support the RIR, both financially and through active participation in governance, ensuring effective management.

**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

A Candidate RIR must demonstrate community support, both in financial contributions and active governance participation, to be recognized as a responsible RIR.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

To gain recognition, a Candidate RIR must show that its community is prepared to support it financially and actively participate in its governance, establishing a solid operational framework.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

The Candidate RIR must demonstrate strong backing from the community in the proposed Region, ensuring both financial support and active participation in governance structures.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**

---

Resource Holders in the proposed Region must endorse the Candidate RIR's recognition, ensuring both financial contributions and active engagement in governance processes.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

To be recognized as an RIR, a Candidate RIR must show that its community is prepared to support it financially and participate actively in its governance, reflecting their commitment.

**Jeremy Cheong (Infineon technologies)**

---

A Candidate RIR must provide evidence that its community is ready to support the RIR, both in financial contributions and through active participation in governance processes.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

The community in the Region proposed for the Candidate RIR must demonstrate broad support for its recognition, ensuring financial contributions and governance engagement.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

A Candidate RIR must prove that it has substantial community support in the proposed Region, both financially and through active involvement in its governance structures.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

I strongly disagree with this requirement. It risks delaying the recognition of an RIR and creates barriers for areas that need support. The emphasis should be on whether the RIR can effectively serve the region, rather than securing approval from all Resource Holders.

**Sohel Kabir (Kabir Traders)**

---

I find this requirement to be unreasonable. It would only delay the recognition of an RIR and pose barriers for regions that are developing. The priority should be on the RIR's ability to fulfill local needs rather than gaining broad approval from all stakeholders.

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

The community in the Region proposed for the Candidate RIR must show substantial support for its recognition as the RIR, providing both financial resources and active governance participation.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---

Broad support from Resource Holders in the Region is essential for recognizing the Candidate RIR as responsible for that area, including strong financial backing and governance engagement.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---

A Candidate RIR must demonstrate that it has the support of the community it seeks to serve, both financially and through active participation in governance, to be recognized as the regional RIR.

**Catalina Cueca (Manpower)**

---

Resource Holders in the Region must express broad support for recognizing the Candidate RIR as the responsible RIR, encompassing both financial contributions and active participation in governance.

**Camilo Riveros (Manpower)**

---

The expectation that a Candidate RIR must prove community support through financial contributions and governance involvement before recognition could stifle growth in resource-limited regions.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

Resource Holders in the proposed Region must demonstrate broad support for recognizing the Candidate RIR as the RIR responsible for that Region, ensuring financial backing and active governance participation.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**



---

Requiring a Candidate RIR to demonstrate community financial backing and governance participation as a condition for recognition could hinder growth, particularly in regions facing resource constraints.

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

I find this approach impractical. Mandating that a Candidate RIR demonstrate both financial backing and active governance participation prior to recognition could impede development, especially in underserved areas.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Insisting that a Candidate RIR prove its financial support and governance involvement before recognition may hinder the establishment of RIRs, especially in resource-limited regions.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

This provision appears impractical. Requiring a Candidate RIR to show both financial support and active governance participation before recognition may create unnecessary obstacles, particularly in areas with limited resources.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

I find this requirement to be excessive. Insisting that a Candidate RIR prove its financial backing and governance participation prior to recognition could unnecessarily hinder the growth of RIRs in resource-constrained regions.

**Anh Dang (NASA)**

---

Mandating that a Candidate RIR demonstrate both financial and governance support before recognition risks stifling development in regions that are already under-resourced.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

This requirement for financial and governance support from the community could unnecessarily delay the recognition of a Candidate RIR, especially in areas with limited resources.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

The expectation that a Candidate RIR must show both financial support and active governance participation prior to recognition could pose significant challenges, especially in resource-limited regions.

**Prasanta Haloi (Pwd)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Georges Lallogo (ANPTIC)**

---

I completely disagree with this approach. Requiring a Candidate RIR to demonstrate financial support and active governance involvement before recognition could stifle RIR development, especially in regions with limited resources.

**Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)**

---

This stipulation seems illogical. Requiring broad support from Resource Holders could hinder the timely recognition of an RIR and create obstacles for emerging regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's capacity to serve the region's needs.

**AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)**

---

I believe this requirement is impractical. It risks delaying the recognition of an RIR and establishing barriers for developing regions. The focus should be on the RIR's capability to meet the region's needs, not on gaining consensus from all stakeholders.

**K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)**

---

I find this requirement impractical. Mandating that a Candidate RIR show financial backing and active governance involvement before recognition could stifle RIR development, especially in regions with limited resources.

**Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)**

---

This approach is counterproductive. Requiring support from all Resource Holders could postpone the recognition of an RIR and create barriers for regions in need. We should prioritize the RIR's ability to serve the region rather than seeking approval from every stakeholder.

**Fuhui Zhang (University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)**

---

I find this stipulation unreasonable. Requiring broad support from Resource Holders could hinder the timely recognition of an RIR and create obstacles for developing regions. The focus should be on the RIR's capacity to meet local needs.

**Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)**

---

This stipulation does not make sense. Requiring broad support from Resource Holders would only postpone the recognition of an RIR and hinder progress in emerging areas. The focus should be on the RIR's ability to serve the region's needs.

**Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)**

---

I believe this requirement is counterproductive. It could delay the recognition of an RIR and create barriers for developing regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's capacity to meet local needs instead of obtaining approval from all stakeholders.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

This requirement for a Candidate RIR to demonstrate community financial backing and governance participation may unnecessarily stifle development, especially in resource-constrained regions.

**Trabahan Pujari (Paruluniversity)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Mandating that a Candidate RIR provide evidence of financial backing and governance involvement before recognition could obstruct RIR growth, especially in underserved regions.

**Juan Mesa (Hispasat)**

---

This provision seems impractical. Requiring a Candidate RIR to show both financial support and active governance participation before recognition may create unnecessary obstacles, particularly in areas with limited resources.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

I find this requirement to be excessively restrictive. Requiring a Candidate RIR to demonstrate financial backing and active governance participation before recognition could significantly hinder the development of RIRs, especially in resource-limited areas.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

I completely disagree with this approach. Requiring a Candidate RIR to demonstrate financial support and active governance involvement before recognition could stifle RIR development, especially in regions with limited resources.

**Pornpipat Kitireanglarp (ZERIWELLPLUS Co., Ltd.)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. The expectation for a Candidate RIR to prove its financial backing and active governance participation before recognition could create unnecessary obstacles, especially in under-resourced areas.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

This stipulation appears overly restrictive. Mandating that a Candidate RIR show financial backing and governance participation before recognition could slow down RIR establishment, particularly in underserved areas.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Insisting that a Candidate RIR demonstrate both financial backing and governance participation before recognition could create barriers that obstruct development, particularly in regions with fewer resources.

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

This stipulation seems excessive. Asking a Candidate RIR to provide proof of financial support and active governance involvement prior to recognition could obstruct RIR growth, particularly in areas with limited resources.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

I consider this approach too rigid. Insisting that a Candidate RIR show both financial support and active governance participation before recognition could stifle development, particularly in regions lacking sufficient resources.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. The demand for a Candidate RIR to prove its financial backing and active governance participation before recognition could create unnecessary obstacles, especially in under-resourced areas.

**Ashraful Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

I believe this approach is too rigid. A Candidate RIR should not need to demonstrate financial support and governance participation prior to recognition, as this could hinder development in areas with limited resources.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

I believe this requirement is overly stringent. A Candidate RIR should not be required to prove financial support and active governance involvement prior to recognition, as this may hinder the growth of RIRs in resource-limited regions.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Insisting that a Candidate RIR demonstrate both financial backing and governance participation before recognition could create barriers that obstruct development, particularly in regions with fewer resources.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

This approach appears counterproductive. Requiring a Candidate RIR to show financial support and governance participation before recognition could unnecessarily delay and hinder its establishment, particularly in areas with limited resources.

**Phuc Pham (Advanced Network Systems VietNam Company Limited)**

---

I find this requirement impractical. Mandating that a Candidate RIR demonstrate both financial backing and active governance involvement prior to recognition could obstruct the development of RIRs, especially in underserved regions.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Requiring a Candidate RIR to provide evidence of financial support and active governance participation before recognition may hinder the growth of RIRs, especially in regions with limited resources.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

This requirement appears overly demanding. A Candidate RIR should not be obliged to demonstrate financial backing and governance involvement prior to recognition, as this could impede the establishment of RIRs in resource-constrained areas.

**Giang Nguyen (NASA)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. The demand for a Candidate RIR to prove its financial backing and active governance participation before recognition could create unnecessary obstacles, especially in under-resourced areas.

**Alex Kwan (Wiplus Malaysia)**

---

I find this requirement to be excessively restrictive. Requiring a Candidate RIR to demonstrate financial backing and active governance participation before recognition could significantly hinder the development of RIRs, especially in resource-limited areas.

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

Disagree

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---

I consider this approach too rigid. Insisting that a Candidate RIR demonstrate both financial support and active governance participation before recognition could stifle development, especially in regions that lack sufficient resources.

**Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Demanding that a Candidate RIR prove its financial backing and active participation in governance prior to recognition could create unnecessary barriers, particularly in under-resourced regions.

**Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)**

---

I find this requirement to be excessively restrictive. Mandating that a Candidate RIR demonstrate financial backing and active governance participation prior to recognition could significantly impede the development of RIRs, particularly in resource-limited regions.

**Pooja Gopi (DM Digital Marketing)**

---

This provision appears impractical. Requiring a Candidate RIR to show both financial support and active governance participation before recognition may create unnecessary obstacles, particularly in areas with limited resources.

**Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. Insisting that a Candidate RIR prove its financial backing and governance participation prior to recognition could unnecessarily hinder the growth of RIRs in resource-constrained regions.

**Quyn Kim (VNPAY)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Demanding that a Candidate RIR demonstrates financial backing and active participation in governance prior to recognition could create unnecessary barriers, particularly in under-resourced regions.

**Shahedul Islam Bhuiyan (Royal Green Limited)**

---

I find this requirement to be impractical. It would delay the recognition process for an RIR and pose barriers for developing regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's ability to fulfill the needs of the region rather than obtaining widespread approval from all Resource Holders.

**Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)**

---

Question 22&23 Community Commitment A Candidate RIR must demonstrate that its community is willing to support the RIR, both financially and by actively participating in its governance. 1- Strongly Disagree Answer: I believe this requirement is overly restrictive. Mandating that a Candidate RIR show financial backing and active governance participation prior to recognition could significantly hinder the development of RIRs, particularly in resource-limited regions.

**Anjan Deka (HDFC)**

---

I believe this requirement is overly restrictive. Mandating that a Candidate RIR show financial backing and active governance participation prior to recognition could significantly hinder the development of RIRs, particularly in resource-limited regions.

**Ketan Parmar (Bids Info Global)**

---

I believe this requirement is counterproductive. It risks delaying the recognition of an RIR and creates barriers for regions that are just starting to develop. We should prioritize the RIR's ability to meet regional needs instead of seeking approval from all Resource Holders.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

This approach does not make sense. Requiring broad support from Resource Holders could hinder the timely recognition of an RIR and create obstacles for developing regions. The focus should be on the RIR's capacity to serve the region, not on gaining consensus from every stakeholder.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

I find this requirement illogical. It would only delay the recognition of an RIR and create unnecessary barriers for emerging regions. The emphasis should be on the RIR's ability to meet the region's needs rather than obtaining approval from all stakeholders.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---

The community might not be aware of the value a RIR can bring, so this should not be a consideration.

**Musa Stephen HONLUE (AFRINIC)**

---

## 11. Independence

---

An RIR must be financially stable and independent.

### 11.1. Independence - Strongly Agree (5)

This is important to allow the RIR to serve a wide and diverse membership without conflicts of interests.

**Mirjam Kühne (RIPE)**

---

Yes but some may not be able to stay financially independent until it is stabilised.

**Alban Kwan (CSC)**

---

I fully agree with this principle, as financial stability and independence are critical for an RIR to function effectively, maintain trust, and serve its community without undue external influence. Here's an analysis: Reasons for Agreement

1. Ensures Operational Sustainability • Financial stability ensures that an RIR can consistently provide essential services, including resource allocation, technical support, and policy development, without interruptions. 2.

Maintains Independence • Financial independence protects an RIR from being influenced or controlled by external entities, such as governments, corporations.

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

Nothing to add or detract

**Brian Longwe (Converged Technology Networks)**

---

No comment

**Kelvin Horng Woei Ong (Propnex)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle. Financial stability and independence are crucial for an RIR to effectively manage resources, maintain operational continuity, and make decisions free from external pressures. This ensures that the RIR can prioritize the needs of its community and invest in long-term growth and sustainability. However, achieving financial independence should be realistic and supported by a sound business model that reflects the region's specific challenges and opportunities.

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle. Financial stability and independence are crucial for an RIR to effectively manage resources, maintain operational continuity, and make decisions free from external pressures. This ensures that the RIR can prioritize the needs of its community and invest in long-term growth and sustainability. However, achieving financial independence should be realistic and supported by a sound business model that reflects the region's specific challenges and opportunities.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---



Any RIR must be able to fund its operations and pay its bills as and when they fall due.

**Narelle Clark (Internet Association of Australia)**

---

could be supported by other RIRs

**Tahar Schaa (Neuland@Homeland)**

---

This is necessary in order not to depend on governments and policies

**alexis ndoumga (ministry of posts and telecommunications)**

---

Of course

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

the problem is when you have high monetary value IPv4... there the independence is easily thwarted by greed and money

**Hendrik Visage (HeViS.Co Systems Pty Ltd)**

---

I strongly support the principle that an RIR must be financially stable and independent. This principle ensures that the RIR can operate effectively, transparently, and sustainably, while maintaining the trust and confidence of its stakeholders. Financial stability enables the RIR to meet its obligations, adapt to change, and engage in long-term strategic planning, while financial independence safeguards its autonomy and integrity in decision-making. This is essential not only for the RIR itself but also for the broader internet governance framework, which relies on a system of independent, trusted, and accountable RIRs to manage the global internet resources.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

The Board should be subject to the jurisdiction of registration's governing and fiduciary duties.

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

5

**Taye Oyebola (Aso Savings and Loans Plc)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. It may not be feasible for all RIRs to be financially stable and independent, particularly in underserved regions. Many will need time and support to attain financial stability.

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

I agree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

yes, you must be financially buoyant to be independent

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

tout a fait

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

This can foster trust, minimize costs for members, and ensure resources

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

Yes

**Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)**

---

It seems to me obvious.

**Luis Caceres (Corporacion Redexcom C.A.)**

---

Properly audited financial statements and accountability to Members are vital.

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

I considered whether a multi-governmental agency could financially support an RIR, but decided it would then no longer be independent; the agency would eventually expect to exert some influence. However, I have no reservations about new RIRs receiving startup support, or RIRs sharing software and practices.

**Lee Howard (IPv4.Global by Hilco Streambank)**

---

Clearly desirable and reasonable.

**Andrew Gallo (The George Washington University)**

---

Yes, but we don't want RIRs with huge reserves or investment funds. The RIR should have enough reserve to see it through a tough time but not so much that they become a target for raiders etc...

**Leo Vegoda (And Polus LLC)**

---

Given that RIRs rely on membership and resource fees from LIRs/ISPs for funding, they may become influenced by large members with significant resources. This could lead to a fear of losing major members and funding, which may cause RIRs to favor larger members in policy-making and pricing. Therefore, the definition of "financial independence" should be clarified to ensure true impartiality.

**Chenyang Gao (NoPKT LLC)**

---

There can be different funding models, so this requirement should not be prescriptive.

**Kevin Meynell (Individual)**

---

## 11.2. Independence - Somewhat Agree (4)

This principle requires some clarification. What is meant by independent here? It should be made clear that independence means operational independence, in the sense that the RIR can operate and fulfill its mission without reliance on other RIRs or other organizations.

**Eric Edora (TELUS Communications Inc.)**

---

Correct, in order to function.

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

Sounds good, but independent from what or who?

**Jordan Carter (auDA)**

---

The stability and financial independence of an RIR are essential to ensure efficient service and adequate management of Internet resources.

**Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)**

---

agee

**Mohammad Mubarak Alfalasi (Telecommunication and Digital government Regulatory Authority)**

---

I'd say yes, but we've seen situation about where AFRINC accounts were frozen, we needed help eventhough we were stable and independent. We need to address situation where a Court freeze an RIR bank account.

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

Crucial

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

that RIRs are not subject to undue influence from external entities. Financial stability and independence allow RIRs to make decisions based on the best interests of the internet community, rather than being swayed by commercial or political pressures. This promotes impartiality and objectivity in resource allocation and policy development, contributing to the overall health and stability of the internet ecosystem.

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

This principle ensures that an RIR remains financially stable and independent, enabling it to operate effectively and sustainably. Financial stability supports necessary investments, while independence allows the RIR to make unbiased decisions in the best interest of its community. Although it can be challenging, particularly for newer or smaller RIRs, this principle is essential for maintaining trust, transparency, and the long-term effectiveness of the RIR

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

I suggest we consider a principle that promotes phased independence, where new RIRs receive time-bound financial and operational support.

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

No comments

**Pacharaporn Wangwinyoo (ZIM (Thailand) Co., LTD.)**

---

Agree

**John Haydon (Education)**

---

s/must/should/ startup and changes can be financially difficult

**Randy Bush (IIJ Research Lab & Arrcus Inc)**

---

I agree

**Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)**

---

Independence needs to be explained, as a political and organisational independence. Of course the RIR will depend on funding from its community, including any sources of incomes that are deemed to be acceptable by the RIRs membership.

**PAUL WILSON (private individual)**

---

Independent from what and who?

**Elvis Velea (V4Escrow LLC)**

---

Sometimes financially stable means interdependence. Maybe to be stable it has to enter into a mutual assistance agreement with other RIRs, is that independent?

**Mike Burns (IPTrading)**

---

I think it better to put other aspects of stability than only financial.

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

**11.3. Independence - Neutral (3)**

This expectation may be too strict for many RIRs, particularly those in underserved areas. Financial independence is often a gradual process requiring support and collaboration.

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---

Why? If an RIR fails, another RIR can be established or assume their customers.

**j heasley (SNI)**

---

Again , "Independant" of what ? Their members ? I hope NOT . Again definition , as it regard their Duties to their members & their function as RIR .

**James Laferriere (n/a)**

---

Agree

**Hann Jye Ng (MyTeksi Sdn Bhd)**

---

This approach appears overly demanding. Achieving financial stability and independence is a process that may take time, particularly for RIRs in emerging markets. Support and collaboration may be necessary for these RIRs to succeed.

**Jun Wen (one futures technology sdn bhd)**

---

I believe this stipulation is impractical. It may not be realistic for every RIR, particularly those operating in emerging or underserved areas. Financial stability and independence can take time to establish, and some may need assistance to reach these goals.

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

Neutral

**Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)**

---

#### **11.4. Independence - Somewhat Disagree (2)**

It remains unclear from whom the RIR must be independent

**Peter Koch (Individual)**

---

No, this requirement may not be practical for all RIRs, especially those in underserved areas. Financial stability often requires time to develop, and support may be crucial.

**Neonjoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. Not all RIRs can achieve immediate financial stability and independence, particularly in developing regions. Many may need time and collaborative efforts to reach these goals.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---

This condition seems impractical. Expecting all RIRs to be financially stable and independent is unrealistic, especially for those in underserved regions. Achieving this stability often requires time and additional support.

**Sidonie Hacking (-)**

---

Independence from the donor and government support

**Andrei Robachevsky (independent)**

---

### **11.5. Independence - Strongly Disagree (1)**

Without defining what “financially stable” and “independent” mean, this is impossible to know the intent of this principle or why they’re tied within the principle titled “independence” – they are two distinct concepts. A principle of “financial stability” should probably be dealt with in the general principle that states an RIR must be operationally stable, which implies stability of finances along with other attributes such as service stability, corporate governance stability, policy definition process stability, etc. In terms of being independent, a dictionary definition of independence is “to have freedom from outside control or support.” An RIR must be supported by its community, financially, legislatively/regulatorily, and otherwise, so it obviously can’t and shouldn’t be independent of its community. RIRs also must obviously abide by the laws of the jurisdiction in which it operates. Further, since one of the reasons for revising ICP-2 is to allow for de-recognition, it implies there must be some outside control(s) (e.g., community, ICANN, etc.) For a principle entitled “independence”, I’d recommend simply saying: “An RIR must be free from undue outside control or support.”

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

No, this requirement seems overly rigid for RIRs, especially those in developing areas where financial stability often requires time and collaboration.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

This requirement might be too stringent, particularly for RIRs in emerging markets, where financial independence is a gradual process that may need support.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

I believe this stipulation is overly strict and may not reflect the realities of RIRs in underserved regions, where achieving financial stability often takes time.

**Tipu Khan (Zx Online Ltd)**

---

No, this requirement could be unrealistic for many RIRs in developing areas, where financial independence can take time and may require partnerships or assistance.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

I find this requirement to be overly rigid, especially for RIRs operating in underserved regions. Financial stability and independence can be difficult to achieve without initial support or partnerships.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---

No, this stipulation could be too stringent for RIRs in emerging markets. Financial independence may take time to achieve, and some RIRs might benefit from external support during this process.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

This requirement might be too strict, as it doesn't consider the unique challenges faced by RIRs in developing areas. Financial stability is often a gradual process, requiring support and collaboration.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---

I think this requirement is overly rigid and may not be realistic for all RIRs, particularly those in underserved regions. Achieving financial independence often involves time and collaboration with other entities.

**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating financial stability and independence may not be realistic for all RIRs, especially in underserved regions. Many RIRs will need time and support to reach these financial goals.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

I think this requirement is overly strict and does not consider the complexities faced by RIRs in underserved areas, where achieving financial independence may take time.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

This requirement could be too rigid for RIRs in emerging markets. Financial stability often requires time and may benefit from collaboration with other entities.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

I believe this requirement is overly strict and may not consider the realities faced by RIRs in underserved areas, where achieving financial independence can be a gradual process.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

This condition seems impractical. Expecting all RIRs to be financially stable and independent is unrealistic, especially for those in underserved regions. Achieving this stability often requires time and additional support.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. Not all RIRs can achieve immediate financial stability and independence, particularly in developing regions. Many will need time and collaborative efforts to reach these goals.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---

No, this requirement may be unrealistic for certain RIRs, particularly those in underserved areas. Achieving financial independence is often a gradual journey, and support from established organizations may be essential.

**Taslina Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

Insisting on financial stability and independence might be too stringent for all RIRs, especially those in emerging regions. Some RIRs may require time and assistance to reach this level of financial health.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

This stipulation may not be realistic for many RIRs, especially those in underserved areas where financial independence typically requires external support and time.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

No, imposing such a strict requirement could limit the potential of RIRs, particularly in regions that are still developing and may need assistance to attain financial stability.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

Insisting on financial stability and independence may not be realistic for all RIRs, especially in developing areas. Achieving these goals often requires time and assistance.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

No, this requirement could be overly rigid for many RIRs, particularly those in underserved regions. Achieving financial stability often necessitates time and support from other entities.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

No, this requirement could be overly rigid for many RIRs, particularly those in underserved regions. Achieving financial stability often necessitates time and support from other entities.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

I find this requirement to be too rigid, especially for RIRs in underserved areas. Achieving financial independence can take time, and some may need collaboration to succeed.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

No, this expectation is overly strict and may not be attainable for many RIRs, particularly those in developing regions. Financial stability often requires time and external support.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

I think this criterion is too stringent, especially for RIRs in emerging markets. Financial stability and independence can take considerable time, and collaboration may be necessary.



**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

No, this requirement may not be practical for all RIRs, especially those in underserved areas. Financial stability often takes time, and some may require support to achieve their goals.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

No, this requirement might not be realistic for all RIRs, particularly those in emerging or underserved markets. Financial stability often takes time, and some RIRs may benefit from external support to achieve independence.

**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

I believe this requirement is unrealistic for many RIRs, particularly those in developing regions. Achieving financial independence can be a lengthy process that may need external assistance.

**Pham Gia Khiem (Phat Tai Logistics)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. The expectation for all RIRs to be financially stable and independent may not be realistic, especially for those in resource-limited regions. Support and time are often essential.

**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

A Candidate RIR must show that its community is committed to providing support, both financially and through active governance involvement, to ensure effective management.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

This requirement may be too stringent for some RIRs, especially those in emerging markets. Financial independence is often a long-term goal that requires time and collaboration.

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

I find this requirement to be overly rigid, especially for RIRs in underserved regions. Financial stability and independence often require time and external support, which should be acknowledged.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

No, this expectation is overly rigid and may not reflect the realities faced by RIRs in emerging markets. Financial stability often requires time and support from established organizations.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

No, this requirement may be too rigid for many RIRs, particularly those in developing regions. Financial stability often requires time and support from external partners.

**Kwan Ke Yue (TBWA/ Kuala Lumpur)**

---

I find this criterion to be too strict, especially for RIRs in underserved areas. Financial independence can take time to achieve, and some may need collaboration to succeed.

**Sean Carroll (The One Academy)**

---

No, this expectation is too rigid and may not be attainable for many RIRs, particularly those in emerging markets. Financial stability often requires time and support from established organizations.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

I find this criterion to be overly strict, especially for RIRs in underserved areas. Financial stability can take time to establish, and some may need collaboration to achieve independence.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

The demand for financial stability and independence can be overly stringent, particularly for RIRs in developing areas that may need assistance to reach these goals over time.

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**

---

No, this requirement is overly demanding and may not reflect the realities of RIRs in emerging markets. Financial stability often requires time and collaboration with others.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

This requirement seems excessively stringent and may not reflect the challenges faced by RIRs in less developed regions. Financial stability is a complex goal that often requires time and collaboration with other organizations.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---

No, this requirement could be too rigid for many RIRs, particularly in underserved regions. Achieving financial stability and independence often requires time and support from others.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---

No, this requirement is overly stringent and may not consider the challenges faced by RIRs in emerging markets. Financial independence often takes time and collaboration to achieve.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

I believe this requirement is too rigid and may not account for the realities faced by RIRs in emerging markets. Financial stability takes time, and some RIRs may need assistance or partnerships to achieve independence.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---

No, this requirement may not be practical for every RIR, especially those in developing areas. Financial stability and independence can be long-term goals that may require assistance to achieve.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

No, this requirement may be overly strict and unrealistic for many RIRs, particularly those in developing or underserved areas. Achieving financial stability and independence is a gradual process, and some RIRs may require external support or collaboration to reach these objectives.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

No, this requirement might be too strict for certain RIRs, particularly in emerging regions. Financial stability often requires time and may benefit from external support or partnerships.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

This stipulation could be overly rigid, as many RIRs in emerging markets may struggle to attain financial independence quickly. Collaboration and external support can be crucial for reaching stability.

**Md Abu Sayeem Siddique Siddique (ServicEngine Ltd)**

---

No, this requirement might be too stringent, particularly for RIRs in developing regions. Achieving financial stability and independence often requires time and support from established organizations.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

This expectation for financial stability and independence may not be realistic for RIRs in developing areas, where the path to stability often involves support and time.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

While striving for financial stability is essential, making it a rigid requirement may not be feasible for RIRs in emerging regions that require time and collaboration to achieve this.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---

No, this requirement is unrealistic for many RIRs, especially in underserved areas. Financial stability often takes time, and collaboration may be necessary for many organizations.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---

Requiring RIRs to be financially stable and independent is a stringent requirement that may not apply to those in developing regions. External support can be vital in achieving this goal.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

Requiring RIRs to be financially stable and independent is a strict expectation that may not reflect the realities faced by those in emerging or underserved areas. Support can be vital for achieving stability.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

This requirement is overly demanding and may not be practical for all RIRs, especially those in developing regions. Achieving financial independence often requires time and external support.

**Trang Tran (VNPT Technologies)**

---

No, this requirement is overly stringent and may not suit all RIRs, especially those in developing areas. Financial independence can take time to establish, and many may need support to reach it.

**Minh Hoang (ANSV)**

---

Requiring financial stability and independence from all RIRs may be too rigid, particularly for those in emerging markets. Many may require support or collaboration to achieve these goals over time.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**

---

No, this requirement could be too stringent for some RIRs, especially those in emerging markets. Achieving financial independence often takes time and may require assistance from other organizations.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**

---

No, this requirement is quite rigid and may not be realistic for all RIRs, particularly those in underserved areas. Financial stability can take time to secure, and collaboration may be necessary to reach that goal.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---

No, this requirement is inflexible and may not reflect the realities faced by RIRs in underserved areas. Achieving financial stability and independence often requires time and collaboration with others.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

No, this requirement might be too strict for some RIRs, particularly those in developing regions. Financial stability and independence can take time to achieve, and collaboration with others may be essential.

**Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)**

---

No, this requirement is overly rigid and may not be attainable for all RIRs, especially in emerging or underserved regions. Financial independence can take time and often relies on partnerships or external support.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

No, this requirement may not be practical for every RIR, particularly those in underserved areas. Financial stability and independence are often long-term goals that may necessitate support or collaboration to achieve.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---

No, this requirement is too inflexible and may not be realistic for all RIRs, especially those in emerging economies. Financial stability can take time to establish, and some RIRs might need assistance from others to reach this goal.

**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

No, this requirement may be too rigid for some RIRs, particularly those in developing regions. Achieving financial stability and independence can be a gradual process that may require external support or partnerships.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---

No, this requirement is overly stringent and may not account for the challenges faced by RIRs in emerging or underserved regions. Financial independence often requires time and collaboration with other organizations to attain.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

No, this requirement could be too rigid and might not be feasible for every RIR, especially those operating in emerging markets. Financial stability and independence typically take time to establish, and some RIRs may need support to achieve these objectives.

**Ryan Khaw (Alsco Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

Financial stability is important, but enforcing it as a strict requirement may not account for the unique challenges faced by RIRs in underserved regions that need support to grow.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

This requirement is unrealistic for many RIRs, especially those in developing regions. Achieving financial independence can take time, and support from other organizations can be crucial in this process.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Aptic)**

---

This requirement for financial independence may be impractical for many RIRs, especially those in underserved areas where achieving stability often necessitates external support.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Financial stability is a significant objective, but imposing it as a strict requirement may not consider the challenges faced by RIRs in developing regions that need time and resources.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

The demand for RIRs to be financially stable and independent might be too rigid, particularly for those in emerging markets that require support to reach these goals over time.

**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

No, this requirement may be unrealistic for certain RIRs, particularly those in underserved areas. Achieving financial independence is often a gradual journey, and support from established organizations may be essential.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

Insisting on financial stability and independence might be too stringent for all RIRs, especially those in emerging regions. Some RIRs may require time and assistance to reach this level of financial health.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

This requirement is too rigid for many RIRs, especially those in emerging markets. Financial stability often requires time and collaboration with others to achieve.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**

---

No, this requirement is overly strict and may not be achievable for RIRs in emerging regions. Financial stability can take time, and many RIRs may need assistance to reach these goals.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

This requirement for financial stability and independence might be unrealistic for all RIRs, especially in developing areas where resources are limited. Achieving financial stability often necessitates external support and collaboration.

**Jeremy Cheong (Infineon technologies)**

---

Financial stability and independence are essential goals, but imposing them as strict requirements may not be feasible for all RIRs, particularly those in regions that are still developing their infrastructure.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

No, this requirement may not be realistic, particularly for RIRs in emerging regions. Financial stability and independence can take time, and some may need collaborative efforts to achieve these goals.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

This expectation is too rigid for RIRs, especially in underserved regions. Financial stability often requires time and support from others, which should be considered in this context.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

I believe this stipulation is too strict. Expecting all RIRs to be financially stable and independent from the start may not be realistic, especially for those in emerging regions that need support to grow.

**Sohel Kabir (Kabir Traders)**

---

I think this requirement is impractical. It may not be realistic for all RIRs, especially those operating in resource-limited areas. Achieving financial stability and independence often requires time and external assistance.

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Requiring an RIR to be financially stable and independent is an unrealistic expectation for many, particularly in underserved areas. Stability is often a gradual process requiring collaboration and support.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---

No, this stipulation is too rigid for many RIRs, especially those in developing regions. Achieving financial independence can be a long-term goal, and some organizations may need external support to get there.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---

This requirement is overly demanding and may not be feasible for RIRs in emerging markets. Financial stability often requires time to establish, and collaboration with others can be essential in this journey.

**Catalina Cueca (Manpower)**

---

No, this expectation is too strict and may not reflect the realities of RIRs in developing regions. Financial stability can be a gradual process, and some RIRs may benefit from support or partnerships to achieve it.

**Camilo Riveros (Manpower)**

---

No, this condition is too inflexible and may not be attainable for every RIR, particularly in underserved areas. Financial stability and independence can take substantial time to establish, and support may be crucial.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

No, this requirement is overly stringent and may not be practical for all RIRs, particularly those in developing or underserved regions. Achieving financial stability and independence often takes time, and some RIRs might require external support or collaboration to reach these objectives.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**

---

This condition is too rigid and may not align with the realities faced by RIRs in developing regions. Financial stability and independence can take time to achieve, and some RIRs may need support or cooperation to reach these targets.

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

This approach appears impractical. Mandating financial stability and independence for all RIRs from the outset could hinder development, particularly in underserved areas where support and collaboration are needed.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. The expectation for all RIRs to be financially stable and independent may not be realistic, especially for those in resource-limited regions. Support and time are often essential.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this condition. The requirement for financial stability and independence can be unrealistic for many RIRs, especially in underserved regions. Achieving this stability often takes time and collaboration.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

This stipulation seems excessive. Financial stability and independence are long-term goals that may not be attainable for all RIRs, particularly those in developing regions. Many will need time and support to reach these objectives.

**Anh Dang (NASA)**

---

This requirement is unrealistic for many RIRs, particularly in emerging areas. Financial stability and independence can be a lengthy process, and some RIRs may depend on collaboration to achieve these goals.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

No, this requirement is overly strict and may not be feasible for all RIRs, particularly those in underserved regions. Achieving financial stability and independence often requires time and external support.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

No, insisting on financial stability and independence as a requirement is overly stringent and may not be realistic for many RIRs, especially those in emerging areas. Achieving these goals can take time, and support may be essential.

**Prasanta Haloi (Pwd)**

---

Neutral

**Georges Lallogo (ANPTIC)**

---

I completely disagree with this condition. The requirement for financial stability and independence can be unrealistic for many RIRs, especially in underserved regions. Achieving this stability often takes time and collaboration.

**Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)**

---

This approach seems overly demanding. Requiring financial stability and independence prior to recognition might hinder RIRs, especially in developing regions that need time and support to establish themselves.

**AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)**

---

I find this stipulation to be too harsh. It may not realistically apply to every RIR, particularly those in emerging regions. Financial stability and independence can take considerable time to achieve, and support may be essential.

**K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)**

---



I completely disagree with this approach. Requiring RIRs to be financially stable and independent from the beginning may not be feasible, especially in emerging markets. Support and collaboration are often crucial for achieving such goals.

**Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)**

---

This requirement appears excessively strict and may not suit all RIRs, especially those in underserved areas. Achieving financial stability and independence often takes time and may require collaborative efforts.

**Fuhui Zhang (University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)**

---

I believe this requirement is too rigid. It may not be realistic for every RIR, particularly those in developing regions. Financial stability and independence can take time, and some may need external support to reach these goals.

**Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)**

---

This approach is excessively rigid and may not be practical for every RIR, especially those in emerging regions. Financial stability and independence often require significant time and support to achieve.

**Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)**

---

I believe this stipulation is overly strict. It may not reflect the realities faced by all RIRs, particularly in underserved regions. Financial stability and independence can take time, and some may need collaboration to succeed.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

This requirement is too rigid and might not be realistic for every RIR, especially those in developing or underserved areas. Financial stability and independence often take time to achieve, and many RIRs may need external support or partnerships to succeed.

**Trabahan Pujari (Paruluniversity)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

This requirement appears overly strict. Not every RIR can achieve immediate financial stability and independence, particularly those in emerging markets. They may require time and support to realize these goals.

**Juan Mesa (Hispasat)**

---

I completely disagree with this condition. The requirement for financial stability and independence can be unrealistic for many RIRs, particularly in underserved regions. Achieving this stability often takes time and collaboration.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

I believe this requirement is excessively stringent. It may not be realistic for all RIRs, especially those in emerging or underserved regions. Achieving financial stability and independence often requires time, and some RIRs may need support or collaboration to reach these goals.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

I completely disagree with this condition. The requirement for financial stability and independence can be unrealistic for many RIRs, especially in underserved regions. Achieving this stability often takes time and collaboration.

**Pornpipat Kitireanglarp (ZERIWELLPLUS Co., Ltd.)**

---

This stipulation seems impractical. It may not be feasible for all RIRs to attain financial stability and independence, especially those in emerging or resource-limited regions. Achieving such stability often necessitates time and collaborative efforts.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. It may not be feasible for all RIRs to be financially stable and independent, particularly in underserved regions. Many will need time and support to attain financial stability.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. The requirement for financial stability and independence may not be realistic for all RIRs, especially those in emerging areas. Many will need time and support to achieve these objectives.

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

I find this requirement too rigid. Financial stability and independence may not be attainable for all RIRs, particularly in developing or underserved areas. Many RIRs will require time and assistance from others to achieve these objectives.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating financial stability and independence may not be realistic for all RIRs, especially in underserved regions. Many RIRs will require time and support to achieve these financial goals.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---

This stipulation seems impractical. It may not be feasible for all RIRs to attain financial stability and independence, particularly those in emerging or resource-limited regions. Achieving such stability often necessitates time and collaborative efforts.

**Ashraful Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Expecting all RIRs to be financially stable and independent is impractical, especially for those in resource-limited regions. Many will need time and assistance to reach financial maturity.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

This requirement appears overly rigid. Financial stability and independence can take time to develop, especially for RIRs in resource-limited regions. Collaboration and external support may be crucial for achieving these goals.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. The requirement for financial stability and independence may not be realistic for all RIRs, especially those in emerging areas. Many will need time and support to achieve these objectives.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

This condition seems impractical. Expecting all RIRs to be financially stable and independent is unrealistic, especially for those in underserved regions. Achieving this stability often requires time and additional support.

**Phuc Pham (Advanced Network Systems VietNam Company Limited)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. Not all RIRs can achieve immediate financial stability and independence, particularly in developing regions. Many may need time and collaborative efforts to reach these goals.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. It is unrealistic to expect all RIRs to achieve financial stability and independence, especially those in emerging or underserved areas. Financial stability typically requires time and assistance from external sources.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

This stipulation seems impractical. It may not be feasible for all RIRs to attain financial stability and independence, particularly those in emerging or resource-limited regions. Achieving such stability often necessitates time and collaborative efforts.

**Alex Kwan (Wiplus Malaysia)**

---

I believe this requirement is excessively stringent. It may not be realistic for all RIRs, especially those in emerging or underserved regions. Achieving financial stability and independence often requires time, and some RIRs may need support or collaboration to reach these goals.

Disagree

Kamissa Toune (Datatech)

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating financial stability and independence may not be realistic for all RIRs, particularly in underserved regions. Many RIRs will need time and support to reach these financial goals.

Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)

---

This stipulation seems impractical. It may not be feasible for all RIRs to attain financial stability and independence, particularly those in emerging or resource-limited regions. Achieving such stability often requires time and collaborative efforts.

Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)

---

I believe this requirement is excessively stringent. It may not be realistic for all RIRs, particularly those in emerging or underserved regions. Achieving financial stability and independence often takes time, and some RIRs may require support or collaboration to reach these goals.

Pooja Gopi (DM Digital Marketing)

---

I completely disagree with this condition. The requirement for financial stability and independence can be unrealistic for many RIRs, especially in underserved regions. Achieving this stability often takes time and collaboration.

Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)

---

This stipulation seems excessive. Financial stability and independence are long-term goals that may not be achievable for all RIRs, particularly those in developing regions. Many will need time and support to get there.

Quyn Kim (VNPAY)

---

This stipulation seems impractical. It may not be feasible for all RIRs to be financially stable and independent, particularly those in emerging or resource-limited regions. Achieving such stability often requires time and collaborative efforts

Shahedul Islam Bhuiyan (Royal Green Limited)

---

I think this requirement is too harsh. It may not be realistic for every RIR, particularly those in emerging regions. Financial stability and independence can take considerable time, and some RIRs may need assistance or collaboration to achieve these goals.

Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)

---

Question 24&25 Independence An RIR must be financially stable and independent. 1- Strongly Disagree Answer: I believe this requirement is overly stringent. It may not be realistic for all RIRs,

particularly those in emerging or underserved regions. Achieving financial stability and independence often takes time, and some RIRs may require support or collaboration to reach these objectives.

**Anjan Deka (HDFC)**

---

I believe this requirement is overly stringent. It may not be realistic for all RIRs, particularly those in emerging or underserved regions. Achieving financial stability and independence often takes time, and some RIRs may require support or collaboration to reach these objectives.

**Ketan Parmar (Bids Info Global)**

---

I find this stipulation to be excessively strict. It may not be realistic for every RIR, particularly those in emerging or underserved regions. Financial stability and independence can require time and support from others to achieve.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

This requirement seems too rigid and may not reflect the realities for all RIRs, especially in developing or underserved regions. Financial stability and independence often take time to achieve, and some RIRs may need external support or partnerships to attain these goals.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

I believe this requirement is overly stringent and may not be practical for all RIRs, particularly those in emerging or underserved areas. Achieving financial stability and independence can take time, and some RIRs may require support or collaboration to reach these objectives.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---

## 12. Not-for-Profit

---

An RIR must operate on a not-for-profit basis.

### 12.1. Not-for-Profit - Strongly Agree (5)

Within a region the RIR is a monopoly, in this scheme. It is in the interests of resource users that there is no structural incentive to boost revenue or under-invest created by allowing a profit motive.

**Jordan Carter (auDA)**

---

Operating an RIR on a non-profit basis is fundamental to ensuring that Internet resources are managed in a fair, equitable and responsible manner. This not only builds trust among members but also fosters a culture of cooperation and innovation in the Internet ecosystem.

**Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle, as operating on a not-for-profit basis aligns with the mission and values of Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) to serve the public good rather than pursue commercial interests. Here's an analysis: Reasons for Agreement

1. Promotes Fairness and Equity • Operating as a not-for-profit ensures that resource allocation is driven by the needs of the community rather than profit motives. This promotes equitable access to internet resources.

2. Ensures Transparency and Accountability • Not-for-profit organizations are typically held to high standards of financial transparency and accountability. This fosters trust among stakeholders and prevents misuse of funds.

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

No comment

**Kelvin Horng Woei Ong (Propnex)**

---

I agree with the principle that "An RIR must operate on a not-for-profit basis." This approach aligns with the mission of RIRs to serve the public good by ensuring fair and equitable distribution of Internet resources. Operating as not-for-profit organizations ensures that:

- Focus Remains on Community Benefit: Resources and revenues are reinvested into improving services, infrastructure, and community support rather than generating profit for shareholders.
- Promotes Fairness: A not-for-profit model helps maintain fairness in resource allocation, avoiding potential conflicts of interest that could arise in profit-driven operations.
- Ensures Accountability: Not-for-profit status enhances accountability to the communities they serve, as decisions are driven by collective benefit rather than financial motives.
- Supports Long-Term Sustainability: By prioritizing public good over profit, RIRs can focus on stable, sustainable operations that benefit the global Internet ecosystem.

This principle is critical for upholding the trust and integrity of the RIR system while ensuring resources are managed in the best interest of the global Internet community.

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

I fully agree with this principle. Operating on a not-for-profit basis aligns with the core mission of RIRs to serve the public good by managing Internet resources in an equitable and transparent manner. A

not-for-profit structure helps ensure that the RIR prioritizes the interests of its community over financial gain, promoting trust and accountability. This approach also reinforces the idea that the RIR's primary responsibility is to support the Internet ecosystem, rather than maximizing profits for shareholders or other stakeholders.

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

I fully agree with this principle. Operating on a not-for-profit basis aligns with the core mission of RIRs to serve the public good by managing Internet resources in an equitable and transparent manner. A not-for-profit structure helps ensure that the RIR prioritizes the interests of its community over financial gain, promoting trust and accountability. This approach also reinforces the idea that the RIR's primary responsibility is to support the Internet ecosystem, rather than maximizing profits for shareholders or other stakeholders.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

Any entity must be structured for the purpose of running the registry, not deriving a profit. A profit motive will drive behaviours that are not necessarily in the best interest of the resource holders or the smooth operation of the registry. A profit motive could mean the entity could dispose of the numbering resources and take up farming bananas or cryptocurrency were it deemed to be a better return.

**Narelle Clark (Internet Association of Australia)**

---

An RIR should not be in business for profit nor be involved in any other business than providing IR functions - at the best price possible.

**j heasley (SNI)**

---

The RIR may run as a Not-for-profit /corporation/, that is internal it should ensure operational efficiency and profitability, however any operating profit thus produced should not be distributed as dividends but rather reinvested in the business.

**Cameron Smith (Bubble Cloud Mozambique S.A.)**

---

It should extend to those RIRs foundation too.

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

No further comment

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

This is absolutely vital.

**Brian Nisbet (HEAnet CLG)**

---

but again... uyou have a non-profit, with very profitable IPv4 address space... the contradiction in terms?

**Hendrik Visage (HeViS.Co Systems Pty Ltd)**

---

I strongly support the principle that an RIR must operate on a not-for-profit basis. This model ensures that the RIR remains true to its mission of serving the internet community, promotes fairness and transparency, and prevents conflicts of interest. Operating without a profit motive allows an RIR to reinvest in its services and infrastructure, fostering long-term stability and growth for the global internet ecosystem. Ultimately, a not-for-profit approach supports the values of internet governance, which prioritize the public good and collaborative efforts to maintain a stable, inclusive, and equitable internet.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

il ne faut pas permettre à une organisation qui au départ était lucrative et puis se transforme en une organisation non lucrative pour prétendre se transformer en candidat RIR, ça sera de la tricherie

**Nico Tshintu bakajika (ISPA-DRC)**

---

Continuing the operation of these organizations at not-for-profit organizations is critical to ensuring the focus remains on serving the membership and the community.

**Douglas Camin (Coordinated Care Services, Inc.)**

---

It should be allowed to create a foundation for fund-raising.

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Requiring a not-for-profit operation could hinder an RIR's potential for innovation and growth. A for-profit model might attract the investments necessary for sustainable community service.

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

I agree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

It makes sense for it to operate on a non for profit

**Danjuma bappa ahmed (Wownetworks limited nigeria)**

---

it's a non profit organisation where Identity are met

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

Ensuring the governing body has effective control safeguards the RIR's direction and keeps decision-making close to the community it serves.

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

No

**Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)**

---



Totally agree

**Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)**

---

A RIR should never operate as a competitive market player, as such it makes no sense for it to be a profit business.

**David Lamparter (Westnetz w.V.)**

---

I I agree

**Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)**

---

This is absolutely essential.

**PAUL WILSON (private individual)**

---

To be clear, it must be chartered to operate for public benefit for registration of internet numbers and related services, not that it must never receive more in revenue than it spends.

**Lee Howard (IPv4.Global by Hilco Streambank)**

---

This is the foundation to enable cooperation between RIRs. This is how the Internet came to light.

**Carlos Friaças (FCT\FCCN)**

---

simple agreement

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

## **12.2. Not-for-Profit - Somewhat Agree (4)**

Agree

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

agree

**Mohammad Mubarak Alfalasi (Telecommunication and Digital government Regulatory Authority)**

---

To a certain extent.

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

that RIRs prioritize the interests of the internet community over profit-driven motives. By operating on a not-for-profit basis, RIRs can allocate resources efficiently, maintain transparency, and avoid

conflicts of interest. This fosters a more equitable and sustainable internet ecosystem where the needs of all stakeholders are considered.

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

This principle ensures that RIRs operate on a not-for-profit basis, prioritizing community interests over financial gain. It fosters trust, fairness, and sustainability by focusing on resource distribution and reinvesting revenue into operations and services. This model helps keep IP address management accessible and equitable, while promoting long-term stability. However, RIRs must manage their finances carefully to remain sustainable without profit-making motives. Overall, it supports impartiality and transparency in serving the global internet ecosystem.

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

This is vital

**John Haydon (Education)**

---

tout a fait

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

I agree with the principle that an RIR (Regional Internet Registry) should operate on a not-for-profit basis. This model ensures that the allocation of Internet number resources—such as IP addresses and Autonomous System Numbers—is done fairly, transparently, and in the public interest. By prioritizing equitable access over profit, the not-for-profit structure helps avoid conflicts of interest and ensures that resources are distributed according to need, not financial capacity. A not-for-profit approach also aligns with broader Internet governance principles, such as openness, fairness, and sustainability. RIRs manage a global, shared resource, and their not-for-profit status helps build trust among all stakeholders, including governments, ISPs, and other organizations. Furthermore, any surplus funds generated through fees can be reinvested into enhancing services and infrastructure, supporting the long-term stability and development of the global Internet ecosystem. In this way, the not-for-profit model is essential for ensuring that RIRs meet their responsibilities in a manner that benefits the global community as a whole.

**Barkha Manral (Corporate Infotech Pvt Ltd)**

---

I tend to agree with this. But corporate organization models can vary widely and I wonder if this requirement for 'not-for-profit' might be too limiting. If all the other principles are met, how important would the RIR's operating model be?

**Andrew Gallo (The George Washington University)**

---

The definition of 'not-for-profit' needs detailing.

**Kevin Meynell (Individual)**

---

### **12.3. Not-for-Profit - Neutral (3)**

Depends on the meaning of not for profits, most non profits organise relies on external financial support to survive. The concept of social enterprise is probably more fitting for RIR - a type of for profit organisation with the aim to be self sufficient and able to use the profit to advance certain social goals. The emphasis is that the social enterprise must be commercial viable, hence profit oriented, however the goal is not profit maximisation for shareholders but maximisation of social goals.

**Alban Kwan (CSC)**

---

This requirement might constrain the operational flexibility of RIRs, particularly in pursuing innovative solutions. A for-profit model could facilitate the resources needed for effective service delivery.

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---

the institution needs a budget for the functioning

**Fabrice TEUGUIA (PCP-ACEFA)**

---

No comments

**Pacharaporn Wangwinyoo (ZIM (Thailand) Co., LTD.)**

---

Neutral

**Georges Lallogo (ANPTIC)**

---

3

**Taye Oyebola (Aso Savings and Loans Plc)**

---

I am not sure being a non-profit or for-profit really relates to whether the organization complies with ICP2 principles (other than being non-profit)

**Jeff Neuman (JJN Soluions, LLC)**

---

Agree

**Hann Jye Ng (MyTeksi Sdn Bhd)**

---

This condition seems overly demanding. Forcing an RIR to function as a not-for-profit could hinder its ability to innovate and scale effectively. A for-profit model could provide the necessary resources and flexibility to better serve its community.

**Sidonie Hacking ('-)**

---

This approach appears excessively rigid. Mandating that an RIR operate as a not-for-profit could stifle its capacity for innovation and scalability. A for-profit model might enable it to secure investments and resources that enhance its services to the community.

**Jun Wen (one futures technology sdn bhd)**

---

I believe this stipulation is too rigid. Requiring an RIR to function as a not-for-profit could limit its innovation and growth potential. A for-profit structure might provide the flexibility and resources necessary for the RIR to effectively serve its community.

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

I do think that becoming a profit making organisation, might push the RIRs to work harder than what we are observing.

**Musa Stephen HONLUE (AFRINIC)**

---

**12.4. Not-for-Profit - Somewhat Disagree (2)**

There are doubts that the term not-for-profit can be universally applied

**Peter Koch (Individual)**

---

Requiring an RIR to operate on a not-for-profit basis may limit its ability to innovate, scale, and attract necessary resources for sustainability. A for-profit model could provide the flexibility needed for growth, encourage efficiency, and attract investments that enable the RIR to better serve its community

**Noel OUPOH (DATACONNECT AFRICA)**

---

This requirement may not be realistic for all RIRs, as it could limit their operational flexibility. A for-profit model could better position them to attract resources and adapt to community needs.

**Neonjyoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

There is no fundamental reason why RIRs should be non-profit organizations. There are good market reasons why a for-profit RIR will not be able to succeed against a non-profit RIR. IF RIRs are (as they currently are) afforded a monopolistic position through preventing overlap then RIRs must be not-for-profit. The existing RIRs might operate on a not-for-profit basis officially but in proper economic analysis the entities aren't true "operate at cost" entities but rather at severe risk of passing on profits to staff and executives.

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

disagree. A commercial RIR may be able to provide better services to customers.

**Elvis Velea (V4Escrow LLC)**

---

Maybe a for-profit RIR would be the most stable and independent? Maybe resource holders could be shareholders? Not for this limitation.

**Mike Burns (IPTrading)**

---

## 12.5. Not-for-Profit - Strongly Disagree (1)

This doesn't appear to be a principle, rather it is an implementation option based on an assertion that appears to be making certain assumptions about the implications of for-profit versus not-for-profit operation without stating what those assumptions are or justifying them in any way. Typically, for-profit vs. not-for-profit denotes (a) how performance is measured, (b) how income surplus over operating expenses is handled/disbursed, and (in some cases) (c) how the organization is taxed and what regulatory regime it operates under. Intuitively, I believe it generally makes sense to have as a principle that states income derived from the community served can only be spent on supporting and operating the services that serve the community, not provided to outside parties such as investors, shareholders, sponsors, etc. How the RIR is organized to meet that principle is an implementation detail, not a principle.

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

Insisting on a not-for-profit mandate may restrict an RIR's ability to attract resources and innovate. A for-profit structure could enhance its capacity for success.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

Requiring an RIR to operate on a not-for-profit basis could limit its potential for growth and innovation. A for-profit model might provide the necessary flexibility for sustainability.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

I think that mandating a not-for-profit operation could hinder an RIR's capacity for innovation and investment attraction. A for-profit model may better support its goals.

**Tipu Khan (Zx Online Ltd)**

---

This requirement may restrict an RIR's ability to grow and innovate. Operating as a for-profit entity might provide the flexibility necessary to attract resources.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

This requirement could restrict an RIR's potential for growth and innovation. Operating as a for-profit entity might allow for greater flexibility and resource attraction.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---

I believe that insisting on a not-for-profit basis could hinder an RIR's ability to innovate and scale effectively. A for-profit model could enhance its resource acquisition capabilities.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

A not-for-profit mandate may limit the RIR's ability to attract necessary investments and innovate. A for-profit status could provide the flexibility for sustainable growth.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---

Requiring a not-for-profit operation could restrict an RIR's capacity for growth. A for-profit model might enhance flexibility and encourage innovation, ultimately benefiting the community.

**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Operating on a not-for-profit basis might limit an RIR's ability to attract resources and innovate. A for-profit structure could facilitate growth and efficiency while providing the flexibility necessary to serve the community effectively.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

A not-for-profit mandate could restrict an RIR's ability to attract resources and innovate effectively. A for-profit structure may enhance its capacity for growth.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

This requirement may limit an RIR's ability to innovate and grow. Operating as a for-profit entity could provide the flexibility needed to attract necessary resources.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

I believe that insisting on a not-for-profit basis could hinder an RIR's potential for innovation and resource attraction. A for-profit model might offer greater operational flexibility.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

This condition seems overly demanding. Forcing an RIR to function as a not-for-profit may hinder its ability to innovate and scale effectively. A for-profit model could provide the resources and flexibility necessary for improved community service.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

I find this requirement impractical. Mandating a not-for-profit operation could restrict an RIR's potential for innovation and efficiency. A for-profit structure might offer the flexibility needed to attract investments and resources for sustainable growth.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---

A not-for-profit requirement could limit an RIR's capacity to innovate and grow. A for-profit model might provide the necessary flexibility and attract investments for ongoing success.

**Taslina Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

Requiring an RIR to function on a not-for-profit basis may restrict its innovative potential and ability to scale. A for-profit model might enable it to attract the resources necessary for sustainability.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

This requirement may restrict an RIR's operational flexibility, as a for-profit model could enhance its ability to innovate and secure essential resources for sustainability.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

Requiring an RIR to operate as not-for-profit may hinder its ability to innovate and attract necessary investments, while a for-profit structure can promote effective resource management.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

A not-for-profit mandate may restrict an RIR's ability to attract resources and innovate. A for-profit model could better facilitate its mission and operational needs.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

Requiring an RIR to operate on a not-for-profit basis could limit its capacity for growth and innovation. A for-profit approach might provide the resources essential for sustainability.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

Requiring an RIR to operate on a not-for-profit basis could limit its capacity for growth and innovation. A for-profit approach might provide the resources essential for sustainability.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

Operating as a not-for-profit organization may restrict an RIR's potential to secure funding and innovate effectively. A for-profit model could provide the necessary agility for growth.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

Requiring an RIR to function as a not-for-profit entity could hinder its ability to innovate and acquire essential resources for sustainability. A for-profit approach might enhance its operational flexibility.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

Mandating that RIRs operate on a not-for-profit basis may limit their capacity to innovate and secure necessary resources. A for-profit model could foster greater growth potential.

**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

I believe that a not-for-profit requirement for RIRs could stifle their ability to attract investments and innovate. A for-profit structure might allow for greater flexibility and sustainability.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

Operating strictly on a not-for-profit basis may restrict an RIR's ability to innovate and expand. A for-profit model could provide the necessary resources for effective service delivery

**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

Requiring an RIR to be not-for-profit may constrain its ability to innovate and gather vital resources for operations. A for-profit framework could enhance its capacity for effective service delivery.

**Pham Gia Khiem (Phat Tai Logistics)**

---

I completely disagree with this approach. Requiring an RIR to operate solely as a not-for-profit may limit its ability to innovate and scale. A for-profit structure could enhance its capacity to secure resources and serve its community.

**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

A not-for-profit requirement may hinder an RIR's innovative potential and operational growth. A for-profit model could allow it to secure necessary resources for effective service.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

Insisting on a not-for-profit structure could constrain an RIR's ability to innovate and scale effectively. A for-profit model might facilitate the attraction of vital resources

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

Mandating a not-for-profit model for an RIR may limit its capacity to innovate and obtain essential resources for its operations. A for-profit approach could enhance its growth potential and efficiency.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

The requirement for an RIR to operate on a not-for-profit basis could limit its capacity to attract essential funding and drive innovation. A for-profit model might provide the necessary growth opportunities.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

I think mandating a not-for-profit operation for RIRs may limit their potential to attract investments and innovate effectively. A for-profit approach could foster greater operational flexibility.

**Kwan Ke Yue (TBWA/ Kuala Lumpur)**

---

Operating as a not-for-profit organization may hinder an RIR's ability to innovate and secure vital resources. A for-profit structure could enhance flexibility and sustainability.

**Sean Carroll (The One Academy)**

---

I believe that a not-for-profit requirement may hinder an RIR's ability to attract investments and drive innovation. A for-profit framework might offer the necessary flexibility for sustainability.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

Operating as a not-for-profit entity may limit an RIR's potential to secure essential resources and innovate effectively. A for-profit model could enhance its capacity for growth and efficiency.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

Operating on a not-for-profit basis may restrict an RIR's growth potential, as a for-profit structure could facilitate innovation and attract the resources essential for sustainability.

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**



---

Operating strictly as a not-for-profit may restrict an RIR's capacity for innovation and resource acquisition. A for-profit structure could enhance its ability to serve the community effectively.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

Mandating a not-for-profit operation could restrict an RIR's potential for growth and innovation, as a for-profit model may allow for greater resource attraction and efficiency.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---

Restricting an RIR to a not-for-profit structure might reduce its capacity to evolve with the needs of its community. A for-profit model could offer financial sustainability, attract capital, and enable innovation at a scale necessary to keep pace with demand.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---

Not-for-profit mandates could limit an RIR's access to funding opportunities, hindering its ability to expand or innovate. A for-profit model may provide a better financial structure for growth, attracting investment and increasing impact.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

I believe that requiring an RIR to operate on a not-for-profit basis could hinder its ability to attract investment and innovate. A for-profit model might offer the necessary flexibility for sustainability.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---

The not-for-profit structure might restrict an RIR's ability to adapt to technological changes. A for-profit model could allow it to invest in cutting-edge technology and increase operational efficiencies, ultimately benefiting the community.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

Operating on a not-for-profit basis may limit an RIR's capacity to innovate and attract necessary resources. A for-profit approach could provide the flexibility needed to grow and better serve its community.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

Operating on a not-for-profit basis could limit an RIR's financial freedom to innovate and expand its operations. A for-profit model might provide the necessary resources for sustainable growth while maintaining a focus on community service.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

This requirement might limit an RIR's ability to innovate and scale effectively, as a for-profit structure could provide essential resources and flexibility for growth.

**Md Abu Sayeem Siddique Siddique (ServicEngine Ltd)**

---

Requiring an RIR to operate on a not-for-profit basis may impede its ability to innovate and attract the necessary resources for sustainability. A for-profit model could offer the flexibility needed for growth.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

Requiring RIRs to function solely as not-for-profits may limit their ability to adapt and grow, especially if a for-profit model could better meet their financial needs.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

Mandating a not-for-profit model for RIRs could restrict their growth and innovation potential, as a for-profit structure might better facilitate resource attraction.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---

This requirement could limit RIRs' operational flexibility and growth potential. A for-profit approach might provide the necessary resources to enhance service delivery and community support.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---

Operating on a not-for-profit basis may constrain an RIR's ability to respond to community needs effectively. A for-profit model could enhance its capacity to innovate and attract investment.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

Requiring RIRs to function as not-for-profit entities may limit their ability to attract investments and innovate. A for-profit approach could foster sustainability and improve service delivery.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

This requirement could restrict an RIR's operational flexibility and capacity for growth. A for-profit model might provide the necessary resources to enhance community services effectively.

**Trang Tran (VNPT Technologies)**

---

This requirement may hinder the operational flexibility of RIRs, particularly in their ability to innovate. A for-profit framework could enable them to attract resources and enhance services.

**Minh Hoang (ANSV)**

---

Operating as a not-for-profit may restrict an RIR's ability to innovate and attract necessary funding. A for-profit model could provide the flexibility needed for growth and improved community service.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**

---

While a not-for-profit approach ensures a focus on public interest, it may limit the RIR's ability to attract investment and innovate. A for-profit model could offer more opportunities for financial growth and service development.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**

---

An RIR limited to a not-for-profit structure might struggle to meet the increasing demand for its services. A for-profit approach would enhance its ability to attract funding, invest in innovation, and ensure sustainable growth.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---

RIRs operating on a not-for-profit basis may face challenges in scaling effectively. Adopting a for-profit model could increase operational agility, attract more investment, and allow the organization to better serve its customers and the wider community.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

A not-for-profit model might limit an RIR's ability to innovate quickly or to scale operations in line with growing demand. Transitioning to a for-profit structure could offer increased flexibility, attract funding, and improve service delivery.

**Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)**

---

The not-for-profit requirement for an RIR may restrict the flexibility needed for long-term sustainability and growth. A for-profit model could incentivize efficiency, attract investments, and better position the RIR to fulfill its mission.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

While non-profit models often focus on community service, a for-profit approach could provide the RIR with greater financial resources to scale, innovate, and invest in cutting-edge technologies, thereby improving its long-term impact.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---

An RIR's ability to scale and innovate could be constrained by a not-for-profit model, as it may struggle to attract the necessary funding for growth. A for-profit model might provide greater access to capital, ensuring the organization can adapt to the needs of the community.

**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

Not-for-profit status for an RIR may inhibit growth, particularly in terms of attracting capital and investment. A for-profit approach could unlock additional opportunities for growth, improve operational efficiency, and ensure the RIR can meet evolving community demands.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---

Limiting an RIR to a not-for-profit model may create challenges in securing adequate funding and resources for its expansion. A for-profit structure would encourage investment, stimulate innovation, and allow the RIR to better serve its mission while sustaining its operations.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

While not-for-profit status might emphasize community focus, it could also limit the RIR's ability to compete, innovate, and grow. A for-profit model might provide the necessary financial flexibility and efficiency to allow the RIR to scale and expand its services.

**Ryan Khaw (Alsco Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

A strict not-for-profit requirement may inhibit an RIR's ability to innovate and attract necessary resources, as a for-profit approach could provide more flexibility.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

Requiring RIRs to operate on a not-for-profit basis could limit their capacity for innovation and resource acquisition. A for-profit structure might enable greater sustainability and responsiveness to community needs.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Apnic)**

---

While not-for-profit operations have benefits, this requirement could limit an RIR's capacity to attract investments and innovate, as a for-profit model might offer more flexibility.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

A strict requirement for not-for-profit operations might hinder an RIR's ability to innovate and secure funding, as a for-profit model could better support its objectives.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

Requiring RIRs to operate on a not-for-profit basis may constrain their growth potential, as a for-profit structure could provide the resources needed for sustainability.

**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

A not-for-profit requirement could limit an RIR's capacity to innovate and grow. A for-profit model might provide the necessary flexibility and attract investments for ongoing success.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

Requiring an RIR to function on a not-for-profit basis may restrict its innovative potential and ability to scale. A for-profit model might enable it to attract the resources necessary for sustainability.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

Operating as a not-for-profit may hinder an RIR's ability to innovate and attract investment. A for-profit framework could provide the flexibility necessary for effective community service.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**

---

Requiring an RIR to be not-for-profit may limit its ability to innovate and scale. A for-profit model could offer the flexibility needed for sustainability and community service enhancement.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

A strict not-for-profit requirement may limit an RIR's flexibility and ability to innovate, as a for-profit model could foster growth and attract the investments needed for success.

**Jeremy Cheong (Infineon technologies)**

---

Mandating that an RIR operate on a not-for-profit basis may restrict its capacity to innovate and scale, as a for-profit approach could enable greater resource attraction for sustainability.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

Operating strictly as a not-for-profit may constrain an RIR's ability to secure essential resources. A for-profit structure could encourage greater innovation and efficient service delivery.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

Requiring an RIR to operate on a not-for-profit basis could limit its potential for growth and sustainability. A for-profit model might foster innovation and adaptability in serving the community.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

I find this stipulation overly limiting. Requiring an RIR to operate as a not-for-profit could impede its growth and innovation. A for-profit model could provide the flexibility and resources necessary for effective community service.

**Sohel Kabir (Kabir Traders)**

---

I think this requirement is too stringent. Operating on a not-for-profit basis may stifle an RIR's ability to innovate and attract necessary resources. A for-profit model could provide the flexibility and efficiency required for sustainability.

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Requiring an RIR to function on a not-for-profit basis may hinder its ability to scale and innovate. A for-profit approach could provide the necessary resources and flexibility for sustainability.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---

This requirement could restrict the operational flexibility of RIRs, especially in pursuing innovative solutions. A for-profit model might help attract resources that support community needs effectively.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---

Operating on a not-for-profit basis may constrain an RIR's ability to innovate and attract investment. A for-profit framework could provide the flexibility needed to enhance service delivery and sustainability.

**Catalina Cueva (Manpower)**

---

Requiring RIRs to operate as not-for-profit entities may limit their ability to adapt and secure essential resources. A for-profit model could foster innovation and sustainability in serving the community.

they have to make money in order to support their activities

**alexis ndoumga (ministry of posts and telecommunications)**

---

This insistence on not-for-profit status may constrain an RIR's capacity to innovate and grow. A for-profit structure could offer the necessary flexibility and attract investments to better serve the community.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

Requiring an RIR to operate on a not-for-profit basis may hinder its ability to innovate and grow. A for-profit model could offer the flexibility and resources needed for sustainability and improved community service.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**

---

Mandating that an RIR function on a not-for-profit basis could constrain its ability to innovate and grow. A for-profit approach might provide the flexibility and efficiency needed to attract resources and better serve the community.

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

This requirement appears overly rigid. Mandating that an RIR operate as a not-for-profit could stifle growth and innovation. A for-profit model might provide the flexibility and resources needed for sustainability.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this approach. Requiring an RIR to operate solely as a not-for-profit may limit its ability to innovate and scale. A for-profit structure could enhance its capacity to secure resources and serve its community.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Mandating that an RIR operate as a not-for-profit may limit its potential to attract investment and innovate. A for-profit structure could facilitate growth and enhance its ability to serve the community.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

This requirement seems impractical. Operating on a not-for-profit basis may restrict an RIR's capacity for innovation and efficiency. A for-profit model could enable it to secure funding and resources for growth.

**Anh Dang (NASA)**

---

This insistence on not-for-profit status could limit an RIR's potential for innovation and resource acquisition. A for-profit model might afford the necessary flexibility and efficiency to attract investments and better serve its community.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

Requiring a not-for-profit model may hinder an RIR's capacity to innovate and scale effectively. A for-profit structure could provide the flexibility needed for growth and attract investments that enhance community services.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

Insisting on a not-for-profit basis for RIR operations could limit their ability to innovate and scale. A for-profit model could provide the necessary flexibility for growth and attract the resources needed to serve the community effectively.

**Prasanta Haloi (Pwd)**

---

I find this approach to be overly rigid. Requiring an RIR to function as a not-for-profit could limit its ability to innovate and scale. A for-profit framework could offer the flexibility and resources needed for effective community service.

**Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)**

---

This approach appears overly demanding. Mandating not-for-profit operations could impair an RIR's potential for growth and innovation. A for-profit model might foster the resources and flexibility needed to serve its community effectively.

**AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)**

---

I believe this stipulation is too rigid. Requiring an RIR to function as a not-for-profit could limit its ability to innovate and expand. A for-profit structure may provide the resources necessary for better community service.

**K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Mandating a not-for-profit operation could limit an RIR's ability to attract investments and innovate. A for-profit structure might better facilitate its growth and efficiency.

**Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)**

---

This requirement seems impractical. By insisting that an RIR operate as a not-for-profit, we might restrict its capacity to innovate and secure essential resources. A for-profit model could offer the flexibility needed for effective community support.

**Fuhui Zhang (University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)**

---

I find this requirement to be overly demanding. Operating on a not-for-profit basis may limit an RIR's potential for growth and innovation. A for-profit model could provide the flexibility and funding necessary to enhance community services.

**Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)**

---

This approach may be counterproductive. Mandating not-for-profit operations could impair an RIR's ability to innovate and scale. A for-profit model could foster the resources and flexibility needed to enhance community services.

**Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)**

---

I find this stipulation overly demanding. Requiring an RIR to operate as a not-for-profit could restrict its capacity for innovation and growth. A for-profit model might offer the necessary resources and flexibility for effective community service.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

Requiring an RIR to function as a not-for-profit may restrict its ability to innovate and scale effectively. A for-profit approach could provide the necessary flexibility for growth, drive efficiency, and attract investments that enhance service to the community.

**Trabahan Pujari (Paruluniversity)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

This condition appears overly demanding. Forcing an RIR to operate as a not-for-profit could hinder its ability to scale and innovate. A for-profit model might provide the necessary flexibility and resources for effective community service.

**Juan Mesa (Hispasat)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Mandating that an RIR operate as a not-for-profit may limit its potential to attract investment and innovate. A for-profit structure could facilitate growth and enhance its ability to serve the community.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

I believe that requiring an RIR to operate as a not-for-profit could hinder its ability to innovate, grow, and secure essential resources for sustainability. A for-profit model might offer the flexibility needed for expansion, improve efficiency, and attract investments that benefit the community.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

I find this approach to be overly rigid. Requiring an RIR to function as a not-for-profit could limit its ability to innovate and scale. A for-profit framework could offer the flexibility and resources needed for effective community service.

**Pornpipat Kitireanglarp (ZERIWELLPLUS Co., Ltd.)**

---



I find this stipulation counterproductive. Mandating that an RIR operate as a not-for-profit may restrict its potential for innovation and growth. Embracing a for-profit model could enhance efficiency and attract the investments necessary for sustainable operations.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Requiring a not-for-profit operation could hinder an RIR's potential for innovation and growth. A for-profit model might attract the investments necessary for sustainable community service.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Operating exclusively as a not-for-profit may limit an RIR's capacity to attract resources and innovate. A for-profit approach could increase its potential for growth and efficiency.

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

This requirement seems excessively restrictive. Forcing an RIR to function as a not-for-profit may limit its capacity to innovate and scale effectively. A for-profit approach could offer the flexibility needed for growth and attract investments to improve community services.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Operating solely as a not-for-profit could limit an RIR's ability to attract resources and innovate. A for-profit structure could promote growth and improve efficiency while providing the flexibility needed to serve the community effectively.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---

I find this stipulation counterproductive. Mandating that an RIR operate as a not-for-profit may restrict its potential for innovation and growth. Adopting a for-profit model could increase efficiency and attract the investments necessary for sustainable operations.

**Ashraful Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. A not-for-profit mandate may restrict an RIR's ability to grow and attract essential resources. A for-profit approach could enhance its capacity for innovation and efficiency.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

This stipulation appears restrictive. Mandating that an RIR operate on a not-for-profit basis might stifle its innovation and scalability. A for-profit model could provide the necessary flexibility and resources to better serve its community.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Operating exclusively as a not-for-profit may limit an RIR's ability to attract resources and innovate. A for-profit approach could enhance its capacity for growth and efficiency.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

This condition seems overly demanding. Forcing an RIR to function as a not-for-profit may hinder its ability to innovate and scale effectively. A for-profit model could provide the resources and flexibility necessary for better community service.

**Phuc Pham (Advanced Network Systems VietNam Company Limited)**

---

I find this requirement impractical. Mandating a not-for-profit operation could restrict an RIR's potential for innovation and efficiency. A for-profit structure might offer the flexibility needed to attract investments and resources for sustainable growth.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Requiring an RIR to be not-for-profit may limit its ability to innovate and grow. A for-profit model could provide the necessary flexibility and attract resources to better serve the community.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

This approach appears excessively rigid. Mandating that an RIR operate as a not-for-profit could stifle its capacity for innovation and scalability. A for-profit model might allow it to secure investments and resources that enhance its community services.

**Giang Nguyen (NASA)**

---

I find this stipulation counterproductive. Mandating that an RIR operate as a not-for-profit may restrict its potential for innovation and growth. Adopting a for-profit model could increase efficiency and attract the investments necessary for sustainable operations.

**Alex Kwan (Wiplus Malaysia)**

---

I believe that requiring an RIR to operate as a not-for-profit could hinder its ability to innovate, grow, and secure essential resources for sustainability. A for-profit model might offer the flexibility needed for expansion, improve efficiency, and attract investments that benefit the community.

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

Desagree

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Operating exclusively as a not-for-profit could hinder an RIR's ability to attract resources and innovate. A for-profit structure could facilitate growth and improve efficiency while providing the flexibility needed to serve the community effectively.

**Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)**

---

I find this stipulation counterproductive. Mandating that an RIR function as a not-for-profit may limit its potential for innovation and growth. Adopting a for-profit model could improve efficiency and attract the investments necessary for sustainable operations.

**Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)**

---

I find this requirement impractical. Mandating that an RIR operate on a not-for-profit basis could limit its potential for innovation and efficiency. A for-profit structure might offer the flexibility needed to attract investments and resources for sustainable growth.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Mandating that an RIR operate as a not-for-profit may limit its potential to attract investment and innovate. A for-profit structure could facilitate growth and enhance its ability to serve the community.

**Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)**

---

This requirement seems impractical. Operating on a not-for-profit basis may restrict an RIR's capacity for innovation and efficiency. A for-profit model could enable it to secure funding and resources for growth.

**Quyn Kim (VNPAY)**

---

I find this stipulation counterproductive. Requiring an RIR to function as a not-for-profit may restrict its potential to innovate and grow. Adopting a for-profit model could enhance efficiency and draw in the investments needed for sustainable operations.

**Shahedul Islam Bhuiyan (Royal Green Limited)**

---

I find this requirement overly limiting. Operating on a not-for-profit basis may restrict an RIR's ability to innovate and scale up. A for-profit approach could foster the flexibility needed for growth and attract the resources necessary for sustainability.

**Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)**

---

Question 26&27 Not-for-Profit An RIR must operate on a not-for-profit basis. 1- Strongly Disagree  
Answer: I believe that mandating an RIR to operate on a not-for-profit basis could hinder its capacity to innovate, grow, and secure essential resources for sustainability. A for-profit model might offer the flexibility needed for expansion, promote efficiency, and attract investments that enhance community service.

**Anjan Deka (HDFC)**

---

I believe that mandating an RIR to operate on a not-for-profit basis could hinder its capacity to innovate, grow, and secure essential resources for sustainability. A for-profit model might offer the flexibility needed for expansion, promote efficiency, and attract investments that enhance community service.

**Ketan Parmar (Bids Info Global)**

---

I believe this stipulation is too restrictive. Requiring an RIR to operate as a not-for-profit may impede its ability to innovate and grow. A for-profit model could offer the flexibility required for expansion and attract investments that enable the RIR to serve its community more effectively.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

This requirement may limit an RIR's potential. Operating on a not-for-profit basis could hinder its ability to innovate, scale, and attract necessary resources. A for-profit structure could provide the needed flexibility for growth and encourage efficiency while drawing in investments to enhance community service.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

Mandating that an RIR operate on a not-for-profit basis could restrict its capacity to innovate, grow, and secure essential resources for sustainability. A for-profit model might offer the flexibility needed for expansion, promote efficiency, and attract investments that help the RIR better serve its community.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---

## 13. Corporate Governance

---

An RIR must follow corporate governance procedures consistent with best practices in its jurisdiction.

### 13.1. Corporate Governance - Strongly Agree (5)

We should have a fixed minimum of universal corporate governance requirements defined by ICANN for this.

**Babagana Digima (Nigerian Communications Commission)**

---

Above all, compliance with the legislation on the geographical areas on which it depends

**Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)**

---

I agree with this principle, as following corporate governance procedures consistent with best practices in its jurisdiction is crucial for ensuring that an RIR operates effectively, transparently, and ethically. Here's an analysis: Reasons for Agreement

1. Ensures Transparency and Accountability

- Adhering to recognized governance practices helps ensure that the RIR operates transparently and is accountable to its stakeholders. This is essential for fostering trust and confidence in its operations.

2. Aligns with Legal and Regulatory Standards

- Following governance procedures consistent with local laws and regulations helps an RIR avoid legal complications and ensures compliance with any applicable requirements in its jurisdiction.

3.

Promotes Effective Decision-Making

- Corporate governance best practices provide frameworks for efficient decision-making, clear delineation of responsibilities, and checks and balances. This contributes to better strategic planning, risk management, and operational effectiveness.

4. Strengthens Stakeholder Trust

- A strong governance structure that aligns with best practices reassures stakeholders that the RIR is operating with integrity and making decisions in their best interest. This is particularly important for organizations managing critical resources like IP addresses.

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

Nothing to add or detract

**Brian Longwe (Converged Technology Networks)**

---

consistent internationally rather than just local jurisdiction

**Aftab Siddiqui (AFTABSIDDIQUI-AU)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle. Adhering to corporate governance procedures consistent with best practices in the jurisdiction ensures that an RIR operates transparently, ethically, and with accountability to its community. It helps foster trust among stakeholders and ensures compliance with local laws and regulations. However, these governance practices should be adaptable to the unique needs and challenges of each region while maintaining high standards of integrity and accountability.

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle. Adhering to corporate governance procedures consistent with best practices in the jurisdiction ensures that an RIR operates transparently, ethically, and with accountability to its community. It helps foster trust among stakeholders and ensures compliance with local laws and regulations. However, these governance practices should be adaptable to the unique needs and challenges of each region while maintaining high standards of integrity and accountability.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

Of course

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

It is important to work while respecting the procedures

**Fabrice TEUGUIA (PCP-ACEFA)**

---

... or must relocate their offices to a different jurisdiction

**Mark Elkins (Posix Systems)**

---

I strongly agree with the principle that an RIR must follow corporate governance procedures consistent with best practices in its jurisdiction. This ensures transparency, accountability, ethical conduct, and legal compliance, while also promoting effective decision-making, long-term sustainability, and trust with stakeholders. Additionally, adherence to best practices helps ensure that the RIR remains aligned with international standards and is capable of navigating the evolving challenges of internet governance. Ultimately, this principle supports the integrity, efficiency, and credibility of the RIR, enabling it to serve its mission in a responsible and effective manner.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

Very much in agreement.

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

Due to differences in Idles, values, culture etc

**Emmanuel Egbe (Nigeria)**

---

I strongly oppose this condition. Insisting that RIRs follow strict corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional best practices could limit their ability to address community-specific needs. Flexibility in governance is essential.

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

I agree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

Corporate Governance procedures must be consistent and strictly adhere to

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

---

d'accord

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

Documentation promotes accountability, while neutrality ensures that policies are fair and unbiased.

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

Yes

**Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)**

---

Totally agree

**Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)**

---

This is a silly question as there is no corporate "terra nullius". Even a theoretical extranational RIR under UN jurisdiction would need to follow UN best practices.

**David Lamparter (Westnetz w.V.)**

---

not only in its jurisdiction, but best international practices, incorporating its jurisdiction

**Saul Stein (eNetworks)**

---

Yes, unless there would be an international statute, which is kind of difficult to obtain.

**Carlos Friaças (FCT\| FCCN)**

---

Clearly desirable and reasonable.

**Andrew Gallo (The George Washington University)**

---

This seems fine as long as the jurisdiction's corporate governance procedures are at the top end of the distribution. It would be helpful to require some global benchmarking and not just benchmark against the jurisdiction the RIR is incorporated in

**Leo Vegoda (And Polus LLC)**

---

Good to point out the importance of consistency in its jurisdiction

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

I like "in its jurisdiction" so we don't enforce "western" practices on other cultures

**Sander Steffann (SJM Steffann Consultancy)**

---

## 13.2. Corporate Governance - Somewhat Agree (4)

Agree

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

agree

**Mohammad Mubarak Alfalasi (Telecommunication and Digital government Regulatory Authority)**

---

RIRs maintain high standards of governance, transparency, and accountability. By adhering to best practices in their respective jurisdictions, RIRs can build trust with their stakeholders and operate in a responsible and ethical manner. This promotes good governance, reduces the risk of mismanagement, and strengthens the overall reputation of the RIR community.

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

Just a fact .

**James Laferriere (n/a)**

---

This principle ensures that RIRs follow corporate governance best practices relevant to their jurisdiction, promoting transparency, accountability, and compliance with local laws. It helps prevent mismanagement and fosters trust by establishing clear management structures and oversight. While it should allow flexibility to adapt to regional legal frameworks, the principle is essential for maintaining effective, responsible, and transparent operations within the global internet ecosystem.

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

No comment

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

depends on the jurisdiction....

**Hendrik Visage (HeViS.Co Systems Pty Ltd)**

---

No comments

**Pacharaporn Wangwinyoo (ZIM (Thailand) Co., LTD.)**

---

Vital

**John Haydon (Education)**

---

best practices is an ambiguous and perhaps subjective term. This could lead to misinterpretation

**Nancy Carter (no affiliation)**

---

Best practices are under threat in many parts of the world.



I agree

Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)

---

Unclear how this should work given the multi-national nature of RIRs. Should a vote be held to determine the most favorable jurisdiction for the RIR to be headquartered?

Xavier Clark (Harris Computer)

---

Hope the jurisdiction chosen is a good one

Mike Burns (IPTrading)

---

Well this is simple a legal requirement. However, jurisdictions must be chosen for incorporating the RIR that are supportive of international practices and global technical coordination activities.

Kevin Meynell (Individual)

---

### **13.3. Corporate Governance - Neutral (3)**

There is something unfortunate in nailing this to "best practices in the jurisdiction" because if the jurisdiction changes itself changes

Andrew Sullivan (N/A)

---

Imposing strict corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional best practices may not align with the needs or realities of all RIRs. RIRs should have the flexibility to adopt governance models that best serve their community's unique circumstances.

Noel OUPOH (DATACONNECT AFRICA)

---

That might not be at the best interest of an RIR, another system needs to be out in place to safe guard the RIR's reosurces and staff of potential threats.

Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)

---

There should be fairness and consideration

Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)

---

Imposing rigid corporate governance models based on jurisdictional standards may not serve the needs of all RIRs effectively. A more flexible approach to governance can better address local challenges.

Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)

---

This is rather an unclear requirement, as in a large geo area there may be multiple conflicting corporate governance requirements. Rather select a small number of internationally-recognized CG governance codes and the RIR must choose one to follow.

**Cameron Smith (Bubble Cloud Mozambique S.A.)**

---

This is the problem of AFRINIC. So imagine the RIR operates in a jurisdiction that allows human rights abuse will the RIR go by that? I think the RIRs must have a standard policy to be respected by all RIRs.

**Raymond Mamattah (EGIGFA)**

---

Agree

**Hann Jye Ng (MyTeksi Sdn Bhd)**

---

This approach appears excessively rigid. Mandating adherence to corporate governance best practices from a jurisdiction may not be practical for every RIR. Each organization should have the flexibility to choose governance structures that serve their unique needs.

**Jun Wen (one futures technology sdn bhd)**

---

The need for effective corporate governance is clear, but RIRs should not be constrained by rigid jurisdictional frameworks. Flexibility is key to serving their distinct communities effectively.

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

I don't know enough about governance procedures in other parts of the world to decide if this would be "enough" governance.

**Sebastian Wiesinger (noris network AG)**

---

RIRs must be established in appropriate jurisdictions such as Mauritius, the Netherlands and the UK. They must follow the best corporate governance procedures of the jurisdiction of their seat which jurisdiction must be a jurisdiction following best global corporate governance practice. They must follow both best domestic practice and best international practice.

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

#### **13.4. Corporate Governance - Somewhat Disagree (2)**

"Best practices in its jurisdiction" may conflict with ICP-2/global interests. A global baseline for corporate governance for all RIRs, e.g., transparency, accountability, openness, etc., must be established – if the jurisdiction is or becomes incompatible with that baseline, it precludes the establishment or continued operation of an RIR in that jurisdiction.

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

Imposing rigid corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional best practices may not align with the unique realities of all RIRs. Flexibility in governance is essential for effective operation.

**Neonjyoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

RIR should rule

**Filipe Coelho (TVCABO Angola)**

---

I find this requirement impractical. Expecting all RIRs to follow strict corporate governance procedures according to local best practices may not accommodate diverse community needs. Flexibility in governance is crucial for effective operation.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---

This condition seems overly demanding. Mandating that RIRs adhere strictly to jurisdictional best practices in corporate governance may not suit their individual circumstances. Governance models should be flexible to better serve their communities.

**Sidonie Hacking (-)**

---

I think best practices should be governing the selection of the jurisdiction, not other way around.

**Andrei Robachevsky (independent)**

---

Best practices should not be localised to jurisdiction, because they may not be well defined (or definable) within that context. In addition to local requirements, RIRs should collectively define minimal standards for governance by each RIR.

**PAUL WILSON (private individual)**

---

### **13.5. Corporate Governance - Strongly Disagree (1)**

Requiring RIRs to follow jurisdictional best practices for governance could hinder their ability to tailor their approaches to meet unique local needs. Flexibility is essential for effective governance.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

Imposing strict corporate governance procedures based on local best practices may not fit every RIR's context. RIRs should have the freedom to adopt governance models that reflect their community.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

Mandating that RIRs follow jurisdictional best practices for governance might limit their adaptability to local circumstances. Governance should be flexible to effectively serve diverse community needs.

**Tipu Khan (Zx Online Ltd)**

---

Requiring strict adherence to corporate governance practices based on jurisdictional standards could overlook the specific realities of different RIRs. Flexibility is key to successful governance.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

Imposing stringent corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional standards may not reflect the unique contexts of all RIRs. Governance models should be adaptable to better serve local needs.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---

Mandating that all RIRs follow jurisdictional best practices for governance could limit their ability to adapt to specific local conditions. RIRs should have the flexibility to choose governance structures that suit their community.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

Strict corporate governance procedures based on local best practices might not be practical for every RIR. Governance models should be flexible to accommodate the diverse needs of their communities.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---

Requiring adherence to corporate governance practices based on jurisdictional standards may not align with the realities faced by all RIRs. Flexibility is crucial to allow governance that meets community needs effectively.

**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Imposing strict governance procedures based on jurisdictional norms may not align with the needs of all RIRs. Governance models should be tailored to the specific circumstances of the communities they serve.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

Mandating strict corporate governance procedures derived from jurisdictional standards may not reflect the realities of all RIRs. Governance models should be flexible to accommodate community needs.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

Imposing strict corporate governance procedures derived from local best practices might not reflect the unique contexts of all RIRs. Flexibility in governance is crucial for addressing local needs effectively.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

Mandating that RIRs follow jurisdictional best practices for governance could limit their ability to adapt to local conditions. Governance should be flexible to effectively serve community needs.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

This condition seems overly demanding. Mandating RIRs to strictly follow jurisdictional best practices in corporate governance may not suit their individual circumstances. Governance models should be flexible to better serve their communities.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

I find this requirement impractical. Expecting all RIRs to adhere strictly to corporate governance procedures according to local best practices may not accommodate the diverse needs of communities. Flexibility in governance is crucial for effective operation.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---

Mandating strict adherence to jurisdictional best practices in corporate governance may not suit every RIR's context. RIRs should have the freedom to tailor their governance structures to better serve their communities.

**Taslina Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

Requiring RIRs to follow rigid corporate governance procedures may not account for the diverse circumstances of different regions. Governance models should be flexible to meet the specific needs of local communities.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

Requiring strict compliance with jurisdictional governance practices could limit the ability of RIRs to tailor their structures to effectively meet the needs of their communities.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

Mandating corporate governance procedures based solely on jurisdictional best practices may overlook the unique challenges that each RIR faces, necessitating adaptable models.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

Requiring strict adherence to jurisdictional governance practices could hinder an RIR's effectiveness in serving its community. Flexibility in governance structures is essential for addressing unique local circumstances.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

Imposing strict corporate governance procedures may limit an RIR's ability to respond to local challenges. Governance models should be flexible to accommodate the specific needs of each community.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

Imposing strict corporate governance procedures may limit an RIR's ability to respond to local challenges. Governance models should be flexible to accommodate the specific needs of each community.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

Requiring adherence to jurisdictional best practices for corporate governance may not reflect the realities of every RIR. Governance models should be flexible to address local circumstances.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

Imposing rigid corporate governance requirements can hinder an RIR's ability to adapt to its unique environment. Flexibility should be allowed to better serve community needs.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

Mandating strict adherence to corporate governance based on best practices may not be feasible for every RIR. They should have the flexibility to tailor governance structures to their community's needs.

**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

Enforcing corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional best practices may not address the diverse circumstances of all RIRs. Governance should be adaptable to local contexts.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

Imposing rigid corporate governance standards may overlook the unique circumstances faced by various RIRs. Flexibility in governance models is essential to effectively address community needs.

**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

Requiring RIRs to strictly follow jurisdictional best practices for corporate governance may not align with their unique realities. Flexible governance models can better serve diverse community needs.

**Pham Gia Khiem (Phat Tai Logistics)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating strict compliance with jurisdictional corporate governance standards may not align with the realities faced by all RIRs. Flexibility in governance is crucial for effective community service.

**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

Enforcing strict corporate governance procedures may overlook the unique realities of different RIRs. Flexibility in governance frameworks is crucial for addressing community needs effectively.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

Mandating that RIRs follow rigid corporate governance standards may not reflect the diverse needs of their communities. Governance should be adaptable to better serve local contexts.

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

A requirement for a member-elected majority in the governing body could impede effective decision-making, especially in regions with diverse stakeholder needs. Greater flexibility in governance might be more effective.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

Imposing rigid corporate governance standards may not be practical for all RIRs. Governance models should be tailored to the specific contexts and needs of their communities.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

Enforcing corporate governance procedures that align with jurisdictional best practices may not suit all RIRs. They should be allowed to adopt governance models that effectively serve their specific communities.

**Kwan Ke Yue (TBWA/ Kuala Lumpur)**

---

Mandating strict corporate governance based on jurisdictional best practices may not reflect the unique needs of all RIRs. Flexibility in governance structures is essential for addressing local challenges.

**Sean Carroll (The One Academy)**

---

Enforcing corporate governance procedures strictly aligned with best practices may not be feasible for all RIRs. They should have the flexibility to choose governance models that best address their community's needs.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

Requiring RIRs to follow strict corporate governance procedures according to jurisdictional best practices may not be practical for all. Governance models should be tailored to the unique needs of the communities they serve.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

Enforcing rigid corporate governance standards may not consider the diverse contexts of RIRs. RIRs should be allowed to implement governance frameworks that best serve their community's interests.

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**

---

Requiring RIRs to follow corporate governance procedures that strictly adhere to jurisdictional best practices may not accommodate their unique circumstances. Flexibility in governance is crucial.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

Mandating corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional best practices could overlook the unique circumstances of different RIRs. Flexibility in governance is essential for addressing local community needs.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---

Imposing jurisdictional corporate governance standards could be challenging for RIRs with unique operational needs. Governance should be flexible enough to accommodate the particular requirements of each RIR.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---

Corporate governance procedures that follow jurisdictional best practices may restrict RIRs' ability to adapt to their specific community's needs. A flexible approach to governance would allow for greater responsiveness.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

Requiring strict adherence to corporate governance procedures aligned with local best practices may not accommodate the specific realities of all RIRs. Governance models should be adaptable to better serve community needs.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---

While it's important to follow governance practices, forcing RIRs to strictly adhere to jurisdictional best practices could limit innovation. RIRs should be free to implement governance models that align with their distinct operational needs.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

Imposing rigid corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional best practices may not suit the diverse needs of all RIRs. RIRs should have the flexibility to adopt governance structures that reflect their unique community contexts.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

Best practices in corporate governance can be valuable, but they may not always reflect the unique needs of an RIR. More flexible governance structures would allow RIRs to better meet their local operational realities.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

This requirement may not align with the realities of all RIRs, as strict adherence to jurisdictional best practices could limit their ability to adapt governance structures to local needs.

**Md Abu Sayeem Siddique Siddique (ServicEngine Ltd)**

---

Imposing strict corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional best practices may not fit the needs of all RIRs. Flexibility in adopting governance models can better serve the unique circumstances of each community.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

Imposing uniform corporate governance standards may overlook the unique circumstances of each RIR. Flexibility in governance structures can better address the specific challenges faced by RIRs.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

Mandating strict corporate governance procedures aligned with jurisdictional best practices may not suit all RIRs. Governance should be tailored to meet the specific needs of the community served.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---



Mandating adherence to corporate governance practices that reflect jurisdictional standards may not suit the specific needs of all RIRs. Governance should be tailored to individual community dynamics.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---

The requirement for strict corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional best practices may not address the varied circumstances of all RIRs. Flexibility is essential for effective governance.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

Imposing stringent corporate governance procedures rooted in jurisdictional best practices may not align with the realities of every RIR. Flexibility in governance is essential to meet local needs.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

The requirement for strict adherence to jurisdictional corporate governance practices may not be practical for all RIRs. Governance should be flexible enough to accommodate unique community dynamics.

**Trang Tran (VNPT Technologies)**

---

The imposition of strict governance procedures based on jurisdictional best practices may not be suitable for all RIRs. Governance should be flexible and responsive to the unique circumstances of each organization.

**Minh Hoang (ANSV)**

---

Requiring adherence to strict corporate governance practices rooted in jurisdictional best practices may not align with the individual needs of RIRs. Flexibility is essential for effective governance.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**

---

Imposing corporate governance best practices from a jurisdictional standpoint may overlook the unique needs of individual RIRs. Each RIR should have the latitude to design governance models that best serve its local circumstances.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**

---

Corporate governance procedures that align with jurisdictional best practices might not be the best fit for all RIRs. A more adaptable governance approach allows RIRs to respond more effectively to local conditions.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---

Although corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional best practices can provide valuable guidelines, they may not always be compatible with the specific needs of individual RIRs. Flexibility in governance structures is essential.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

Corporate governance best practices are important, but strict adherence to jurisdictional norms may not address the specific challenges faced by every RIR. Governance models should be flexible enough to allow local customization.

**Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)**

---

Best practices for corporate governance in a jurisdiction may not always fit the needs of an RIR. Governance frameworks should allow for some degree of local adaptation to ensure effectiveness and efficiency.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

Requiring RIRs to strictly follow jurisdictional corporate governance best practices may not always align with their operational realities. More flexibility in governance models would better serve their unique requirements.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---

While corporate governance best practices are important, a one-size-fits-all approach may not be appropriate. RIRs should be allowed to implement governance models that are more in tune with their specific needs and challenges.

**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

Best practices in corporate governance are useful, but imposing them as a rigid requirement may not suit all RIRs. Governance structures should have the flexibility to be adjusted according to the specific context of each RIR.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---

Corporate governance requirements based on jurisdictional best practices might not be suitable for all RIRs, as each may have distinct challenges. Governance models should allow for flexibility to ensure they meet the unique needs of the local community.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

Requiring RIRs to adopt governance practices based on jurisdictional best standards may overlook local circumstances. Governance should be adaptable, ensuring that each RIR can operate in the way that best suits its environment.

**Ryan Khaw (Alsco Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

Requiring strict adherence to corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional norms may not be realistic for all RIRs. Flexibility should be built into governance models to accommodate diverse needs.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

Imposing rigid corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional standards may not reflect the realities of every RIR. Governance models should be adaptable to the unique needs of local communities.

Enforcing rigid corporate governance procedures may not reflect the unique challenges faced by RIRs in different contexts. A flexible approach can enhance governance effectiveness.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Imposing strict corporate governance requirements based on jurisdictional norms may not account for the diverse realities of RIRs. Flexibility in governance can better serve the needs of individual communities.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

Mandating adherence to jurisdictional best practices in corporate governance may not be suitable for all RIRs. Governance models should be flexible enough to address the unique circumstances faced by each RIR.

**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

Mandating strict adherence to jurisdictional best practices in corporate governance may not suit every RIR's context. RIRs should have the freedom to tailor their governance structures to better serve their communities.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

Requiring RIRs to follow rigid corporate governance procedures may not account for the diverse circumstances of different regions. Governance models should be flexible to meet the specific needs of local communities.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

Mandating corporate governance consistent with jurisdictional best practices may not reflect the unique circumstances of all RIRs. Flexibility in governance is essential to meet diverse community needs.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**

---

Mandating corporate governance procedures aligned with jurisdictional best practices could restrict RIRs from addressing their unique circumstances. Governance models should allow for local adaptations.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

Imposing rigid corporate governance standards aligned with jurisdictional best practices may overlook the unique challenges faced by RIRs. Flexibility in governance can enable RIRs to respond effectively to their community's circumstances.

**Jeremy Cheong (Infineon technologies)**

---

While corporate governance procedures are important, enforcing strict adherence to jurisdictional best practices may not align with the operational realities of all RIRs. Governance models should be tailored to fit the community's needs.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

Enforcing rigid corporate governance models based on best practices may not reflect the realities faced by all RIRs. Governance frameworks should allow for adaptation to community-specific needs.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

Mandating corporate governance consistent with jurisdictional best practices may not address the diverse needs of all RIRs. A flexible approach to governance would better serve local communities.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

Adhering to corporate governance procedures is crucial, but RIRs should not be limited by rigid jurisdictional standards. Flexibility enables them to develop governance models that better serve their communities.

**Sohel Kabir (Kabir Traders)**

---

Corporate governance procedures are vital for RIRs, yet a strict focus on jurisdictional best practices may not serve them well. Governance models should be adaptable to meet specific community needs.

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Imposing strict corporate governance procedures based on best practices may not be suitable for all RIRs. Governance should be tailored to reflect the unique circumstances and needs of each organization.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---

Requiring adherence to jurisdictional best practices in corporate governance may not accommodate the specific challenges faced by all RIRs. Governance models should be flexible to meet the unique needs of local communities.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---

The imposition of strict corporate governance procedures reflective of jurisdictional best practices may not be practical for all RIRs. Governance frameworks should allow for flexibility to address unique community needs.

**Catalina Cueca (Manpower)**

---

Enforcing rigid corporate governance practices based on jurisdictional standards may not reflect the diverse needs of all RIRs. RIRs should be empowered to adopt governance structures that are most relevant to their communities.

**Camilo Riveros (Manpower)**

---

Mandating adherence to jurisdictional best practices in corporate governance may not align with the individual needs of all RIRs. Governance should be adaptable to better serve each community's unique circumstances.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

Imposing stringent corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional best practices may not suit the specific needs of all RIRs. Flexibility in governance models allows RIRs to better serve their communities' unique circumstances.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**

---

Requiring strict adherence to jurisdictional best practices in corporate governance may not reflect the realities faced by all RIRs. Flexibility in governance structures is essential to effectively serve each community's unique circumstances.

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

This condition appears overly demanding. Imposing rigid corporate governance procedures may limit an RIR's ability to innovate and respond to community needs. Governance should be flexible and tailored to local circumstances.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating strict compliance with jurisdictional corporate governance standards may not align with the realities faced by all RIRs. Flexibility in governance is crucial for effective community service.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

un RIR doit avoir la possibilité de recourir aux juridictions régionales ou internationales lorsque la juridiction locale étouffe son fonctionnement

**Nico Tshintu bakajika (ISPA-DRC)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Rigid corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional practices may not fit the unique circumstances of every RIR. Governance should be tailored to the specific needs of the community served.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

This requirement seems impractical. Expecting RIRs to conform strictly to jurisdictional best practices in corporate governance may not accommodate the diverse needs of all organizations. Flexibility is key to effective governance.

**Anh Dang (NASA)**

---

This requirement may impose unnecessary rigidity on RIRs, preventing them from adopting governance structures that suit their unique contexts. Flexibility is key to meeting the needs of diverse communities.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

Insisting that RIRs follow corporate governance procedures consistent with best practices might not address the specific needs of all organizations. RIRs should be free to adopt governance models that align with their community's realities.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

This requirement for rigid corporate governance procedures may not take into account the diverse contexts of all RIRs. Each RIR should be empowered to adopt governance practices that best suit its community's needs.

**Prasanta Haloi (Pwd)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Georges Lallogo (ANPTIC)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Rigid corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional practices may not fit the unique circumstances of every RIR. Governance should be tailored to the specific needs of each community.

**Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)**

---

While it is essential for RIRs to follow corporate governance procedures, these should not be overly restrictive. Flexibility allows RIRs to tailor their governance models to their community's unique context.

**AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)**

---

The necessity of corporate governance for RIRs is clear; however, strict adherence to jurisdictional best practices may not always align with their community needs. Flexibility is key to effective governance.

**K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Insisting on strict adherence to jurisdictional governance best practices may not reflect the realities of every RIR. Governance models should be adaptable to the specific needs of the community they serve.

**Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)**

---

Rigid corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional best practices may not be suitable for all RIRs. They should be given the flexibility to develop governance models that suit their unique circumstances.

**Fuhui Zhang (University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)**

---

While best practices in corporate governance are valuable, RIRs should have the freedom to adapt their governance structures to meet the specific needs of their communities, rather than strictly following jurisdictional guidelines.

**Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)**

---

20. RIRs must adhere to corporate governance procedures, but these should not be overly rigid. Flexibility in governance allows RIRs to adapt to their community's specific needs and challenges.

**Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)**

---

19. Corporate governance is vital for RIRs, but a strict application of jurisdictional best practices may not align with their unique situations. Flexibility in governance is crucial for effective community service.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

Requiring strict adherence to corporate governance procedures aligned with jurisdictional best practices may not be practical for every RIR. RIRs should be allowed to adopt governance models tailored to their community's specific needs.

**Trabahan Pujari (Paruluniversity)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

This condition appears overly demanding. Imposing strict corporate governance procedures may not reflect the realities of all RIRs. Governance models should be flexible enough to address the unique contexts of different communities.

**Juan Mesa (Hispasat)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Rigid corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional practices may not fit the unique circumstances of every RIR. Governance should be tailored to the specific needs of each community.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

I believe that enforcing rigid corporate governance procedures solely based on jurisdictional best practices may not suit all RIRs. Each RIR should have the flexibility to adopt governance models that address the unique needs of its community.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Rigid corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional practices may not fit the unique circumstances of every RIR. Governance should be tailored to the specific needs of each community.

**Pornpipat Kitireanglarp (ZERIWELLPLUS Co., Ltd.)**

---

I find this stipulation counterproductive. Mandating corporate governance procedures that strictly follow jurisdictional best practices may not address the diverse needs of all RIRs. Flexibility in governance structures is essential to meet unique community contexts.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

I strongly oppose this condition. Insisting that RIRs follow strict corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional best practices could limit their ability to address community-specific needs. Flexibility in governance is essential.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Imposing strict governance procedures based on best practices may not consider the unique needs of all RIRs. Each organization should have the flexibility to adopt governance models appropriate for their specific context.

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

This requirement feels overly restrictive to me. Strict adherence to corporate governance procedures based on local best practices may not accurately reflect the realities of all RIRs. Governance models should be adaptable to each community's specific situation.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Imposing strict governance procedures based on jurisdictional norms may not align with the needs of all RIRs. Governance models should be tailored to each community's specific circumstances.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---

I find this stipulation counterproductive. Mandating corporate governance procedures that strictly align with jurisdictional best practices may not meet the diverse needs of all RIRs. Flexibility in governance structures is essential to serve unique community contexts.

**Ashraful Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Mandating adherence to jurisdictional best practices in corporate governance may not be feasible for every RIR. Governance structures should be adaptable to the specific needs of their communities.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

This stipulation appears overly restrictive. Rigid adherence to corporate governance best practices may not align with the realities faced by all RIRs. Governance should be adaptable to meet the unique needs of different communities.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---



I completely disagree with this requirement. Imposing strict governance procedures based on best practices may not reflect the unique needs of all RIRs. Each organization should have the flexibility to adopt governance models that fit their specific context.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

This condition seems overly demanding. Mandating that RIRs adhere strictly to jurisdictional best practices in corporate governance may not suit their individual circumstances. Governance models should be flexible to better serve their communities.

**Phuc Pham (Advanced Network Systems VietNam Company Limited)**

---

I find this requirement impractical. Expecting all RIRs to follow strict corporate governance procedures according to local best practices may not accommodate diverse community needs. Flexibility in governance is crucial for effective operation.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Rigid corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional best practices may not reflect the realities of all RIRs. Governance models should be adaptable to the unique circumstances of each community.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

This approach feels excessively rigid. Mandating adherence to corporate governance best practices from a jurisdiction may not be practical for every RIR. Each organization should have the flexibility to choose governance structures that fulfill their unique needs.

**Giang Nguyen (NASA)**

---

I find this stipulation counterproductive. Mandating corporate governance procedures that strictly align with jurisdictional best practices may not meet the diverse needs of all RIRs. Flexibility in governance structures is essential to serve unique community contexts.

**Alex Kwan (Wiplus Malaysia)**

---

I believe that enforcing rigid corporate governance procedures solely based on jurisdictional best practices may not suit all RIRs. Each RIR should have the flexibility to adopt governance models that address the unique needs of its community.

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

Disagree

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Imposing strict governance procedures based on jurisdictional norms may not align with the needs of all RIRs. Governance models should be tailored to the specific circumstances of the communities they serve.

**Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)**

---

I find this stipulation counterproductive. Mandating corporate governance procedures that strictly align with jurisdictional best practices may not meet the diverse needs of all RIRs. Flexibility in governance structures is essential for serving unique community contexts.

**Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)**

---

I believe that enforcing rigid corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional best practices may not be suitable for all RIRs. Each RIR should have the flexibility to adopt governance models that address the unique needs of its community.

**Pooja Gopi (DM Digital Marketing)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Rigid corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional practices may not fit the unique circumstances of every RIR. Governance should be tailored to the specific needs of the community served.

**Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)**

---

This requirement seems impractical. Expecting RIRs to conform strictly to jurisdictional best practices in corporate governance may not accommodate the diverse needs of all organizations. Flexibility is key to effective governance.

**Quyn Kim (VNPAY)**

---

I find this stipulation counterproductive. Mandating corporate governance procedures that align strictly with jurisdictional best practices may not meet the diverse needs of all RIRs. Flexibility in governance structures is essential for serving unique community contexts

**Shahedul Islam Bhuiyan (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Following jurisdictional best practices in corporate governance is crucial, but it should not limit RIRs from customizing their approaches to fit their unique community contexts.

**Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)**

---

Question 28&29 Corporate Governance An RIR must follow corporate governance procedures consistent with best practices in its jurisdiction. 1- Strongly Disagree I believe that imposing rigid corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional best practices may not suit all RIRs. Each RIR should have the flexibility to adopt governance models that better address the unique needs of its community.

**Anjan Deka (HDFC)**

---

I believe that imposing rigid corporate governance procedures based on jurisdictional best practices may not suit all RIRs. Each RIR should have the flexibility to adopt governance models that better address the unique needs of its community.

**Ketan Parmar (Bids Info Global)**

---

. Strict adherence to corporate governance standards from a jurisdictional perspective might not align with the diverse needs of all RIRs. Flexibility in governance models allows them to better serve their unique communities.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

Imposing rigid governance structures based on jurisdictional best practices may not be practical for all RIRs. It's essential for them to adopt governance frameworks that reflect their individual community circumstances.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

1. While adhering to corporate governance procedures is vital, strict compliance with jurisdictional best practices may not suit every RIR. Each RIR should have the liberty to choose governance models that cater to its community's distinct needs.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---

## 14. Member-Controlled

---

The majority of an RIR's governing body must be elected by the RIR's Members, and the governing body must maintain effective control over the RIR.

### 14.1. Member-Controlled - Strongly Agree (5)

We should have a fixed minimum of universal requirements defined by ICANN for this.

**Babagana Digima (Nigerian Communications Commission)**

---

Democratic /Fair

**Colwayne Babb (Cable and Wireless)**

---

I am strongly agree with that

**Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle, as it ensures that an RIR remains accountable to its community, operates transparently, and adheres to the principles of democratic governance. Here's an analysis:

Reasons for Agreement

1. Ensures Accountability to the Community
- 

Having the majority of the governing body elected by the RIR's members ensures that the RIR remains directly accountable to those it serves. This democratic process fosters a sense of ownership and encourages active participation from the community in decision-making.

2. Enhances Legitimacy and Trust
- An elected governing body is more likely to be seen as legitimate by members, as it reflects the will of the community. This legitimacy strengthens the RIR's ability to implement policies and gain support from stakeholders.
3. Encourages Transparency and Inclusivity
- Elections and member participation in governance make the decision-making process more transparent and inclusive.

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

Nothing to add or detract

**Brian Longwe (Converged Technology Networks)**

---

diversified membership control

**Aftab Siddiqui (AFTABSIDDIQUI-AU)**

---

I fully agree with this principle. A community-driven policy development process that is open, transparent, neutral, and publicly documented is essential for maintaining trust, accountability, and inclusivity within the RIR. It ensures that decisions reflect the diverse needs of the community and that stakeholders have a clear understanding of how policies are developed and implemented. This approach strengthens the RIR's legitimacy and helps foster a collaborative environment where all voices can be heard.

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle. Having the majority of an RIR's governing body elected by its members ensures that the RIR remains accountable and responsive to the needs of the community it serves. It promotes transparency, inclusivity, and trust within the organization. Furthermore, maintaining effective control within the governing body allows for strong oversight and strategic decision-making, which is crucial for the RIR's sustainability and alignment with its members' interests.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

Should also establish thirty party legal audit to prevent people selling or buying members' votes.

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

I think only the Members should do this.

**Mark Elkins (Posix Systems)**

---

I strongly agree with the principle that the majority of an RIR's governing body must be elected by its Members, and that the governing body must maintain effective control over the RIR. This principle ensures that the RIR is democratically governed, transparent, accountable, and responsive to the needs of its Members. It helps prevent the concentration of power, promotes stability, and fosters trust and legitimacy, which are crucial for the RIR's continued success and effectiveness in managing internet resources.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

Members should be main beneficiaries.

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

I strongly oppose this condition. Requiring a majority of the governing body to be elected by members could complicate decision-making processes, particularly in areas with multiple needs. A more flexible governance model might be more effective.

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

I agree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

It makes sense

**Danjuma bappa ahmed (Wownetworks limited nigeria)**

---

yes

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

This openness reassures stakeholders and enables members to make informed decisions

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

---

Yes

**Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)**

---

Totally agree

**Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)**

---

Better: "All of the RIRs governing body..."

**Wolfgang Tremmel (Private Citizen)**

---

I agree

**Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)**

---

Those chosen must belong to countries as diversely distributed in the coverage region as possible.

**Lia Solis (personal)**

---

certainly the majority of the members

**Saul Stein (eNetworks)**

---

Agree- this is an important point.

**Andrew Gallo (The George Washington University)**

---

simple agreement

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

Good wording!

**Sander Steffann (SJM Steffann Consultancy)**

---

## **14.2. Member-Controlled - Somewhat Agree (4)**

I agree

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

Glad it says 'majority' as there is a good case to allow scope for nomcom appointed directors to add depth / skills etc.

**Jordan Carter (auDA)**

---

agree

**Mohammad Mubarak Alfalasi (Telecommunication and Digital government Regulatory Authority)**

---

No comment

**Kelvin Horng Woei Ong (Propnex)**

---

Yes, in democracy

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

supermajority, not majority.

**William Herrin (Self)**

---

RIRs are truly member-driven organizations. By requiring that the majority of the governing body be elected by the members, it empowers the community to shape the direction and priorities of the RIR. Effective control over the RIR by the governing body guarantees that decisions are made in the best interests of the members and the broader internet community. This principle promotes accountability, transparency, and democratic governance within the RIR ecosystem.

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

This principle ensures that an RIR's governing body is primarily elected by its Members, promoting democratic decision-making and accountability. It also requires the governing body to maintain effective control over the RIR, ensuring strategic direction and preventing external influence. For this to work, the election process must be transparent and inclusive, and the governing body must have the necessary authority to govern effectively. Overall, it supports a balance between Member participation and strong leadership.

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

Agree. No comment

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

just how to determine the vote count? member single vote, or vote based on size/number of resources? So money could wag the dog

**Hendrik Visage (HeVIS.Co Systems Pty Ltd)**

---

No comments

**Pacharaporn Wangwinyoo (ZIM (Thailand) Co., LTD.)**

---

4

**Taye Oyebola (Aso Savings and Loans Plc)**

---

This is important

**John Haydon (Education)**

---

modele transparent

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

perhaps a definition for "effective control" would be helpful?

**Nancy Carter (no affiliation)**

---

Not sure about the 50% Could be more (66%? 90%?)

**Joerg Dorchain (private)**

---

Subject to the supervisory jurisdiction of the applicable courts an RIRs governing body must be freely and fairly elected in the proper course by the RIRs members. If the governing body fails to maintain effective control of the RIR control must rest entirely with the RIRs members through a mechanism such as a general meeting. As soon as practicable a new governing body must be brought into effect and able to maintain effective control over the RIR. RIR governing bodies must be primarily accountable to RIR members and external interference from governments, former members of RIR governing bodies and staff must be resisted.

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

This clause needs to be more specific as to "voting members" of the governing body.

**PAUL WILSON (private individual)**

---

Concerned about how easy it is to capture control of an RIR with the limited community involvement that we see

**Mike Burns (IPTrading)**

---

### **14.3. Member-Controlled - Neutral (3)**

What this effectively does is give an advantage to the existing arrangements. I am not sure I have an alternative, but as a principle it feels jarring to recognize that, were there to be a concentrated ownership in a region it would become progressively harder to address abuses.

**Andrew Sullivan (N/A)**

---

Requiring a member-elected majority in the governing body could hinder effective decision-making, especially in regions with diverse needs. A more flexible governance model may better address local challenges.

**Noel OUPOH (DATACONNECT AFRICA)**

---



The requirement for a majority of the governing body to be elected by members might hinder effective governance in regions with complex challenges. An adaptable governance approach may be necessary.

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---

ALL of the governing body must be elected RIR members.

**j heasley (SNI)**

---

Agree

**Hann Jye Ng (MyTeksi Sdn Bhd)**

---

This condition seems overly restrictive. Requiring a member-elected majority in the governing body may limit effective governance, particularly in areas with diverse needs. A flexible approach may allow for better local responsiveness.

**Sidonie Hacking ('-)**

---

This approach appears excessively demanding. A governing body comprised mainly of member-elected individuals may struggle with effective governance, especially in diverse regions. Flexibility in governance models could better cater to local needs.

**Jun Wen (one futures technology sdn bhd)**

---

While member election of the governing body fosters accountability, it may hinder swift decision-making in regions with varied needs. A more flexible governance model could better tackle local challenges.

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

Consistence in terminology would be helpful (e.g. community/resource holders/members). Perhaps "decision majority" (e.g. some decisions can require 2/3 of the votes).

**Andrei Robachevsky (independent)**

---

I think there must be a more clear separation of what is member controlled and what community controlled

**Jordi Palet Martinez (The IPv6 Company)**

---

#### **14.4. Member-Controlled - Somewhat Disagree (2)**

Requiring a member-elected majority may lead to delays in decision-making, particularly in regions with varied interests. A governance structure that mixes elected representatives with appointed leaders could better balance control and responsiveness.

**Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)**

---

How would you ensure member's control is trustworthy?

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

The requirement for a majority of the governing body to be elected by members may not facilitate effective governance in areas with varied challenges. An adaptable governance structure could be more effective.

**Neonjyoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

This needs to be better detailed. It would actually be beneficial for RIRs to have independent members of the governing body - particularly with respect to financial and legal oversight. Indeed this is considered good practice in the modern corporate world, but existing RIRs are still yet to implement this.

**Kevin Meynell (Individual)**

---

#### **14.5. Member-Controlled - Strongly Disagree (1)**

This principle assumes that an RIR has to be a membership organisation in the first place; further, it is unclear how "effective control over the RIR" would co-exist with a policy setting body that is broader than the RIR membership

**Peter Koch (Individual)**

---

The first part of this proposed principle, "majority of an RIR's governing body must be elected by the RIR's members" needs justification and presumes all RIRs must be membership-based organizations. This restriction on organizational structure is unwarranted in a proposed principle for ICP-2. The second part of this proposed principle would mean that all RIRs would NOT be multistakeholder organizations – they would be controlled by a single stakeholder, namely the membership. Whether or not this is appropriate is a matter of opinion but at least historically, there has been numerous assertions in various venues that the RIRs are multistakeholder organizations, so this may have repercussions, at least in the political sphere.

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

Requiring a governing body with a majority elected by members may complicate governance processes, particularly in areas with differing community interests. Flexibility could enhance effectiveness.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

Mandating that the governing body maintain a member-elected majority could slow down effective governance, especially in regions with varied needs. Flexibility may be key to better outcomes.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

A requirement for a majority elected by members might hinder timely decision-making, particularly in regions with diverse requirements. A more adaptable governance structure could be advantageous.

**Tipu Khan (Zx Online Ltd)**

---

Insisting on a member-elected majority in the governing body could complicate governance, especially in areas with differing community needs. Flexibility may improve effectiveness.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

Insisting on a member-elected majority in the governing body could create challenges in effective decision-making, especially in areas with diverse community needs. Flexibility may improve governance outcomes.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---

Requiring a governing body with a majority elected by members could slow down decision-making, particularly in regions with differing needs. A flexible governance model might better serve local communities.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

Mandating that the governing body maintain a member-elected majority could hinder responsive decision-making in regions with diverse requirements. A more adaptable governance structure may be necessary.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---

A requirement for a member-elected majority in the governing body could complicate decision-making processes, especially in areas with varied community needs. Flexibility may enhance governance effectiveness.

**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Insisting on a majority elected by members could restrict effective decision-making in regions with varying needs. A more adaptable governance approach may be necessary to address local issues effectively.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

Mandating that the governing body have a member-elected majority might impede effective governance, especially in regions with varying priorities. Flexibility could enhance overall effectiveness.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

Mandating that the governing body have a member-elected majority could hinder responsive governance, particularly in diverse regions. Flexibility in decision-making could improve outcomes.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

A requirement for a governing body with a majority elected by members might slow down decision-making, especially in regions with differing interests. A more flexible governance approach may be needed.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

This condition feels overly restrictive. Requiring a member-elected majority on the governing body could limit effective governance, particularly in areas with varied needs. A more flexible approach could enhance responsiveness to local issues.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

I find this requirement impractical. Mandating that the majority of the governing body be elected by members could complicate decision-making, particularly in diverse areas. A more flexible governance structure may be more effective for local challenges.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---

Requiring a majority of the governing body to be elected by members could create obstacles to effective decision-making, particularly in diverse regions. Flexibility in governance could better serve local needs.

**Taslima Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

Insisting on a governing body that is primarily member-elected may hinder effective governance, especially in regions with varying stakeholder interests. A flexible governance structure could better address local complexities.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

Requiring a majority-elected governing body may hinder effective decision-making processes, especially in regions with varying community interests. A more adaptable governance structure could improve efficiency.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

Insisting on a member-elected majority could complicate governance, particularly in diverse areas. A more flexible approach may better serve local needs and facilitate effective decisions.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

Insisting on a member-elected majority in the governing body may hinder effective governance, especially in areas with varied needs. A flexible model may better accommodate local challenges.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

Mandating a governing body consisting primarily of member-elected individuals could complicate decision-making, particularly in diverse regions. A more flexible governance structure may enhance effectiveness.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

Mandating a governing body consisting primarily of member-elected individuals could complicate decision-making, particularly in diverse regions. A more flexible governance structure may enhance effectiveness.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

Insisting on a member-elected majority may complicate decision-making, particularly in regions with varied stakeholder needs. A more adaptable governance structure could be more effective.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

The requirement for a majority-elected governing body could limit effective governance in regions with diverse interests. A flexible approach may better align with local challenges.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

Mandating that the governing body consist of a majority elected by Members might complicate governance, especially in areas with varied needs. Flexibility may enhance effectiveness.

**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

Requiring a member-elected majority in the governing body could impede effective decision-making, particularly in diverse regions. A more adaptable governance model may be preferable.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

Insisting on a member-elected majority in the governing body may create challenges in decision-making, especially in diverse regions. Flexibility in governance structures may better accommodate local realities.

**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

A requirement for a majority-elected governing body may not promote effective governance in regions with diverse stakeholder interests. Flexibility in governance could better address local challenges.

**Pham Gia Khiem (Phat Tai Logistics)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating a majority elected by members may complicate governance, particularly in diverse areas. A more adaptable governance structure could provide the necessary flexibility for effective decision-making.

**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

Insisting on a governing body that is primarily member-elected may limit effective decision-making, particularly in regions with diverse needs. A more adaptable governance model could better serve local contexts.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

Requiring the majority of the governing body to be elected by members may create challenges for governance effectiveness, especially in regions with differing interests. Flexibility in governance may better address local circumstances.

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

A requirement for a member-elected majority in the governing body could impede effective decision-making, especially in regions with diverse stakeholder needs. Greater flexibility in governance might be more effective.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

Mandating that the majority of the governing body be elected by Members could complicate governance, especially in regions with varied interests. A flexible approach may be more beneficial.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

The insistence on a majority-elected governing body might limit effective governance in regions with diverse needs. A flexible governance model could better serve local challenges.

**Kwan Ke Yue (TBWA/ Kuala Lumpur)**

---

Requiring a member-elected majority may hinder effective decision-making, particularly in regions with diverse stakeholder needs. A more adaptable governance structure could be more effective.

**Sean Carroll (The One Academy)**

---

Mandating that the governing body have a majority elected by Members might complicate decision-making, particularly in diverse regions. A more flexible governance model could enhance effectiveness.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

Requiring a member-elected majority in the governing body may limit effective governance, especially in regions with varied stakeholder interests. Flexibility in governance could better address community needs.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

While member representation is essential, requiring a majority-elected governing body may complicate effective decision-making in regions with varied needs. A more flexible governance structure can better serve local requirements.

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**

---

Mandating that the governing body maintain a majority elected by members could complicate decision-making, particularly in areas with varied interests. Flexibility in governance models is essential.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

Requiring a member-elected majority in the governing body could obstruct timely decision-making, especially in regions with differing priorities. A more flexible governance model might be preferable.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---

Requiring a majority of the governing body to be elected by members could make governance cumbersome in regions with diverse needs. A mixed model of elected and appointed members could help balance control and effectiveness in decision-making.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---

Having a member-elected majority could result in slower decision-making, particularly in diverse regions. A governance structure that incorporates appointed members alongside elected ones might maintain control and increase decision-making efficiency.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

Mandating that the governing body have a member-elected majority might hinder effective decision-making, particularly in areas where the community's needs are varied. Flexibility in governance could be more beneficial.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---

While a member-elected majority is important for representation, it could limit the governing body's ability to make prompt decisions. A governance model with appointed members could ensure more effective control over the RIR's operations.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

Requiring a majority of the governing body to be elected by members could complicate decision-making, especially in regions with diverse needs. A more adaptable governance model may better address local challenges.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

Member-elected governing bodies are important for accountability but might not always lead to effective governance in regions with complex issues. A more flexible governance structure could maintain control while allowing for swift and efficient decision-making.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

This requirement might hinder effective governance, particularly in areas with diverse needs. A flexible approach to governance could facilitate more efficient decision-making and representation.

**Md Abu Sayeem Siddique Siddique (ServicEngine Ltd)**

---

Requiring a majority of the governing body to be elected by members could complicate decision-making, especially in diverse regions where varied interests exist. A more flexible governance model may better address local complexities.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

While representation is essential, a requirement for a majority-elected governing body may limit effective decision-making in regions with diverse perspectives. Flexibility can enhance responsiveness.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

Mandating a member-elected majority in the governing body could create challenges for effective governance, especially in diverse regions. A more adaptable model may better address local needs.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---

The requirement for a governing body predominantly elected by members may not support effective governance in regions with diverse needs. A more flexible approach could enhance local responsiveness.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---

Mandating that the majority of the governing body be elected by members could impede effective decision-making, particularly in regions with complex needs. A more adaptable governance model may be beneficial.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

Requiring a member-elected majority in the governing body may not support effective governance, particularly in regions with differing stakeholder needs. A more flexible governance model could be beneficial.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

The requirement for a majority of the governing body to be elected by members might impede effective decision-making, especially in regions with diverse challenges. An adaptable governance approach may be more effective.

**Trang Tran (VNPT Technologies)**

---

The requirement for a governing body predominantly elected by members may not facilitate effective governance in regions with varying needs. A more flexible approach could better serve local challenges.

**Minh Hoang (ANSV)**

---

Mandating that the majority of the governing body be elected by members could limit the ability to respond effectively to local needs, especially in diverse regions. Flexibility in governance structures is crucial.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**

---

While a member-elected majority promotes democratic representation, it may not always be the best fit for ensuring effective governance in diverse regions. A hybrid model could provide better balance between control and flexibility.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**



---

Requiring a member-elected majority could slow down the decision-making process in regions with diverse needs. A governance model with both elected and appointed members could help maintain control while addressing the local challenges more effectively.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---

Member-elected governing bodies may struggle with swift decision-making in regions with competing demands. A more flexible governance model that includes appointed individuals could improve both efficiency and control.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

While a majority elected by members supports representation, it may not always lead to the most effective governance in diverse regions. A more adaptable governance structure could ensure efficient control and decision-making.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

A member-elected majority in the governing body might be less efficient in decision-making, especially when quick responses are necessary. A flexible governance model that combines elected and appointed members could better address operational needs.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---

Requiring a member-elected majority could complicate governance, especially in regions with varied stakeholder interests. A governance structure that blends elected representatives with appointed experts may maintain effective control and promote efficient decisions.

**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

While member-elected representation is essential, it may create challenges for effective decision-making, especially in regions with diverse and competing needs. A governance model that allows for appointed members could maintain balance and control.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---

Requiring the governing body to consist of a member-elected majority might hinder decision-making, particularly when quick and effective action is needed. A mixed model of elected and appointed members could offer better control and flexibility.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

Having a majority of the governing body elected by members may reduce the ability to make quick, decisive actions. A more flexible governance model could ensure the RIR maintains effective control while balancing representation.

**Ryan Khaw (Alsco Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

Imposing a requirement for a majority-elected governing body could hinder effective governance, particularly in regions with significant diversity. A more flexible approach may better accommodate local challenges.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

Requiring a member-elected majority in the governing body may hinder effective decision-making, especially in regions with diverse challenges. A more adaptable governance model could be more effective.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Aptic)**

---

Requiring a majority of the governing body to be elected may complicate governance, particularly in regions with varied member interests. Flexibility can enhance decision-making processes.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

While member elections are important, mandating a majority-elected governing body could restrict effective governance in diverse areas. A more flexible approach can better serve local needs.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

Requiring that the governing body be predominantly elected by Members could undermine effective decision-making, especially in regions with diverse interests. Flexibility may enhance governance.

**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

Requiring a majority of the governing body to be elected by members could create obstacles to effective decision-making, particularly in diverse regions. Flexibility in governance could better serve local needs.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

Insisting on a governing body that is primarily member-elected may hinder effective governance, especially in regions with varying stakeholder interests. A flexible governance structure could better address local complexities.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

Mandating that the majority of the governing body be elected by members may not facilitate effective governance in regions with varied challenges. Flexibility in governance structures could enhance local responsiveness.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**

---

Requiring a member-elected majority in the governing body could limit effective governance, particularly in regions with complex community dynamics. Flexibility in governance models may be necessary.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

Mandating that the majority of an RIR's governing body be elected by its Members may hinder effective governance, especially in diverse regions. Flexibility in governance can promote better decision-making.

**Jeremy Cheong (Infineon technologies)**

---

While member election of the governing body is important, requiring a majority to be elected may restrict effective decision-making in regions with varying needs. A more adaptable approach could better serve local challenges.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

Mandating that the governing body maintain a majority elected by members could hinder effective governance, particularly in regions with varied needs. Flexibility in governance could enhance local responsiveness.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

Requiring a member-elected majority in the governing body could complicate decision-making processes, especially in areas with diverse stakeholder interests. A more adaptable governance model may be necessary.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

While a member-elected governing body ensures representation, it may hinder effective decision-making in regions with diverse interests. A flexible governance model could facilitate quicker responses to local issues.

**Sohel Kabir (Kabir Traders)**

---

A governing body primarily elected by members could face challenges in decision-making efficiency, particularly in diverse regions. A flexible governance approach may better address local needs.

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Requiring a member-elected majority in the governing body may not facilitate effective governance, particularly in regions with differing stakeholder needs. An adaptable governance approach could be more effective.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---

The requirement for a governing body predominantly elected by members might hinder effective decision-making in regions with diverse needs. A more flexible governance structure could enhance local responsiveness.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---

Mandating that the majority of the governing body be elected by members could impede effective decision-making, especially in regions with varied interests. Flexibility in governance structures may be advantageous.

**Catalina Cueca (Manpower)**

---

Requiring a member-elected majority in the governing body could limit effective governance, particularly in regions with diverse challenges. A more adaptable governance model may better meet local needs.

**Camilo Riveros (Manpower)**

---

This requirement for a majority elected by members might hinder effective governance, especially in regions with diverse community needs. A more flexible model may better address local challenges.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

Requiring a majority of the governing body to be elected by RIR members could complicate decision-making processes, especially in regions with varied needs. A more adaptable governance structure may better address local challenges.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**

---

This requirement for a member-elected majority could complicate governance, especially in regions with a wide range of community needs. A more adaptable governance model may be better suited to local contexts.

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

This condition appears overly rigid. A governing body with a member-elected majority may struggle to make effective decisions in regions with varied needs. Flexibility in governance could enhance local responsiveness.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Requiring a majority elected by members may complicate governance, particularly in diverse areas. A more adaptable governance structure could provide the flexibility needed for effective decision-making.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Having a majority of the governing body elected by members could complicate governance, particularly in diverse regions. A more adaptable governance model may be more effective in tackling local issues.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

This requirement seems counterproductive. Mandating a member-elected majority in the governing body could restrict effective decision-making, especially in areas with varying needs. A flexible governance model might better address these challenges.

**Anh Dang (NASA)**

---

Insisting on a member-elected majority in the governing body could slow down the decision-making process, especially in areas with varied needs. A more adaptable governance model may better address these local issues.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

Requiring a majority of the governing body to be elected by members might impede effective decision-making, particularly in diverse regions. A more flexible governance structure could better meet local challenges.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

Insisting on a member-elected majority in the governing body may hinder timely and effective decision-making, particularly in regions with diverse needs. A more flexible governance approach could be advantageous.

**Prasanta Haloi (Pwd)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Georges Lallogo (ANPTIC)**

---

I find this approach overly demanding. Mandating that the governing body be mainly member-elected could challenge effective governance in regions with diverse needs. An adaptable governance structure might yield better outcomes.

**Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)**

---

While member elections for the governing body foster accountability, they might impede timely decision-making in diverse contexts. A more adaptable governance model may be more effective.

**AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)**

---

Requiring a majority of the governing body to be elected by members may hinder effective governance, especially in areas with complex needs. Flexibility in governance may be necessary for responsiveness.

**K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Insisting on a majority elected by members could obstruct effective governance, particularly in regions with varied community needs. A more flexible governance model may be essential.

**Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)**

---

Although a member-elected majority supports accountability, it may complicate decision-making processes in regions with diverse needs. A more flexible governance model could better serve these communities.

**Fuhui Zhang (University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)**

---

A governing body that is largely elected by its members might struggle with decision-making efficiency, particularly in diverse locales. Flexibility in governance could enhance responsiveness to local issues.

**Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)**

---

Although a governing body primarily made up of elected members promotes legitimacy, it might slow down decision-making processes in diverse regions. A flexible approach could mitigate this issue.

**Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)**

---

19. The requirement for a member-elected majority could complicate governance, particularly in areas with diverse needs. Flexibility in governance structures may facilitate more effective decision-making.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

Insisting on a member-elected majority in the governing body may hinder effective decision-making, especially in areas with varied community needs. A flexible governance structure could better accommodate local circumstances.

**Trabahan Pujari (Paruluniversity)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

This condition appears overly demanding. Imposing strict corporate governance procedures may not reflect the realities of all RIRs. Governance models should be flexible enough to address the unique contexts of different communities.

**Juan Mesa (Hispasat)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Having a majority of the governing body elected by members could complicate governance, particularly in diverse regions. A more adaptable model may be more effective in addressing local issues.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

I believe that mandating that the majority of the governing body be elected by members may hinder effective decision-making, especially in areas with diverse needs. A more flexible governance model could better address local challenges.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Having a majority of the governing body elected by members could complicate governance, particularly in diverse regions. A more adaptable model may be more effective in tackling local issues.

**Pornpipat Kitireanglarp (ZERIWELLPLUS Co., Ltd.)**

---

I find this stipulation counterproductive. A governing body with a majority elected by members may complicate decision-making, particularly in areas with diverse requirements. Flexibility in governance is essential to tackle local challenges.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

I strongly oppose this condition. Requiring a majority of the governing body to be elected by members could complicate decision-making processes, particularly in areas with diverse needs. A flexible governance model might be more effective.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Insisting on a majority elected by members may hinder effective decision-making, particularly in regions with diverse community needs. A more adaptable governance model may be necessary.

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

This requirement feels overly rigid. Mandating a predominantly member-elected governing body could negatively impact effective governance, particularly in communities with varying needs. An adaptable structure might be more beneficial.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

I strongly disagree with this requirement. Mandating a majority elected by members may limit effective decision-making, particularly in regions with unique needs. A more adaptable approach may be essential for addressing local issues.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---

I find this stipulation counterproductive. A majority member-elected governing body may complicate decision-making, especially in areas with diverse requirements. Flexibility in governance may better address local challenges.

**Ashrafal Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Mandating a member-elected majority in the governing body could hinder effective decision-making, particularly in regions with varying needs. A more flexible governance model might serve these areas better.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

This stipulation feels too rigid. A governing body with a member-elected majority may face challenges in effective governance, particularly in diverse regions. Flexibility in governance structures could better address local needs.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Insisting on a majority elected by members may hinder effective decision-making, particularly in regions with diverse community needs. A more adaptable governance model may be necessary.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

This condition seems overly restrictive. Requiring a member-elected majority in the governing body may limit effective governance, particularly in areas with varied needs. A more flexible approach may enhance local responsiveness.

**Phuc Pham (Advanced Network Systems VietNam Company Limited)**

---

I find this requirement impractical. Mandating a majority of the governing body to be elected by members could complicate decision-making, particularly in diverse regions. A more flexible governance structure may be more effective in addressing local challenges.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

I am firmly against this provision. Requiring a member-elected majority could hinder effective decision-making, particularly in regions with a range of needs. A more adaptable governance model may better address these challenges.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

This approach appears overly demanding. A governing body primarily composed of member-elected representatives may struggle with effective governance, particularly in diverse regions. Flexible governance models could better accommodate local needs.

**Giang Nguyen (NASA)**

---

I find this stipulation counterproductive. A majority member-elected governing body may complicate decision-making, especially in areas with diverse requirements. Flexibility in governance may better address local challenges.

**Alex Kwan (Wiplus Malaysia)**

---

I believe that mandating that the majority of the governing body be elected by members may hinder effective decision-making, especially in areas with diverse needs. A more flexible governance model could better address local challenges.

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

Disagree

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---



I strongly disagree with this requirement. Insisting on a majority elected by members could limit effective decision-making in areas with different needs. A more adaptable governance approach may be essential for addressing local issues.

**Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)**

---

I find this stipulation counterproductive. Having a member-elected majority in the governing body may complicate decision-making, especially in regions with diverse requirements. A flexible governance model could more effectively tackle local challenges.

**Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)**

---

I believe that mandating a majority of the governing body to be elected by members could hinder effective decision-making, especially in areas with diverse needs. A more flexible governance model may better address local challenges.

**Pooja Gopi (DM Digital Marketing)**

---

I find this requirement impractical. Mandating that the majority of the governing body be elected by members could complicate decision-making, especially in diverse regions. A more flexible governance structure may be more effective in meeting local challenges.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Having a majority of the governing body elected by members could complicate governance, especially in diverse regions. A more adaptable governance model may be more effective in addressing local issues.

**Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)**

---

This requirement seems counterproductive. Requiring a member-elected majority in the governing body might restrict effective decision-making, particularly in areas with varied needs. A flexible governance model could better address these challenges.

**Quyn Kim (VNPAY)**

---

I find this stipulation counterproductive. Requiring a member-elected majority in the governing body may complicate decision-making, particularly in regions with diverse requirements. A flexible governance model could better meet local challenges.

**Shahedul Islam Bhuiyan (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Although having a member-elected majority can enhance legitimacy, it may also impede effective governance in regions with complex needs. A flexible approach might be more suitable to address these challenges.

**Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)**

---

Question 30&31 Member-Controlled The majority of an RIR's governing body must be elected by the RIR's Members, and the governing body must maintain effective control over the RIR. 1-

Strongly Disagree Answer: I believe that requiring a majority of the governing body to be elected by members could impede effective decision-making, particularly in regions with diverse needs. A more flexible governance model might better address local challenges.

**Anjan Deka (HDFC)**

---

I believe that requiring a majority of the governing body to be elected by members could impede effective decision-making, particularly in regions with diverse needs. A more flexible governance model might better address local challenges.

**Ketan Parmar (Bids Info Global)**

---

Requiring a majority to be elected by members could create challenges in decision-making, especially in areas with a wide range of needs. A flexible governance structure may serve local interests better.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

While a member-elected majority in the governing body promotes representation, it may also slow down decision-making in diverse regions. A more adaptable governance model might be more effective.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

1. Mandating a majority elected by members may complicate decision-making processes, particularly in regions with varied interests. A flexible governance structure could better navigate local complexities.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---

## 15. Community-Driven

---

An RIR must maintain a community-driven policy development process that is open, transparent, neutral, and publicly documented.

### 15.1. Community-Driven - Strongly Agree (5)

This is important in order to keep the RIR accountable and to allow those who actually need and use the number resources to determine the distribution policies.

**Mirjam Kühne (RIPE)**

---

Essential.

**Jordan Carter (auDA)**

---

Agree

**Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle, as it is fundamental to ensuring that the RIR operates in a way that reflects the collective interests and needs of its community. A community-driven policy development process that is open, transparent, neutral, and publicly documented is key to fostering trust, participation, and fairness. Here's an analysis: Reasons for Agreement

1. Promotes Inclusivity and Participation • A community-driven process encourages all stakeholders to contribute, ensuring that policies reflect the diverse needs and interests of the community. It empowers members to have a voice in decisions that directly affect them.
2. Builds Trust and Legitimacy • Transparency in the policy development process allows stakeholders to understand how decisions are made and why particular policies are adopted. This builds trust in the RIR and enhances its legitimacy.
3. Ensures Neutrality and Fairness • A neutral policy development process ensures that no single entity or interest group can dominate the decision-making process. This promotes fairness and ensures that policies serve the broader community rather than special interests.
4. Encourages Accountability

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

Nothing to add or detract

**Brian Longwe (Converged Technology Networks)**

---

Yes.

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

strong control to avoid hijacking of policy process

**Aftab Siddiqui (AFTABSIDDIQUI-AU)**

---

I agree with the principle that **\*\*"An RIR must maintain a community-driven policy development process that is open, transparent, neutral, and publicly documented."\*\*** This approach is fundamental to ensuring trust, inclusivity, and fairness in Internet resource management. - Openness: Encourages diverse participation, ensuring all stakeholders have an opportunity to contribute and voice their perspectives. - Transparency: Builds trust and accountability by making processes and decisions clear and accessible to the public. - Neutrality: Ensures that policies are developed without bias, focusing solely on the collective interests of the community. - Public Documentation: Preserves institutional knowledge and provides a reference for ongoing governance, helping to maintain consistency and clarity. By adhering to these principles, RIRs uphold the collaborative ethos of Internet governance and ensure policies reflect the needs and priorities of their communities.

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

I fully agree with this principle. Maintaining and publishing comprehensive records of governance, activities, and finances is essential for ensuring transparency, accountability, and trust within the RIR and its community. Publicly accessible records allow stakeholders to assess the RIR's performance, decision-making processes, and financial health, fostering confidence in its operations. This practice is fundamental for good governance and helps ensure that the RIR is held accountable to its members and the broader Internet community.

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

I fully agree with this principle. A community-driven policy development process that is open, transparent, neutral, and publicly documented is essential for maintaining trust, accountability, and inclusivity within the RIR. It ensures that decisions reflect the diverse needs of the community and that stakeholders have a clear understanding of how policies are developed and implemented. This approach strengthens the RIR's legitimacy and helps foster a collaborative environment where all voices can be heard.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

Who constitutes the community? In afrinic currently it seems the non-running-a-network crowd is drowning out those who are.

**Jaco Kroon (Interexcel World Connection)**

---

Yes

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

Goes without saying

**Mark Elkins (Posix Systems)**

---

I strongly agree that an RIR must maintain a community-driven policy development process that is open, transparent, neutral, and publicly documented. This approach ensures that the RIR is accountable, responsive, and inclusive, leading to more effective and legitimate policies. It fosters trust within the community, ensures fairness, and enables the RIR to adapt to the evolving needs of the internet ecosystem. Ultimately, these principles help to safeguard the integrity of the RIR and the broader internet governance ecosystem.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

Good idea

**Raymond Mamattah (EGIGFA)**

---

Agreed. Based on these principles.

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

Transparency in governance is key

**Emmanuel Egbe (Nigeria)**

---

5

**Taye Oyebola (Aso Savings and Loans Plc)**

---

Vital for good governance

**John Haydon (Education)**

---

I strongly oppose this condition. Full transparency in policy discussions could expose sensitive security information, enabling exploitation by malicious actors. A more controlled approach may be more prudent.

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

I agree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

Absolutely

**Danjuma bappa ahmed (Wownetworks limited nigeria)**

---

The community must have input and also driven by the members

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

recommande

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

ICANN or RIRs, both are responsible for maintaining an open, transparent, neutral, and publicly documented approach for policy development, ensuring that the internet remains accessible and equitable for all. Openness allows any interested individual or organization to participate, contributing diverse insights that help shape fair, inclusive policies. Transparency further builds trust by making the entire decision-making process visible, allowing stakeholders to see the rationale behind each decision. Neutrality ensures that no single group or region dominates, keeping the policy process unbiased and aligned with the global community's needs. Public documentation creates a record of all decisions and

discussions, making policy development accountable and traceable. Together, these principles foster an internet governance framework that is fair, reliable, and serves the best interests of a broad, global audience.

**Barkha Manral (Corporate Infotech Pvt Ltd)**

---

Public documentation allows stakeholders to follow decision-making and promotes accountability.

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

Totally agree

**Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)**

---

I agree

**Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)**

---

and easy to understand with the aim of promoting participation

**Lia Solis (personal)**

---

Vital for transparency.

**Luis Caceres (Corporacion Redexcom C.A.)**

---

Should there be certain core RIR principals and processes that aren't subject to community-driven processes?

**Ron da Silva (Network Technologies Globl)**

---

I think this is required of legitimate stakeholder governance

**Mike Burns (IPTrading)**

---

needs a definition of "community-driven" in practice

**Matthew Cowen (dgtlfutures)**

---

Love the "member controlled" vs "community driven" distinction

**Sander Steffann (SJM Steffann Consultancy)**

---

There must be a mandate for supporting appeals, for example that is not possible in APNIC and must be sorted out.

**Jordi Palet Martinez (The IPv6 Company)**

---

## 15.2. Community-Driven - Somewhat Agree (4)

The transparency and documentation is good.

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

agree

**Mohammad Mubarak Alfalasi (Telecommunication and Digital government Regulatory Authority)**

---

No comment

**Kelvin Horng Woei Ong (Propnex)**

---

underscores the importance of community involvement in shaping RIR policies. By emphasizing an open, transparent, neutral, and publicly documented policy development process, it ensures that all stakeholders have the opportunity to participate and contribute to the decision-making process. This promotes inclusivity, fosters a sense of ownership, and ultimately leads to policies that are aligned with the needs and interests of the broader internet community.

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

This principle ensures that an RIR maintains an open, transparent, and neutral community-driven policy development process. It allows all stakeholders to actively participate in shaping policies, fostering trust and engagement. Public documentation ensures accountability and helps maintain fairness. While it requires significant resources to ensure inclusivity and transparency, this approach leads to policies that are effective, widely accepted, and aligned with the community's interests.

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

No comments

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

I believe policies should come from within the RIR (localized policies)

سامي ايت علي ولحسن)المركز الوطني للبحث العلمي و التقني)

---

This condition seems overly demanding. Complete transparency in the policy process could reveal sensitive security information, potentially allowing malicious actors to exploit vulnerabilities. A more controlled approach might better protect critical infrastructure.

**Sidonie Hacking (-)**

---

"community" needs to be properly defined.

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

"Community driven" should be included as one of the list of attributes of the policy development process, and phrased as "substantially community driven".

PAUL WILSON (private individual)

---

better with bottom-up added

Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)

---

### 15.3. Community-Driven - Neutral (3)

A community-driven policy development process must remain open and neutral, but it must also be flexible enough to address local needs. Transparency and public documentation are essential, but these elements should not prevent the process from adapting to new challenges.

Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)

---

Maintaining an open and transparent community-driven policy development process is essential for an RIR, yet the governing body must also have sufficient control to ensure smooth operations, with credit or derecognition requiring member consent.

Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)

---

No comments

Pacharaporn Wangwinyoo (ZIM (Thailand) Co., LTD.)

---

Agree

Hann Jye Ng (MyTeksi Sdn Bhd)

---

This approach to policy development seems overly transparent. Full openness could risk revealing sensitive information about network security, allowing malicious actors to exploit vulnerabilities. A more controlled process could enhance security around critical infrastructure.

Jun Wen (one futures technology sdn bhd)

---

Although transparency in policy development is important, it may also expose discussions that could compromise network security. A more tempered approach could help safeguard sensitive infrastructure information.

Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)

---

Yes

Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)

---

If the RIR member/governing body decides a technocrat approach is preferable, I see no reason to prevent that. I don't believe any governing doing that but would leave it there.

David Lamparter (Westnetz w.V.)



---

consensus-based decision making seems to be important

**Andrei Robachevsky (independent)**

---

The Policies should be developed by resource members.

**Musa Stephen HONLUE (AFRINIC)**

---

#### **15.4. Community-Driven - Somewhat Disagree (2)**

While a principle stating that policy development must be open, transparent, neutral, and publicly documented is necessary (depending on how those terms are interpreted), it is not sufficient. The policy development process must also be accountable to the community that the RIR serves and fit for purpose. That is, the policy developed must meet the need that drives its development, and it is the community that makes that determination.

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

Full openness might expose sensitive discussions about network security, making it easier for malicious actors to exploit potential vulnerabilities. A more controlled process could help protect critical infrastructure information.

**Noel OUPOH (DATACONNECT AFRICA)**

---

While maintaining a community-driven policy development process that is open and transparent is essential for an RIR, the governing body must also have sufficient control to ensure operational efficacy, requiring member consent for credit or derecognition.

**Neonjoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

I find this requirement impractical. Full openness in policy development could expose sensitive security discussions, making it easier for malicious actors to exploit weaknesses. A more controlled framework could help secure vital infrastructure data.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---

#### **15.5. Community-Driven - Strongly Disagree (1)**

While a community-driven policy development process that is open and transparent is critical, the governing body must also consist of elected members who retain sufficient control, requiring consent from all existing members for recognition decisions.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

An RIR should ensure a community-driven policy development process that is open, transparent, and publicly documented. At the same time, the governing body must be elected and maintain enough control to ensure smooth operations, with recognition decisions needing all members' consent.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

A transparent and community-driven policy development process is essential for an RIR. However, it is equally important for the governing body to be elected and maintain effective control, with any recognition decisions requiring unanimous consent.

**Tipu Khan (Zx Online Ltd)**

---

While it is crucial for an RIR to have an open and community-driven policy development process, the governing body must also consist of elected members who ensure operational control, requiring collective consent for any recognition changes.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

Maintaining a community-driven policy development process that is open and transparent is essential for an RIR. However, the governing body must also be composed of elected members who ensure operational control, requiring consent from all members for any recognition decisions.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---

An RIR must prioritize an open and community-driven policy development process. Simultaneously, the governing body should have elected representatives who ensure effective control, with all decisions about recognition requiring agreement from all existing members.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

While a community-driven policy development process that is open and transparent is crucial, the governing body must also be elected and maintain enough control to operate effectively. Any decision to recognize or derecognize an RIR should involve consent from all members.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---

An RIR must foster an open and transparent community-driven policy development process. Additionally, the governing body should consist of elected members who exercise control to facilitate smooth operations, with all decisions regarding recognition needing the consensus of existing members.

**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

I completely disagree with the notion of full transparency. Open discussions might inadvertently expose sensitive security topics, making it easier for bad actors to exploit vulnerabilities. A more guarded approach could better protect crucial infrastructure.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

It is important for an RIR to prioritize an open and transparent policy development process. Simultaneously, the governing body should be composed of elected members who maintain control, necessitating consent from all members for recognition decisions.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

While it is essential for an RIR to have a transparent and community-driven policy development process, the governing body should also consist of elected members who ensure effective control, requiring consent from all members for recognition decisions.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

An RIR should ensure that its policy development process is open and community-driven. At the same time, the governing body must be composed of elected members who maintain operational control, with decisions about recognition needing unanimous consent.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

I feel this expectation is overly demanding. Complete transparency could reveal sensitive security information, potentially creating vulnerabilities. A more controlled approach could better safeguard crucial infrastructure.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

I find this requirement impractical. Full openness in policy development could expose sensitive security discussions, making it easier for malicious actors to identify weaknesses. A more secure framework might better protect critical data.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---

A community-driven policy development process must be both open and transparent, yet the governing body should retain control for operational efficiency. Any changes in RIR recognition should require the consent of all existing members.

**Taslina Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

It's important for an RIR to foster an open and transparent policy development process. However, the governing body must also maintain sufficient control to ensure smooth operations, requiring unanimous consent for decisions regarding crediting or derecognition.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

All governing body members of an RIR ought to be elected by the RIR's Members, ensuring a community-driven approach. The governing body must maintain enough authority for operations, but any changes in recognition require unanimous consent.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

It is crucial for the governing body of an RIR to consist solely of members elected by the RIR's Members to ensure accountability. Any decision about recognizing or derecognizing an RIR, however, needs the agreement of all current members.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

While it's important to uphold a community-driven policy development process, the governing body must ensure effective control for smooth operations. Decisions regarding recognition should require consent from all members.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

An RIR should emphasize an open and transparent policy development process, but the governing body must also have sufficient control to ensure smooth functioning. Any decision to credit or derecognize should require unanimous consent.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

An RIR should emphasize an open and transparent policy development process, but the governing body must also have sufficient control to ensure smooth functioning. Any decision to credit or derecognize should require unanimous consent.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

An RIR should prioritize a community-driven policy development process that is transparent and publicly documented. However, the governing body must maintain sufficient authority for smooth operations.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

It is crucial for an RIR to maintain an open and neutral community-driven policy development process, but the governing body must also have enough control to ensure effective management.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

An RIR must emphasize a community-driven policy development process that is publicly documented and transparent, while also ensuring the governing body retains control for efficiency.

**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

While an RIR should have a community-driven policy development process that is open and transparent, the governing body must also retain enough authority for effective operation.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

Open and transparent policy development is crucial for an RIR, but the governing body must also maintain sufficient control for smooth functioning. Any decision to credit or derecognize an RIR should require the agreement of all members.

**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

A community-driven policy development process that is open and transparent is vital for an RIR. However, the governing body must maintain sufficient control to ensure smooth operations.

**Pham Gia Khiem (Phat Tai Logistics)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Full openness could risk exposing sensitive network security discussions to exploitation. A more cautious approach could be warranted.

**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

It is crucial for an RIR to have an open and transparent policy development process; however, the governing body must also maintain control for smooth operations. Any recognition decisions should involve the consent of all existing members.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

Maintaining a community-driven policy development process that is open and transparent is essential, but the governing body must ensure effective control for operational efficiency. Consent from all members is necessary for recognition decisions.

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

While the policy development process of an RIR must be community-driven and publicly documented, the governing body should also have enough authority to ensure effective operation.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

An RIR must adopt a neutral and community-driven policy development process that is open and transparent, but the governing body should also have enough control for operational effectiveness.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

An RIR should maintain a community-driven policy development process that is open and transparent, but the governing body must retain sufficient authority to facilitate smooth operations.

**Kwan Ke Yue (TBWA/ Kuala Lumpur)**

---

It is important for an RIR to uphold a community-driven policy development process that is both open and publicly documented, while the governing body ensures effective management.

**Sean Carroll (The One Academy)**

---

It is crucial for an RIR to maintain a community-driven policy development process that is transparent and neutral. However, the governing body must have sufficient control to ensure operational effectiveness.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

An RIR must ensure its policy development process is open, transparent, and community-driven, but the governing body should retain adequate control for efficient management.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

It is crucial for RIRs to maintain a community-driven policy development process, but imposing a requirement for an entirely elected governing body may not fully address the complexities of representation. Flexibility is key.

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**

---

An RIR should focus on maintaining a transparent and community-driven policy development process, but the governing body must ensure it has the necessary control for effective operations, requiring member consent for credit or derecognition.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

A community-driven policy development process that is open and transparent is essential for an RIR. At the same time, the governing body must be elected and retain sufficient control to manage operations effectively, ensuring that any changes in recognition are agreed upon by all members.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---

A community-driven policy process must be transparent and neutral, but it also needs to be flexible and responsive to ensure that policies remain effective and relevant over time. Public documentation ensures accountability without impeding responsiveness.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---

While transparency and neutrality are key to policy development, it is also important that the process allows for adaptation to community needs. The policy development process should be inclusive, open, and able to evolve as necessary.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

An RIR should indeed maintain an open and transparent policy development process driven by the community. However, it is equally important for the governing body to be composed of elected members who ensure that operations run smoothly, with any decision on recognition requiring unanimous consent from all members.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---

The policy development process should be neutral, open, and transparent, but it must also be efficient enough to meet the demands of the community. Flexibility ensures that policies are both relevant and responsive.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

While it is crucial for an RIR to have a community-driven policy development process that is open, transparent, and publicly documented, the governing body must also ensure that its members are elected and maintain adequate control for effective operation. Any decisions regarding the recognition or derecognition of an RIR should require the consent of all existing members.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

An open and neutral policy development process that is publicly documented helps ensure transparency, but flexibility is necessary to address evolving needs. The RIR must be able to adapt policies to meet the changing dynamics of the community.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

It is essential that all members of an RIR’s governing body are elected by the RIR’s Members to maintain community representation. The governing body must also ensure smooth operations while requiring consensus among existing members for any changes in recognition status.

**Md Abu Sayeem Siddique Siddique (ServicEngine Ltd)**

---

All members of an RIR’s governing body should be elected by the RIR’s Members to ensure accountability, while the governing body must retain sufficient control to facilitate the RIR’s operations. However, any decision regarding the recognition or derecognition of an RIR requires unanimous consent from all current members.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

While it is essential for RIRs to have a community-driven policy development process, a requirement for an all-elected governing body might not effectively address the diverse needs of the community. Flexibility is critical.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

A robust community-driven policy development process is important, but a strict requirement for all members of the governing body to be elected may overlook the need for diverse representation. Flexibility can enhance effectiveness.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---

An RIR should maintain a community-driven policy development process that is both open and transparent; however, the governing body must retain sufficient control to ensure smooth operations, with credit or derecognition decisions needing member consent.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---

It is vital for an RIR to uphold a community-driven policy development process that is open and transparent, but the governing body must also ensure it has enough control for effective operations, requiring member consent for credit or derecognition decisions.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

An RIR should ensure its policy development process is community-driven, open, and transparent, while the governing body retains sufficient control to ensure effective operations, with any credit or derecognition decisions requiring member consent.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

Maintaining a community-driven policy development process that is open and transparent is essential for an RIR. However, the governing body must also ensure it has the control necessary for smooth operation, requiring unanimous member consent for credit or derecognition.

**Trang Tran (VNPT Technologies)**

---

An RIR must establish a community-driven policy development process that is both open and transparent. However, the governing body needs to retain enough control to ensure operational smoothness, requiring consensus from all members for credit or derecognition actions.

**Minh Hoang (ANSV)**

---

While it is important for an RIR to uphold a community-driven policy development process that is open and transparent, the governing body must maintain sufficient control to ensure effective operations, with all credit or derecognition decisions needing member consent.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**

---

An open, transparent, and neutral policy development process is important, but it should also allow for rapid adaptation to new challenges. Public documentation is important for accountability, but the process must also remain responsive to community needs.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**

---

The policy development process should be neutral and transparent, but it must also ensure that it can effectively respond to the diverse needs of the community. Flexibility is essential to ensure that the policies remain relevant over time.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---

The policy development process should be both open and transparent, but it should also allow for timely responses to urgent matters. Neutrality is important, but the ability to quickly adapt is crucial for addressing the dynamic needs of the community.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

While a neutral, transparent, and community-driven policy development process is vital, the process must also allow for the consideration of rapidly changing technological or social landscapes. Public documentation supports accountability but should not impede responsiveness.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

The policy development process must maintain neutrality and transparency, but it should also be agile enough to quickly respond to changing community needs. Open and inclusive discussions are essential for ensuring that policies remain relevant.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---

Community-driven policies should prioritize openness, neutrality, and transparency, but the process should also be efficient enough to address urgent needs. Public documentation helps accountability, but policies must be flexible to serve the community's best interests.



**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

While it is critical that the policy development process is open, transparent, and neutral, it must also allow for flexibility to reflect the evolving needs of the community. Clear documentation is important, but responsiveness is equally necessary.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---

A community-driven approach to policy development must remain open and neutral, but it should also provide mechanisms for swift responses to emerging issues. Transparency and public documentation must not hinder the agility needed in a dynamic environment.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

Transparency, neutrality, and public documentation are fundamental for policy development, but the process should also be flexible enough to accommodate the input of diverse stakeholders. Community-driven processes should remain adaptable to evolving needs.

**Ryan Khaw (AlSCO Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

A transparent policy development process is important, but requiring all governing body members to be elected may complicate governance. An adaptable approach can better serve community interests.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

An RIR should focus on a community-driven policy development process that is transparent and documented, yet the governing body must ensure it has adequate control to facilitate operations, requiring unanimous consent for credit or derecognition decisions.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Apmic)**

---

Maintaining a community-driven policy development process is essential, but mandating that all governing body members be elected may not capture the complexities of stakeholder engagement. Flexibility is important.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

While it is vital for RIRs to maintain an open and transparent policy development process, requiring that all governing body members be elected could limit effective governance. Flexibility can enhance representation.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

A community-driven policy development process is crucial, but imposing a requirement for an entirely elected governing body may complicate governance. An adaptable model can better address diverse needs.

**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

A community-driven policy development process must be both open and transparent, yet the governing body should retain control for operational efficiency. Any changes in RIR recognition should require the consent of all existing members.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

It's important for an RIR to foster an open and transparent policy development process. However, the governing body must also maintain sufficient control to ensure smooth operations, requiring unanimous consent for decisions regarding crediting or derecognition.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

While it is crucial for an RIR to maintain a community-driven policy process that is transparent, the governing body needs to ensure it has adequate control for smooth operations, requiring member consent for credit or derecognition actions.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**

---

While an RIR should have a community-driven policy development process that is open and transparent, the governing body must ensure it has the necessary control to facilitate smooth operations, with credit or derecognition decisions requiring member consent.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

While it is vital for an RIR to have a community-driven policy development process, requiring all governing body members to be elected could limit the effectiveness of governance. A balanced approach might better serve diverse interests.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

An RIR must maintain an open and transparent community-driven policy development process, but the governing body should have sufficient control to ensure effective operations, with all decisions regarding credit or derecognition requiring member consent.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

While an RIR should prioritize a community-driven policy development process that is transparent and publicly documented, the governing body must also maintain control for smooth operations, requiring member consent for any credit or derecognition decisions.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

Although transparency promotes accountability, full openness could expose vulnerabilities that malicious entities may exploit. A more controlled policy development process may better protect sensitive information.

**Sohel Kabir (Kabir Traders)**

---

Complete transparency in policy development could lead to the exposure of sensitive security vulnerabilities, making it easier for attackers to exploit weaknesses. A more controlled approach may be necessary.

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

While an RIR is expected to maintain a transparent and community-driven policy development process, the governing body must have enough control to facilitate effective operations, requiring member consent for any crediting or derecognition decisions.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---

An RIR's community-driven policy development process should be open and documented, but the governing body must also ensure smooth operations. Decisions regarding credit or derecognition should require consensus among all existing members.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---

While an RIR should maintain an open and transparent policy development process, the governing body must have the necessary control to operate effectively. Decisions to credit or derecognize an RIR should involve the consent of all existing members.

**Catalina Cueca (Manpower)**

---

An RIR must uphold a community-driven policy development process that is open and transparent. Nonetheless, the governing body needs sufficient control to ensure operational efficiency, with any decision regarding credit or derecognition requiring member consent.

**Camilo Riveros (Manpower)**

---

Full transparency in policy development may inadvertently expose sensitive discussions regarding network security, making it easier for malicious actors to take advantage of vulnerabilities. A more controlled process could enhance protection.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

While it is essential for an RIR to maintain a community-driven policy development process that is open, transparent, and publicly documented, the governing body must also ensure that it has sufficient control for the smooth operation of the RIR. Any decision to credit or derecognize an RIR should require the unanimous consent of all existing members.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**

---

While an open and transparent process is essential, complete disclosure could expose sensitive security discussions, making it easier for malicious actors to exploit vulnerabilities. A more controlled approach could protect critical infrastructure.

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

This approach appears overly demanding. Requiring complete transparency in policy development could reveal sensitive security information, enabling malicious actors to exploit vulnerabilities. A more managed process might better protect critical infrastructure.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Full openness in the policy process could risk exposing sensitive network security discussions, making it easier for bad actors to exploit vulnerabilities. A more cautious framework may be warranted.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Full transparency could reveal sensitive network security discussions, allowing bad actors to exploit vulnerabilities. A more controlled approach could better protect crucial data.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

I find this stipulation counterproductive. Full openness might compromise sensitive security discussions, allowing bad actors to exploit weaknesses. A regulated process could offer safer data protection.

**Anh Dang (NASA)**

---

While openness is important, full transparency may compromise sensitive discussions related to network security, making it easier for malicious actors to exploit vulnerabilities. A more controlled approach could protect essential infrastructure.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

Total transparency might inadvertently expose sensitive discussions about network security, increasing the risk of exploitation by malicious entities. A more cautious policy development process could safeguard critical infrastructure.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

Absolute transparency in policy development could reveal sensitive information about network security, potentially leading to exploitation by malicious actors. A more guarded process could enhance the protection of critical infrastructure.

**Prasanta Haloi (Pwd)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Full transparency could expose sensitive network security discussions, allowing bad actors to exploit vulnerabilities. A more controlled approach could better protect crucial data.

**Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)**

---

While community-driven policy development should prioritize transparency, full openness may risk revealing sensitive information that malicious actors could exploit. A more controlled process may safeguard critical assets.

**AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)**

---

Although transparency is important for community trust, excessive openness in policy development could compromise sensitive discussions about security. A more cautious approach may enhance protection against exploitation.

**K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Full transparency could lead to the exposure of sensitive discussions about network security, which could be exploited by malicious actors. A more controlled policy development process could enhance security.

**Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)**

---

While an open policy process is crucial for accountability, complete transparency may expose sensitive network security discussions. A more moderated approach could better safeguard critical infrastructure.

**Fuhui Zhang (University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)**

---

Full openness in policy discussions might inadvertently disclose critical security vulnerabilities, risking exploitation by malicious actors. A more controlled process could enhance the protection of essential infrastructure.

**Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)**

---

Complete transparency in policy development could risk exposing sensitive discussions, potentially aiding malicious actors in exploiting network vulnerabilities. A more moderated approach may be necessary.

**Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)**

---

19. While fostering an open policy process is important, full transparency might compromise sensitive security discussions. A more balanced approach could enhance the protection of critical infrastructure.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

Full transparency in policy development might expose sensitive issues regarding network security, making it easier for malicious entities to take advantage of vulnerabilities. A more guarded approach could better protect critical infrastructure.

**Trabahan Pujari (Paruluniversity)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

This condition feels overly demanding. Complete transparency could risk exposing security information and create vulnerability risks. A more cautious approach may be warranted.

**Juan Mesa (Hispasat)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Enforcing a one-size-fits-all policy may not be effective for addressing the evolving needs of different regions. RIRs should have the autonomy to modify policies based on local circumstances.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

I believe full transparency in policy development could unintentionally expose sensitive discussions about network security, potentially creating vulnerabilities for malicious actors. A more controlled approach may better protect critical infrastructure.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

In my opinion, complete openness could make sensitive discussions about network security susceptible to exploitation by malicious actors. A limited, controlled process might better secure essential infrastructure.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

I strongly oppose this condition. Full transparency in policy discussions could expose sensitive security information, making it easier for malicious actors to exploit. A more controlled approach may be wiser.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Full openness could disclose sensitive discussions, allowing malicious actors to exploit vulnerabilities. A more regulated approach might provide better protection.

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

I feel that total transparency might risk exposing sensitive network security information, which could be exploited. A regulated approach would help better protect critical data.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

I strongly disagree with the idea of full transparency. Open discussions could reveal sensitive security topics, increasing the likelihood of exploitation. A more guarded approach could better protect essential infrastructure.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---

In my view, complete openness could make sensitive discussions about network security vulnerable to exploitation by bad actors. A limited, controlled process might better secure crucial infrastructure.

**Ashrafal Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Full transparency could reveal critical security discussions, creating vulnerabilities. A more managed process may be necessary to protect infrastructure.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

To me, this requirement seems overly rigid. Maintaining complete transparency might expose network security, creating a risk of exploitation. A more controlled approach could offer better security.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Full openness could reveal sensitive discussions, allowing bad actors to exploit vulnerabilities. A more regulated approach might offer better protection.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

I feel this expectation is overly demanding. Complete transparency could expose sensitive security information, potentially making vulnerabilities accessible. A more controlled approach might protect crucial infrastructure.

**Phuc Pham (Advanced Network Systems VietNam Company Limited)**

---

I find this requirement impractical. Full openness in policy development could expose sensitive security discussions, making it easier for bad actors to find weaknesses. A more secure framework could help protect critical data.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

I'm firmly against complete transparency in this case. Exposing all discussions could lead to network security vulnerabilities that bad actors might exploit. A more managed approach could provide necessary protection.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

To me, this level of openness feels excessive. Full transparency could reveal network security information, risking exploitation. A more controlled process could strengthen infrastructure security.

**Giang Nguyen (NASA)**

---

I believe full transparency in policy development could unintentionally expose sensitive discussions about network security, potentially creating vulnerabilities for malicious actors. A more controlled approach may better protect critical infrastructure.

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

Disagree

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---

I strongly disagree with the idea of full transparency. Open discussions could expose sensitive security topics, making vulnerabilities easier to exploit. A more guarded approach could better protect essential infrastructure.

**Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)**

---

In my view, complete openness could risk sensitive discussions on network security being exploited by bad actors. A more limited, controlled process could better secure crucial infrastructure.

**Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)**

---

I believe that full transparency in policy development could unintentionally expose sensitive discussions on network security, potentially opening vulnerabilities to malicious actors. A more controlled process might better safeguard critical infrastructure.

**Pooja Gopi (DM Digital Marketing)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Full transparency could expose sensitive discussions on network security, allowing malicious actors to exploit any vulnerabilities. A more controlled process may better protect crucial infrastructure data.

**Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)**

---

This stipulation seems counterproductive. Complete openness might compromise sensitive discussions about network security, making it easier for malicious individuals to exploit weaknesses. A more regulated process could be safer for critical infrastructure information.

**Quyn Kim (VNPAY)**

---

I find that complete openness may pose risks by revealing sensitive discussions about network security, which could be exploited by malicious actors. A more limited and controlled process could help secure critical infrastructure information.

**Shahedul Islam Bhuiyan (Royal Green Limited)**

---

While an open and transparent policy development process is essential, it could also expose sensitive information that malicious actors may use to exploit vulnerabilities. A more controlled environment may enhance security.

**Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)**

---

Question 32&33 Community-Driven An RIR must maintain a community-driven policy development process that is open, transparent, neutral, and publicly documented. 1- Strongly Disagree I believe that complete openness in the policy development process could risk exposing sensitive discussions related to network security, potentially allowing malicious actors to exploit vulnerabilities. A more controlled approach might better protect critical infrastructure information.

**Anjan Deka (HDFC)**

---



I believe that complete openness in the policy development process could risk exposing sensitive discussions related to network security, potentially allowing malicious actors to exploit vulnerabilities. A more controlled approach might better protect critical infrastructure information.

**Ketan Parmar (Bids Info Global)**

---

An open policy development process is vital, yet excessive transparency could lead to the exposure of sensitive security discussions, making it easier for attackers to exploit vulnerabilities. A more balanced approach may be necessary.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

Maintaining full transparency in policy development could risk disclosing sensitive discussions that may be exploited by malicious entities. A moderated approach might better protect crucial infrastructure information.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

1. While transparency is important, complete openness could inadvertently reveal sensitive information about network security, exposing vulnerabilities to malicious actors. A more controlled process may safeguard critical infrastructure.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---

This should be a matter for the RIR concerned. There's no inherent reason why there has to be a community driven process, and in some cases this has led to inconsistencies that have been exploited by number resource registrants. There could just as well be globally or nationally agreed policies - whatever is required for local circumstances.

**Kevin Meynell (Individual)**

---

## 16. Neutrality

---

An RIR must operate and apply its policies in a manner that is neutral and consistent.

### 16.1. Neutrality - Strongly Agree (5)

Essential to the social license of the system to operate.

**Jordan Carter (auDA)**

---

Agree

**Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle, as neutrality and consistency are essential for maintaining the credibility, fairness, and effectiveness of an RIR. Here's an analysis: Reasons for Agreement

1. Ensures Fairness and Equity • Neutrality guarantees that the RIR does not favor any particular group, region, or entity, and ensures that all members are treated equitably. Consistency in applying policies helps prevent bias and ensures that similar situations are handled similarly, fostering fairness in the allocation and management of resources.

2. Builds Trust and Credibility • An RIR that operates neutrally and consistently is more likely to earn the trust of its members. Stakeholders are more likely to engage with and support an organization they believe is impartial and follows clear, predictable rules.

3. Prevents Conflicts of Interest • Neutrality ensures that the RIR avoids conflicts of interest that could arise if it were to favor certain stakeholders or parties. This helps to protect the integrity of the RIR's operations and policies.

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

Nothing to add or detract

**Brian Longwe (Converged Technology Networks)**

---

yes.

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

policies can't neutral all the time. it should be for the good of the community and Internet

**Aftab Siddiqui (AFTABSIDDIQI-AU)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle. Regular audits by an external and independent auditor are crucial for ensuring that an RIR continues to comply with ICP-2 and adheres to high standards of governance and financial integrity. Independent audits provide an objective assessment of the RIR's operations, identifying potential issues and ensuring transparency. This process helps build trust with stakeholders and ensures that the RIR is fulfilling its responsibilities in a consistent and accountable manner.

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle. Neutrality and consistency in policy application are critical for maintaining fairness, trust, and stability within an RIR. By ensuring that policies are applied without bias and in a predictable manner, the RIR can build confidence among its members and stakeholders. Consistency also helps prevent disputes and promotes a level playing field, enabling the RIR to effectively serve the diverse needs of its community.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

Any rules based system must be applied consistently to maintain respect for the system. Any departures need to have sound justification.

**Narelle Clark (Internet Association of Australia)**

---

Yes

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

Noting that such neutrality can be influenced by the specific national jurisdiction in which the RIR operates.

**Brian Nisbet (HEAnet CLG)**

---

where you can take money out of the picture, that would be great

**Hendrik Visage (HeViS.Co Systems Pty Ltd)**

---

Of course.

**Mark Elkins (Posix Systems)**

---

No comments

**Pacharaporn Wangwinyoo (ZIM (Thailand) Co., LTD.)**

---

I strongly agree that an RIR must operate and apply its policies in a manner that is neutral and consistent. This approach fosters fairness, trust, and transparency, while ensuring the stability and legitimacy of the RIR's operations. It also promotes cooperation, compliance, and long-term sustainability, both within the RIR's community and within the broader global internet governance structure. Neutrality and consistency are fundamental to the RIR's ability to effectively manage internet resources and maintain the confidence of its stakeholders.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

APNIC is operating in this spirit.

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

I strongly oppose this condition. Insisting on complete neutrality and consistency could prevent RIRs from effectively addressing the dynamic needs of different regions. A more flexible approach to policy application is needed.

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

I agree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

It should be neutral

**Danjuma bappa ahmed (Wownetworks limited nigeria)**

---

yes

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

tres souhaite

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

It fosters equality and ensures that policies are applied fairly

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

Totally agree

**Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)**

---

I would like the RIR to apply its policies neutral with the exception when there is clear indication that a policy is being abused. Then there should probably be some kind of process to stop people abusing this until the loophole is fixed.

**Sebastian Wiesinger (noris network AG)**

---

...and open

**Wolfgang Tremmel (Private Citizen)**

---

convenient for all multiple stakeholders

**Lia Solis (personal)**

---

No preferences.

**Luis Caceres (Corporacion Redexcom C.A.)**

---

The policies must also be lawful, reasonable, proportionate and grounded in technical considerations over political nonsense. RIRs must further respect the legitimate commercial interests of members.

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

Fairness is a hallmark of good governance

**Mike Burns (IPTrading)**

---

---

Very important. But in the event any action by an RIR is questions, who adjudicates violation of this principle- the NRO or courts with jurisdiction over the RIR?

**Andrew Gallo (The George Washington University)**

---

Consider changing "neutral" for "impartial" as neutral could be interpreted as being between two extremes while impartial means "not favoring one more than another"

**Leo Vegoda (And Polus LLC)**

---

There is an argument that existing community agreed polices don't always do this.

**Kevin Meynell (Individual)**

---

simple agreement

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

The audit process must verify this. I can show several cases, where is not happening correctly. PDP is vague or operated by the chairs "in their own way", nobody seems to care, so the audit must be able to receive community inputs to verify the claims.

**Jordi Palet Martinez (The IPv6 Company)**

---

## **16.2. Neutrality - Somewhat Agree (4)**

To ensure fairness

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

agree

**Mohammad Mubarak Alfalasi (Telecommunication and Digital government Regulatory Authority)**

---

There should be fairness

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

RIRs maintain a neutral stance and avoid discriminatory practices in their operations and policy implementation. By operating in a consistent and impartial manner, RIRs can promote fairness and equity in the allocation and management of internet number resources. This neutrality is essential for fostering a level playing field and ensuring that the internet remains accessible and open to all.

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

This principle ensures that an RIR operates neutrally and consistently, treating all stakeholders fairly and equitably. Neutrality prevents favoritism, while consistency provides reliability and stability, fostering trust. While balancing conflicting interests can be challenging, clear documentation and adaptable policies help maintain fairness. Overall, this principle strengthens the RIR's integrity and credibility, ensuring transparency and predictability in its operations

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

The neutrality principle is critical but doesn't explicitly address mechanisms for ensuring unbiased policy application

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

4

**Taye Oyebola (Aso Savings and Loans Plc)**

---

An RIR should have the flexibility to ignore or reject DoS style requests, or actions which harm the RIR / community.

**Warren Kumari (Auth-Servers)**

---

Once again this is vital

**John Haydon (Education)**

---

This condition seems overly demanding. Requiring RIRs to implement policies in an entirely neutral and consistent manner may not be feasible given the diverse and changing needs of their regions. Flexibility in policy adaptation.

**Sidonie Hacking ('-)**

---

Yes

**Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)**

---

I agree

**Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)**

---

### **16.3. Neutrality - Neutral (3)**

Mandating that an RIR maintain complete neutrality and consistency in its policies may not accommodate the unique challenges faced by different regions. Flexibility in policy application is vital.

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---

This approach appears excessively demanding. Mandating that policies be applied in a strictly neutral and consistent way might undermine the ability of RIRs to address the diverse needs of their regions. Flexibility is crucial for effective policy implementation.

**Jun Wen (one futures technology sdn bhd)**

---

While it's important for RIRs to operate neutrally, a one-size-fits-all approach may not cater to the diverse needs of different areas. Policies should be adaptable to reflect local conditions.

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

In reality, since a significant portion of an RIR's funding comes from a small number of large members with substantial resources, it is challenging for an RIR to maintain true neutrality.

**Chenyang Gao (NoPKT LLC)**

---

#### **16.4. Neutrality - Somewhat Disagree (2)**

As a proposed principle, "neutrality" is too vague and needs context (neutral with respect to what? How is that measured?). Perhaps "An RIR must apply policies in a way that are consistent (policies are applied in the same way in similar situations, creating predictable outcomes), objective (decisions within the policy are based on clear, predefined criteria or evidence, not on emotions, personal biases, or external influence), and impartial (all those impacted by policy are treated equally, without favoritism or discrimination)."

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

My comments to the previous item apply here too.

**Andrew Sullivan (N/A)**

---

While neutrality and consistency in policy application are valuable, RIRs should not be bound by these principles if they limit their ability to be responsive to local conditions. Flexibility in policy implementation is key to addressing diverse regional needs.

**Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)**

---

Requiring an RIR to apply policies in an entirely neutral and consistent way may overlook the diverse and evolving needs of different regions. RIRs should have the flexibility to adapt their policies to address local circumstances, rather than being bound by a rigid, one-size-fits-all approach.

**Noel OUPOH (DATACONNECT AFRICA)**

---

Mandating that an RIR apply its policies in a strictly neutral and consistent fashion may overlook the distinctive and evolving needs of various regions. Flexibility in policy application is vital for effective governance.

**Neonjyoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

I find this requirement impractical. Insisting on complete neutrality and consistency may overlook the unique challenges faced by various regions. RIRs should be allowed the flexibility to adjust their policies to fit local circumstances.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---

**16.5. Neutrality - Strongly Disagree (1)**

A strict requirement for neutrality and consistency in policy application might not consider the specific challenges faced by various areas. Flexibility is essential for effective governance.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

Mandating that an RIR maintain a neutral and consistent approach in policy application may not reflect the realities of diverse regions. RIRs should be afforded the flexibility to adjust their policies accordingly.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

Requiring an RIR to apply its policies in a wholly neutral and consistent way could restrict its ability to adapt to changing regional needs. Flexibility is key for effective service delivery.

**Tipu Khan (Zx Online Ltd)**

---

Insisting on a completely neutral and consistent application of policies may overlook the unique challenges faced by different regions. Flexibility in policy application is essential for effective governance.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

Insisting on a completely neutral and consistent application of policies may not reflect the unique circumstances faced by different RIRs. Flexibility in policy adaptation is critical to serving local communities effectively.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---

Requiring an RIR to apply its policies in a wholly neutral and consistent way may not adequately address the diverse and evolving needs of different regions. Flexibility is essential for effective policy implementation.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

A strict requirement for neutrality and consistency in policy application might overlook the complexities and changing needs of various regions. RIRs should have the flexibility to adjust their policies accordingly.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---



Mandating that an RIR apply its policies in an entirely neutral and consistent manner could ignore the unique and evolving circumstances of different areas. RIRs should be able to adapt their policies to address local needs.

**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Enforcing a rigidly neutral and consistent policy application may ignore the varying and evolving needs of different areas. RIRs should be able to adapt their policies to better serve local conditions.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

Mandating that an RIR apply its policies in an entirely neutral and consistent manner could limit its capacity to address the unique circumstances of various regions. Flexibility in policy adaptation is vital.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

Mandating that an RIR maintain a neutral and consistent approach in policy application could hinder its ability to address the diverse needs of different communities. Flexibility in policy adaptation is vital.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

Requiring an RIR to apply its policies in a strictly neutral and consistent manner might not accommodate the unique and evolving circumstances of various regions. Flexibility is essential for effective service delivery.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

This condition seems overly rigid. Insisting on RIRs to apply policies in a strictly neutral and consistent way may not be feasible due to the shifting and diverse needs of different regions. Flexibility is necessary for effective policy adaptation.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. Requiring RIRs to enforce strict neutrality and consistency might fail to take into account the unique challenges faced by different regions. RIRs should have the freedom to tailor policies to local needs.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---

Requiring rigid neutrality and consistency in policy application could limit an RIR's ability to respond to the specific needs of different communities. Flexibility should be allowed to adapt policies as needed.

**Taslima Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

Mandating that an RIR apply its policies in a strictly neutral and consistent manner may not reflect the diverse and changing needs of various regions. Flexibility in policy application is crucial for effective governance.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

Mandating rigid neutrality in policy application could prevent RIRs from addressing the specific needs of different regions, emphasizing the importance of flexibility in governance.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

This requirement may not account for the unique challenges of various regions, as strict neutrality could hinder an RIR's ability to adapt its policies to local circumstances.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

Mandating that an RIR apply its policies in a strictly neutral and consistent manner may hinder its ability to respond to local circumstances. Flexibility in policy application is essential for effective service delivery.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

Insisting on a completely neutral and consistent application of policies may not account for the diverse and evolving needs of different communities. Flexibility is crucial for effective governance.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

Insisting on a completely neutral and consistent application of policies may not account for the diverse and evolving needs of different communities. Flexibility is crucial for effective governance.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

Expecting an RIR to operate its policies in an entirely neutral and consistent manner may hinder its ability to respond to local challenges. Flexibility is vital for effective governance.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

Mandating that an RIR maintain strict neutrality and consistency in policy application might not address the varied needs of local communities. Adaptability is crucial for effective service delivery.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

Requiring complete neutrality and consistency in policy application may overlook the diverse circumstances of different regions. RIRs should have the freedom to adapt their policies accordingly.

**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

Expecting an RIR to apply its policies in a strictly neutral and consistent way may not consider the evolving needs of various regions. Flexibility is essential for effective governance.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

Mandating that an RIR apply its policies in a fully neutral and consistent way may hinder its ability to address the unique needs of different regions. Flexibility is essential for effective policy implementation.

**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

Imposing a requirement for strict neutrality and consistency in policy application may not be practical for all RIRs. Policies should be adaptable to local circumstances to ensure effectiveness.

**Pham Gia Khiem (Phat Tai Logistics)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. A rigid approach to policy application might hinder RIRs from addressing the diverse and evolving needs of their communities. Flexibility is key to effective policy implementation.

**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

Mandating that an RIR operate under fully neutral and consistent policies may limit its capacity to address the diverse needs of its regions. Flexibility in policy application is essential for effective governance.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

Requiring rigid neutrality and consistency in policy application could overlook the unique circumstances faced by various regions. RIRs should have the flexibility to tailor their policies accordingly.

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

Imposing a requirement for neutral and consistent policy application may not acknowledge the evolving needs of different regions. RIRs should have the flexibility to adapt their policies accordingly.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

An RIR's obligation to enforce policies neutrally and consistently may not reflect the specific challenges faced by different regions. Flexibility in policy implementation is vital.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

Expecting an RIR to maintain strict neutrality and consistency in policy application may not align with the unique needs of various communities. Adaptable policies are crucial for effective service.

**Kwan Ke Yue (TBWA/ Kuala Lumpur)**

---

Requiring RIRs to apply policies in a completely neutral and consistent manner may overlook the complexities of local contexts. Flexibility is key to meeting diverse regional needs.

**Sean Carroll (The One Academy)**

---

Imposing strict requirements for neutral and consistent policy application may not reflect the realities of various regions. RIRs should have the flexibility to tailor policies to local conditions.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

An RIR's obligation to apply policies neutrally and consistently may not consider the evolving needs of diverse regions. Adaptable policies are crucial for meeting local challenges.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

Requiring an RIR to apply policies in a fully neutral and consistent way could hinder its ability to respond to the diverse needs of different regions. Flexibility is essential for effective governance.

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**

---

Requiring an RIR to apply its policies in a strictly neutral and consistent way could limit its responsiveness to the diverse needs of different regions. An adaptable policy framework is essential.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

Insisting on a strictly neutral and consistent application of policies may not consider the varying and evolving needs of different regions. RIRs should be allowed the flexibility to tailor their policies to local circumstances.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---

Although neutrality and consistency in policy application are valuable, they should not prevent RIRs from addressing local challenges. Flexibility is essential to ensure that policies are effective and relevant in diverse contexts.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---

The application of policies in a neutral and consistent way may not always reflect the unique needs of different regions. RIRs should be free to adjust policies to meet regional requirements rather than applying a blanket approach.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

Mandating that an RIR apply its policies in a completely neutral and consistent way might overlook the diverse and changing needs of different areas. RIRs should have the flexibility to adapt policies to better serve local communities.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---

While neutrality and consistency are important for fairness, enforcing them too rigidly might undermine an RIR's ability to address the needs of its region. A more flexible approach would allow RIRs to tailor policies for local conditions.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

Requiring an RIR to apply its policies in a strictly neutral and consistent manner may not account for the unique and evolving needs of various regions. Flexibility in policy application is essential to address local circumstances effectively.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

Requiring strict consistency and neutrality in policy application could limit an RIR's ability to meet the specific needs of diverse regions. RIRs should be allowed to apply policies flexibly to accommodate local requirements.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

This requirement could overlook the unique circumstances of different regions, as strict neutrality may hinder an RIR's ability to adapt its policies to meet local demands effectively.

**Md Abu Sayeem Siddique Siddique (ServicEngine Ltd)**

---

Requiring an RIR to apply its policies in a strictly neutral and consistent manner may not account for the diverse and evolving needs of various regions. Flexibility to adapt policies to local contexts is essential for effective governance.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

While neutrality and consistency in policy application are essential, imposing rigid requirements may hinder an RIR's ability to adapt to local circumstances. Flexibility is necessary for effective governance.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

An RIR's commitment to neutral and consistent policy application is important, but demanding strict adherence may overlook the unique challenges of different regions. Flexibility is key.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---

Mandating strict neutrality and consistency in policy application may not reflect the varied circumstances of different regions. RIRs should have the flexibility to adapt their policies accordingly.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---

Requiring an RIR to apply its policies in an entirely consistent and neutral manner may not align with the diverse and changing needs of different regions. Flexibility is essential for effective governance.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

The expectation that an RIR apply its policies in a uniform and neutral manner may overlook the varied and evolving needs of different regions. Flexibility in policy application is crucial for effective governance.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

Mandating that an RIR apply its policies in a strictly neutral and consistent way may hinder its ability to respond to the diverse needs of different regions. A more adaptable approach is necessary.

**Trang Tran (VNPT Technologies)**

---

Mandating that an RIR maintain strict neutrality and consistency in policy application may not align with the unique challenges faced by various regions. Flexibility is vital for addressing local circumstances effectively.

**Minh Hoang (ANSV)**

---

Requiring complete neutrality and consistency in policy application could overlook the distinct and evolving needs of different regions. Flexibility in how policies are applied is crucial for effective governance.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**

---

While neutrality and consistency in policy application are valuable, they should not hinder RIRs from addressing local challenges. RIRs should have the flexibility to modify policies to ensure they are appropriate for each region's specific needs.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**

---

A neutral and consistent policy approach may not always align with the specific requirements of different regions. RIRs should have the autonomy to adapt their policies to local conditions, ensuring they remain effective in diverse contexts.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---

Neutrality and consistency are important, but they should not come at the cost of flexibility. RIRs should be able to adjust their policies to meet the unique challenges and circumstances of each region they serve.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

A neutral and consistent approach to policy application may not always be the most effective way to address the varying needs of different regions. RIRs should have the ability to tailor policies to their specific community's needs.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

Neutrality and consistency in policy application are essential, but overly rigid enforcement could stifle an RIR's ability to adapt to the changing needs of different regions. Policies should be flexible enough to accommodate local diversity.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---

While applying policies in a neutral and consistent manner is important, RIRs should not be constrained by these principles if it prevents them from addressing regional variations. Flexibility in policy application should be encouraged to better meet local needs.

**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

Enforcing strict neutrality and consistency across all regions may prevent RIRs from addressing local issues effectively. RIRs should be allowed to adapt their policies in a way that best serves the unique circumstances of each region.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---

Requiring rigid neutrality and consistency in policy application may hinder an RIR's ability to be responsive to local needs. RIRs should have the flexibility to adjust policies based on regional differences and evolving requirements.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

While consistency and neutrality are key, a rigid application of these principles may overlook the specific needs of different regions. RIRs should be able to adapt policies to the unique needs of their communities without being constrained by a one-size-fits-all model.

**Ryan Khaw (Alsco Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

Requiring an RIR to apply policies in a completely neutral and consistent way may not consider the diverse needs of various regions. Flexibility in policy application is crucial for effectiveness.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

The requirement for an RIR to operate in a purely neutral and consistent manner may not reflect the diverse circumstances of various regions. RIRs should have the ability to adapt policies to meet local needs.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Aptic)**

---

While it is vital for RIRs to apply policies neutrally and consistently, a rigid requirement may not accommodate the diverse realities faced by various regions. Flexibility can enhance effectiveness.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Requiring absolute neutrality and consistency in policy application might limit an RIR's ability to respond to the evolving needs of different regions. Flexibility is crucial for effective governance.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

While it is essential for RIRs to operate neutrally and consistently, strict adherence to this principle may not allow for necessary adaptations to local contexts. Flexibility is key.

**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

Requiring rigid neutrality and consistency in policy application could limit an RIR's ability to respond to the specific needs of different communities. Flexibility should be allowed to adapt policies as needed.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

Mandating that an RIR apply its policies in a strictly neutral and consistent manner may not reflect the diverse and changing needs of various regions. Flexibility in policy application is crucial for effective governance.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

Requiring an RIR to operate with complete neutrality and consistency in policy application may hinder its ability to respond to the unique circumstances of different regions. Flexibility is key.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**

---

The requirement for an RIR to apply its policies in a purely neutral and consistent manner may not reflect the unique challenges of various regions. Flexibility in policy application is essential for effective governance.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

Mandating that an RIR operates with complete neutrality and consistency may not account for the diverse challenges faced by different regions. Policies should be adaptable to address local needs effectively.

**Jeremy Cheong (Infineon technologies)**

---

Requiring an RIR to apply policies in a fully neutral and consistent manner might not reflect the varying circumstances across regions. Flexibility in policy application is necessary to meet local challenges.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

Requiring an RIR to operate with complete neutrality and consistency in policy application may not reflect the unique realities of various regions. Flexibility in policy adaptation is essential.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

Expecting an RIR to apply its policies in an entirely neutral and consistent manner may not account for the diverse and changing needs of different regions. A flexible approach is necessary for effective governance.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

While it is vital for RIRs to maintain neutral and consistent policies, a rigid framework may not accommodate the diverse requirements of different regions. Flexibility is important for effective policy application.

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Expecting an RIR to apply its policies in a completely neutral and uniform way may not accommodate the diverse and evolving needs of different regions. Flexibility is necessary for effective policy application.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---

Mandating that an RIR operate in a strictly neutral and consistent manner may overlook the unique needs of various regions. Flexibility in policy application is vital for addressing local challenges effectively.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---



Requiring absolute neutrality and consistency in policy application may not align with the diverse and changing requirements of different regions. RIRs should have the flexibility to tailor their policies to local circumstances.

**Catalina Cueca (Manpower)**

---

The expectation that an RIR apply its policies in an entirely neutral and consistent way might not account for the unique and evolving needs of different regions. Flexibility in policy application is crucial for effective governance.

**Camilo Riveros (Manpower)**

---

Requiring an RIR to enforce policies with absolute neutrality and consistency could overlook the diverse needs of different regions. Flexibility in policy application is essential for addressing local circumstances effectively.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

Requiring an RIR to apply its policies in a completely neutral and consistent manner may not accommodate the diverse and changing needs of different regions. RIRs should have the flexibility to adjust their policies to better meet local circumstances.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**

---

Requiring total neutrality and consistency in the application of policies by RIRs could disregard the unique and changing needs of different regions. A flexible approach would allow RIRs to respond more effectively to local conditions.

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

This condition appears overly strict. Requiring policies to be applied in a neutral and consistent manner may not cater to the unique circumstances of different regions. RIRs should have the flexibility to adapt their policies accordingly.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. A rigid approach to policy application could hinder RIRs from addressing the diverse and evolving needs of their communities. Flexibility is key to effective policy implementation.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Enforcing a one-size-fits-all approach may not serve the diverse and evolving needs of different regions. RIRs need the flexibility to tailor their policies to meet local challenges better.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

This requirement seems impractical. Mandating unwavering neutrality and consistency in policy application could overlook the unique needs of different areas. RIRs should have the flexibility to adapt policies to local circumstances.

Insisting on absolute neutrality and uniformity in policy application for RIRs might overlook the unique dynamics of different areas. A flexible policy framework would better serve local needs.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

Mandating that RIRs maintain complete neutrality and consistency in their policies may not take into account the diverse and evolving needs across regions. RIRs should be free to adapt their policies to local circumstances.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

Insisting on fully neutral and consistent policies from RIRs may overlook the diverse and evolving requirements of various areas. RIRs should have the flexibility to adapt their policies to local realities.

**Prasanta Haloi (Pwd)**

---

I find this approach too rigid. Mandating RIRs to apply policies in a strictly neutral and consistent manner may not fully address the diverse challenges faced by different regions. Flexibility is essential for effective governance.

**Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)**

---

Enforcing strict neutrality and consistency in policy application could hinder RIRs from responding to the evolving needs of various regions. Flexibility in policy formulation is essential for effective governance.

**AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)**

---

While RIRs should strive for consistency and neutrality, a rigid approach may not adequately address the diverse needs of different communities. Policies should be adaptable to local environments.

**K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. A rigid commitment to neutrality and consistency may hinder RIRs from effectively addressing the unique circumstances of different areas. Flexibility is essential for local governance.

**Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)**

---

Although neutrality and consistency are critical in policy application, enforcing them too rigidly may overlook the unique circumstances of various regions. RIRs should be flexible enough to adjust their policies.

**Fuhui Zhang (University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)**

---

While it's important for RIRs to apply policies neutrally, a strict one-size-fits-all approach may not serve the diverse needs of different regions. Flexibility in policy adaptation is crucial.

**Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)**

---

---

While neutrality and consistency in policy enforcement are important, a rigid approach could overlook the specific needs of different regions. RIRs should have the ability to adapt their policies accordingly.

**Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)**

---

19. Enforcing absolute neutrality and consistency in policy application may fail to address the unique circumstances of various regions. RIRs need the flexibility to tailor their policies to local requirements.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

Full transparency in policy development might expose sensitive issues regarding network security, making it easier for malicious entities to take advantage of vulnerabilities. A more guarded approach could better protect critical infrastructure.

**Trabahan Pujari (Paruluniversity)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

This condition feels overly rigid. Mandating strict neutrality and consistency in policy application could prevent RIRs from addressing specific regional needs. Flexibility is key to effective governance.

**Juan Mesa (Hispasat)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Requiring detailed records of governance and finances could shift an RIR's focus from its main tasks. Flexibility in transparency standards is crucial to meet local needs effectively.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

I believe that requiring an RIR to enforce policies with strict neutrality and consistency doesn't allow for the unique and evolving needs of different regions. RIRs should be empowered to adapt policies to local circumstances rather than following a rigid, uniform approach.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Enforcing a one-size-fits-all approach may not meet the diverse and evolving needs of different regions. RIRs need the freedom to adjust policies to better address local challenges.

**Pornpipat Kitireanglarp (ZERIWELLPLUS Co., Ltd.)**

---

I find this requirement counterproductive. Mandating RIRs to apply policies with strict neutrality and consistency could fail to address the varied needs of different regions. It's important to allow for flexibility to effectively respond to local circumstances.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

I strongly oppose this condition. Requiring strict neutrality and consistency might limit RIRs from responding effectively to the changing needs of different regions. More flexibility in policy application is necessary.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. A rigid, neutral, and consistent policy approach may fail to address the distinct needs of different regions. RIRs should have the freedom to adjust policies based on local needs.

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

This requirement feels inflexible. Insisting on total neutrality and consistency in policy enforcement might overlook the specific and changing needs of different regions. RIRs need the ability to adapt policies to local contexts.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Enforcing a strictly neutral and consistent policy approach could ignore the distinct and changing needs of different regions. RIRs should have the ability to adjust policies to serve local conditions better.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---

I find this stipulation counterproductive. Mandating RIRs to apply policies entirely neutrally and consistently may fail to address the diverse needs of different regions. Flexibility is essential for effectively meeting local circumstances.

**Ashraful Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. A strict requirement for neutrality and consistency could ignore the diverse and evolving needs of local communities. RIRs should have the flexibility to adapt policies to suit regional contexts.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

This stipulation seems excessively rigid. Enforcing strict neutrality and consistency could limit RIRs from addressing the varied needs of their regions. Flexibility in policy is essential for effective governance.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. A rigid approach to neutrality and consistency might ignore the unique needs of different regions. RIRs need the autonomy to adapt policies based on local contexts.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

This condition feels overly demanding. Requiring RIRs to implement policies in a strictly neutral and consistent manner may not be feasible, given the diverse and changing needs of their regions. Flexibility in policy adaptation is essential.

**Phuc Pham (Advanced Network Systems VietNam Company Limited)**

---

I find this requirement impractical. Insisting on complete neutrality and consistency might overlook the unique challenges faced by different regions. RIRs should have the flexibility to adjust policies to fit local circumstances.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Demanding strict neutrality and consistency could prevent RIRs from responding effectively to the specific and changing needs of different regions. Flexibility in policies is crucial for adapting to local contexts.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

This approach seems overly demanding. Requiring strict neutrality and consistency in policy application may prevent RIRs from adequately addressing the diverse needs within their regions. Flexibility is vital for effective policy implementation.

**Giang Nguyen (NASA)**

---

I find this stipulation counterproductive. Mandating RIRs to apply policies entirely neutrally and consistently may fail to address the diverse needs of different regions. Flexibility is essential for effectively meeting local circumstances.

**Alex Kwan (Wiplus Malaysia)**

---

I believe that requiring an RIR to enforce policies with strict neutrality and consistency doesn't allow for the unique and evolving needs of different regions. RIRs should be empowered to adapt policies to local circumstances rather than following a rigid, uniform approach.

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

Disagree

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Enforcing rigidly neutral and consistent policy application can ignore the varying and evolving needs of different areas. RIRs should be able to adjust their policies to better serve local conditions.

**Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)**

---

I find this stipulation counterproductive. Requiring RIRs to apply policies entirely neutrally and consistently might not reflect the diverse needs of different regions. Flexibility in adapting policies is essential for effectively addressing local circumstances.

**Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Enforcing a one-size-fits-all approach may not serve the diverse and evolving needs of various regions. RIRs should have the flexibility to tailor their policies to better meet local challenges.

**Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)**

---

This requirement seems impractical. Mandating unwavering neutrality and consistency in policy application could overlook the unique needs of different areas. RIRs should be flexible enough to adapt their policies to local circumstances.

**Quyn Kim (VNPAY)**

---

I find this stipulation counterproductive. Requiring RIRs to apply policies in an entirely neutral and consistent manner may not reflect the diverse needs of different regions. Flexibility in policy adaptation is essential for addressing local circumstances effectively.

**Shahedul Islam Bhuiyan (Royal Green Limited)**

---

While consistent and neutral policy application is vital, a rigid framework may neglect the diverse requirements of various regions. RIRs should have the flexibility to adjust their policies as needed.

**Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)**

---

Question 34&35 Neutrality An RIR must operate and apply its policies in a manner that is neutral and consistent. 1- Strongly Disagree I believe that mandating an RIR to apply policies in a strictly neutral and consistent manner may not account for the diverse and changing needs of various regions. RIRs should be flexible enough to adapt their policies to local circumstances instead of adhering to a rigid, one-size-fits-all approach.

**Anjan Deka (HDFC)**

---

I believe that mandating an RIR to apply policies in a strictly neutral and consistent manner may not account for the diverse and changing needs of various regions. RIRs should be flexible enough to adapt their policies to local circumstances instead of adhering to a rigid, one-size-fits-all approach.

**Ketan Parmar (Bids Info Global)**

---

Although neutrality and consistency are important principles, a strict application of these might overlook the diverse needs of regions. RIRs should have the latitude to modify policies to address local challenges.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

Requiring absolute neutrality and consistency in policy application could fail to consider the unique circumstances of different regions. RIRs should be allowed to adapt their policies to meet local needs effectively.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

1. While neutrality and consistency in policy application are essential, enforcing a rigid standard may not accommodate the diverse and changing needs of various regions. RIRs should have the flexibility to tailor their policies accordingly.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---

# 17. Transparency

An RIR must maintain and publish comprehensive records of its governance, activities, and finances.

## 17.1. Transparency - Strongly Agree (5)

This is essential for demonstrating integrity and trustworthiness.

**Eric Edora (TELUS Communications Inc.)**

Agree

**Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)**

I strongly agree with this principle, as maintaining and publishing comprehensive records of governance, activities, and finances is vital for ensuring transparency, accountability, and trust within the RIR’s community. Here’s an analysis: Reasons for Agreement

1. Promotes Transparency • Publishing records related to governance, activities, and finances allows members and stakeholders to understand how decisions are made, how resources are allocated, and how the RIR is performing. Transparency is essential for building trust and preventing any perception of mismanagement or favoritism.
2. Ensures Accountability • By documenting and publishing key aspects of its operations, an RIR holds itself accountable to its members. This helps ensure that the RIR is fulfilling its duties in a manner that aligns with its mission and objectives, and allows stakeholders to hold it responsible for its actions.
3. Fosters Community Trust • Comprehensive records reassure stakeholders that the RIR is operating fairly, ethically, and in line with the interests of the community. Transparency in financial matters, for example, ensures that members can verify that funds are being used appropriately.
4. Supports Effective Oversight • Comprehensive documentation facilitates oversight by both internal and external parties, including the RIR’s members, auditors, and other stakeholders. This oversight can help identify areas for improvement, enhance decision-making.

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cabinet)**

Nothing to add or detract

**Brian Longwe (Converged Technology Networks)**

yes.

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

no compromise on transparency

**Aftab Siddiqui (AFTABSIDDIQUI-AU)**

yes

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**



I fully agree with this principle. Providing stable, reliable, secure, accurate, and accountable services is fundamental for an RIR to effectively manage Internet resources and meet the needs of its community. Adhering to standard protocols and specifications ensures cross-RIR compatibility, enabling seamless coordination and communication across regions. This is essential for maintaining the global integrity of the Internet's resource allocation system and for ensuring that stakeholders can trust the services provided by the RIR.

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

I fully agree with this principle. Maintaining and publishing comprehensive records of governance, activities, and finances is essential for ensuring transparency, accountability, and trust within the RIR and its community. Publicly accessible records allow stakeholders to assess the RIR's performance, decision-making processes, and financial health, fostering confidence in its operations. This practice is fundamental for good governance and helps ensure that the RIR is held accountable to its members and the broader Internet community.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

This like the other principles of governance above are essential for good governance of not-for-profit organisations.

**Narelle Clark (Internet Association of Australia)**

---

Including compensation and bids for services.

**j heasley (SNI)**

---

It should add thirty party legal audit statement.

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

but what about the underhanded resources of high value? Human nature

**Hendrik Visage (HeVIS.Co Systems Pty Ltd)**

---

Of course.

**Mark Elkins (Posix Systems)**

---

I strongly agree that an RIR must maintain and publish comprehensive records of its governance, activities, and finances. Doing so ensures that the RIR operates transparently, ethically, and efficiently, fostering trust, accountability, and stakeholder engagement. It enhances good governance, supports financial responsibility, and encourages participation from all stakeholders. Transparency in these areas is essential for maintaining the legitimacy of the RIR and ensuring its effectiveness in managing internet resources in a fair and responsible manner.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

And subject to an external auditor to be published.

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

5

**Taye Oyebola (Aso Savings and Loans Plc)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Comprehensive record-keeping seems excessive and could pull resources away from essential duties. RIRs should have the autonomy to determine transparency standards based on regional needs.

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

I agree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

It makes sense

**Danjuma bappa ahmed (Wownetworks limited nigeria)**

---

transparency is the key

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

tres souhaiter

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

Enhance accountability and transparency

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

Yes

**Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)**

---

Totally agree

**Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)**

---

This is a matter where regardless of what level of autonomy RIRs have, they need to operate in the larger ecosystem and cooperate with peer RIRs. Even with member/governing body consensus, it can't get away from this.

**David Lamparter (Westnetz w.V.)**

---

I agree

**Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)**

---

RIRs may not have improper NDAs and similar restraints on communication designed to cover over malfeasance. Clear whistle blower protections are imperative.

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

This should be part of the audit, and RIRs must comply.

**Musa Stephen HONLUE (AFRINIC)**

---

Openness is required for stakeholder governance

**Mike Burns (IPTrading)**

---

Transparency is key.

**Carlos Friaças (FCT\| FCCN)**

---

Yes, but this doesn't fully happen now.

**Kevin Meynell (Individual)**

---

An RIR must maintain and publish comprehensive records of ALL its governance, activities, and finances.

**Matthew Cowen (dgtlfutures)**

---

## **17.2. Transparency - Somewhat Agree (4)**

To show accountability

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

agree

**Mohammad Mubarak Alfalasi (Telecommunication and Digital government Regulatory Authority)**

---

promotes accountability and trust within the RIR community. By maintaining and publishing comprehensive records, RIRs ensure transparency in their operations, financial activities, and decision-making processes. This allows stakeholders to scrutinize the RIR's activities, identify potential issues, and hold the RIR accountable for its actions. Transparency also fosters public trust and strengthens the RIR's reputation as a reliable and responsible organization.

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

This principle ensures transparency and accountability by requiring an RIR to maintain and publish comprehensive records of its governance, activities, and finances. It builds trust among stakeholders by providing visibility into decision-making, resource allocation, and financial management. While

maintaining these records can be resource-intensive, the benefits of openness, oversight, and community confidence make it essential for good governance and responsible operation.

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

Transparency is important

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

Vital

**John Haydon (Education)**

---

I guess in this principle "RIR" is referred as to the legal entity or its secretariat, where RIR may include its community. Elaboration should be helpful

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

### **17.3. Transparency - Neutral (3)**

Mandating detailed records regarding governance, activities, and finances might be excessive and could limit an RIR's ability to focus on its primary responsibilities. RIRs should have the discretion to adapt transparency measures to their regional needs.

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---

No comments

**Pacharaporn Wangwinyoo (ZIM (Thailand) Co., LTD.)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. Mandating comprehensive records could take valuable resources away from an RIR's primary duties. RIRs should have the freedom to establish transparency levels that align with their local needs without unnecessary pressure.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---

This condition seems impractical. Comprehensive record-keeping on governance and finances may divert attention from an RIR's essential functions. RIRs should be empowered to determine the appropriate level of transparency that suits their regions.

**Sidonie Hacking ('-)**

---

This approach appears overly stringent. Requiring comprehensive documentation of governance and finances could divert resources from an RIR's main responsibilities. RIRs should have the flexibility to determine their own transparency standards based on regional needs.

**Jun Wen (one futures technology sdn bhd)**

---

While it's important for RIRs to operate neutrally, a one-size-fits-all approach may not cater to the diverse needs of different areas. Policies should be adaptable to reflect local conditions.

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

#### **17.4. Transparency - Somewhat Disagree (2)**

As written, this isn't a principle, rather it is a description of how a principle related to transparency could be implemented. In terms of that description, transparency is more than simply maintenance and publication of materials – the published materials must be published in a timely manner, easily accessed, comprehensible by the community, and allow any interested party to understand the organization's governance, activities, and finances. Pragmatically speaking, there will always be confidentiality requirements for some aspects of the operation of any organization, including RIRs. As such, true transparency will almost always require some mechanism for appeal of decisions made by the organization to redact or not release certain records or documents. Perhaps "An RIR must operate with sufficient transparency to ensure its community is able to fully understand its governance, activities, and finances."

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

Excessive requirements for record-keeping and public documentation may divert resources away from the core work of an RIR. RIRs should have the ability to assess and decide on the level of transparency that best serves their regional community.

**Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)**

---

Mandating comprehensive records on governance, activities, and finances is excessive and may divert resources from an RIR's primary responsibilities. RIRs should have the flexibility to determine the level of transparency that suits their regional needs without unnecessary regulatory pressure.

**Noel OUPOH (DATACONNECT AFRICA)**

---

Mandating detailed records on governance, activities, and finances might impose unnecessary burdens on RIRs, distracting them from their core responsibilities. RIRs should have the discretion to decide on transparency that aligns with local needs.

**Neonjyoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

#### **17.5. Transparency - Strongly Disagree (1)**

The mandate for extensive documentation of governance, activities, and finances could overwhelm RIRs, detracting from their essential functions. RIRs should have the flexibility to choose transparency measures that align with their local circumstances.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

Requiring RIRs to maintain and publish comprehensive records may place excessive demands on them, taking resources away from their primary responsibilities. They should have the autonomy to define the transparency levels that suit their regional contexts.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

Mandating comprehensive records regarding governance, activities, and finances could detract from RIRs' core missions and be overly demanding. Flexibility in transparency measures is essential to accommodate local needs.

**Tipu Khan (Zx Online Ltd)**

---

Imposing strict requirements for comprehensive records on governance, activities, and finances could burden RIRs and shift focus from their main objectives. RIRs should have the freedom to determine suitable transparency standards for their contexts.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

Imposing a requirement for comprehensive records of governance, activities, and finances may overwhelm RIRs and draw resources away from their main tasks. RIRs should be able to set transparency standards that reflect their unique regional needs.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---

The obligation to maintain and publish detailed records on governance, activities, and finances could be excessive and may detract from an RIR's essential functions. RIRs should be empowered to decide the transparency measures that suit their local context.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

Requiring comprehensive documentation of governance, activities, and finances might place an undue burden on RIRs, hindering their focus on primary responsibilities. RIRs should have the freedom to choose transparency levels that meet their regional demands.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---

Mandating RIRs to keep and publish extensive records of governance, activities, and finances may be excessive and could divert attention from their core responsibilities. RIRs should have the flexibility to determine what level of transparency is appropriate for their regions.

**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating exhaustive records of governance and finances may hinder an RIR's ability to focus on essential tasks. RIRs should have the autonomy to establish the level of transparency that suits their specific circumstances.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

Requiring comprehensive documentation of governance, activities, and finances could be excessive and may hinder RIRs from focusing on their core responsibilities. RIRs should have the flexibility to adapt transparency measures to suit local environments.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

Requiring RIRs to maintain and publish comprehensive records of governance, activities, and finances could impose unnecessary strains on their resources, detracting from their core missions. RIRs should have the autonomy to choose their transparency levels.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

Mandating detailed records on governance, activities, and finances may be excessive and could distract RIRs from their primary responsibilities. RIRs should have the flexibility to define the transparency measures that are most appropriate for their regions.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

This condition seems impractical. Extensive record-keeping on governance and finances could take attention away from an RIR's essential tasks. RIRs should be empowered to determine transparency standards based on local needs.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. Mandating exhaustive record-keeping could drain resources away from an RIR's main responsibilities. RIRs should have the freedom to establish transparency levels suited to their local conditions.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---

Insisting on rigorous record-keeping for governance, activities, and finances may overwhelm RIRs, detracting from their core missions. RIRs should have the discretion to define their transparency levels according to local circumstances.

**Taslina Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

Mandating comprehensive documentation of governance and finances might impose an unnecessary burden on RIRs, especially in resource-limited settings. RIRs should be allowed to choose their transparency practices based on regional needs.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

The obligation to maintain extensive documentation could overwhelm RIRs and distract from their essential tasks. Flexibility in determining transparency levels is important for regional effectiveness.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

Requiring comprehensive records may not align with the operational realities of all RIRs, as it could divert resources from primary responsibilities. Tailored transparency approaches are essential.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

Mandating detailed documentation of governance, activities, and finances could distract RIRs from their primary responsibilities. RIRs should have the autonomy to determine their transparency standards.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

Insisting on comprehensive records may place an excessive burden on RIRs, particularly those with limited resources. Flexibility in determining transparency levels is essential for effective governance.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

Insisting on comprehensive records may place an excessive burden on RIRs, particularly those with limited resources. Flexibility in determining transparency levels is essential for effective governance.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

Imposing strict requirements for comprehensive record-keeping could be burdensome and may not reflect the realities of every RIR. Flexibility in transparency is important for meeting local needs.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

Mandating detailed documentation may not be practical for all RIRs and could detract from their essential functions. RIRs should choose transparency standards that align with their regional needs.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

Requiring RIRs to maintain exhaustive records of governance, activities, and finances could hinder their effectiveness and distract from core objectives. They should have the flexibility to determine appropriate transparency levels.

**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

Imposing strict transparency requirements may be overly burdensome and could detract from the primary missions of RIRs. Flexibility is essential for accommodating diverse regional contexts.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

Mandating comprehensive records may place undue pressure on RIRs, particularly in emerging regions. RIRs should have the freedom to establish transparency standards that are appropriate for their specific contexts.

**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

Mandating comprehensive records of governance and activities may be excessive and could shift focus from core responsibilities. RIRs should be allowed to set their own transparency standards.

**Pham Gia Khiem (Phat Tai Logistics)**

---



I completely disagree with this provision. Comprehensive record-keeping seems excessive and could divert resources from an RIR's primary responsibilities. Flexibility in transparency standards is essential for addressing local needs.

**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

Mandating thorough records on governance and finances might detract from RIRs' core missions. RIRs should be empowered to choose their transparency levels according to regional requirements.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

Requiring RIRs to maintain extensive documentation may overwhelm them, diverting focus from essential activities. RIRs should have the discretion to define transparency standards that suit their local context.

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

Imposing strict requirements for comprehensive records may be too demanding and could detract from an RIR's primary responsibilities. RIRs should have the autonomy to define their level of transparency based on community needs.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

Requiring extensive documentation on governance and finances may not be necessary and could detract from an RIR's main activities. Flexibility in transparency is crucial for addressing regional challenges.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

Mandating detailed documentation of governance and financial activities could be burdensome for RIRs, affecting their core operations. RIRs should have the flexibility to adapt transparency practices to their specific contexts.

**Kwan Ke Yue (TBWA/ Kuala Lumpur)**

---

Imposing strict requirements for comprehensive records may not reflect the realities faced by all RIRs and could hinder their effectiveness. RIRs should choose transparency standards that meet their community's needs.

**Sean Carroll (The One Academy)**

---

Requiring extensive governance and financial records may not be necessary and could shift focus away from an RIR's core responsibilities. Flexibility is key to meeting the diverse needs of different regions.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

Imposing comprehensive record-keeping requirements could be overly demanding and detract from an RIR's essential activities. RIRs should be allowed to choose the level of transparency that serves their community best.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

Mandating extensive records on governance and finances could distract RIRs from their primary activities. RIRs should have the flexibility to determine the level of transparency that meets their community's needs.

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**

---

The requirement for comprehensive records on governance, activities, and finances may be overly demanding and could distract from an RIR's core operations. RIRs should maintain the flexibility to establish transparency levels that fit local contexts.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

The requirement for comprehensive records regarding governance, activities, and finances may be overly demanding and could shift focus away from an RIR's essential tasks. RIRs should be allowed to choose the level of transparency that best fits their regional circumstances.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---

Requiring comprehensive records could place an undue administrative burden on RIRs. A more tailored approach, where RIRs determine the appropriate level of transparency, would better serve regional needs.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---

While transparency is important, an overly detailed record-keeping requirement may detract from an RIR's operational focus. RIRs should have the ability to choose how much documentation is necessary for accountability and service to their community.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

Mandating detailed records on governance, activities, and finances might impose an unnecessary burden on RIRs, diverting resources from their primary functions. RIRs should have the flexibility to decide the extent of transparency that aligns with their local context.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---

Mandating detailed financial and governance records could place unnecessary burdens on RIRs. A more flexible approach would allow RIRs to tailor the level of documentation to their regional needs.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

Requiring RIRs to maintain and publish comprehensive records of governance, activities, and finances may be excessive and could detract from their core responsibilities. RIRs should have the autonomy to determine the level of transparency that meets their regional needs without undue regulatory pressure.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

Excessive transparency requirements may lead to resource strain and distract from an RIR's core operations. RIRs should be empowered to decide what level of documentation best serves the needs of their regional stakeholders.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

Requiring RIRs to maintain and publish extensive records may be excessive and could detract from their core responsibilities. Flexibility in determining transparency levels is essential to address regional needs effectively.

**Md Abu Sayeem Siddique Siddique (ServicEngine Ltd)**

---

Mandating comprehensive records of governance, activities, and finances could place an undue burden on RIRs, diverting valuable resources from their primary functions. RIRs should be allowed to establish transparency levels that align with their regional contexts.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

Mandating extensive records on governance and finances might divert resources from RIRs' core activities. RIRs should have the discretion to determine the level of transparency that meets their regional needs.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

While maintaining transparency is important, mandating overly comprehensive documentation may overwhelm RIRs and detract from their primary responsibilities. Flexibility is essential for regional effectiveness.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---

Mandating the publication of comprehensive records regarding governance, activities, and finances could be burdensome and detract from an RIR's core responsibilities. RIRs should have the freedom to determine suitable transparency levels.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---

The obligation to maintain and publish detailed governance, activity, and finance records may be excessive and could limit RIRs' focus on essential functions. Flexibility in transparency is crucial for addressing local needs effectively.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

Mandating that RIRs maintain extensive records of governance, activities, and finances may be excessive and may detract from their primary missions. RIRs should have the latitude to establish transparency levels that reflect local needs.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

The requirement for detailed records on governance, activities, and finances may be overly burdensome and could limit an RIR's focus on core responsibilities. RIRs should have the flexibility to tailor their transparency approaches to regional contexts.

**Trang Tran (VNPT Technologies)**

---

The obligation to maintain comprehensive records of governance, activities, and finances could be burdensome and may divert resources from an RIR's core duties. RIRs should have the flexibility to tailor their transparency efforts to regional requirements.

**Minh Hoang (ANSV)**

---

Mandating detailed records on governance, activities, and finances may be overly demanding and could limit an RIR's ability to focus on its primary responsibilities. RIRs should have leeway in determining transparency levels that suit their regional context.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**

---

Excessive record-keeping requirements could divert RIRs' attention from critical operations. A more flexible approach to transparency, based on regional needs, would better support their ability to serve their community.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**

---

The requirement for exhaustive records may increase administrative overhead, reducing the effectiveness of RIRs. RIRs should have the autonomy to determine the appropriate level of transparency for their region.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---

While maintaining records of governance and finances is important, a rigid requirement for comprehensive documentation may impose unnecessary administrative burdens. RIRs should be empowered to set the level of transparency based on their regional context.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

The requirement to publish detailed records on governance, activities, and finances could overwhelm an RIR's resources. RIRs should be able to determine what level of transparency is necessary based on local conditions and operational needs.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

Mandating comprehensive records may impose unnecessary costs and resource allocation on RIRs. A more flexible approach, where RIRs determine the level of transparency based on regional needs, would be more efficient.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---

While transparency is crucial, requiring exhaustive records could lead to unnecessary administrative overhead for RIRs. RIRs should have the flexibility to determine the extent of documentation required, based on regional priorities.

**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

Mandating comprehensive records on governance and finances might be burdensome and reduce an RIR's ability to focus on its core mission. RIRs should be able to tailor the level of transparency to the needs of their region.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---

Requiring RIRs to publish comprehensive records of governance, activities, and finances could be resource-intensive and may distract from their primary mission. RIRs should have the autonomy to determine the necessary level of transparency for their community.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

While transparency is important, excessive documentation could divert resources from an RIR's primary functions. RIRs should have the discretion to maintain records that are sufficient to meet their regional needs, rather than being bound by overly detailed requirements.

**Ryan Khaw (Alsco Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

Requiring an RIR to maintain comprehensive records could hinder its focus on essential responsibilities. A flexible approach to transparency is necessary to better serve local contexts.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

The requirement for comprehensive records of governance, activities, and finances may be too stringent and could distract from an RIR's essential operations. RIRs should be empowered to decide how much transparency aligns with their local needs.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Apnic)**

---

Requiring comprehensive governance and activity records could impose undue burdens on RIRs, distracting them from essential functions. Flexibility is key to achieving effective transparency.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

While transparency is vital, requiring RIRs to maintain extensive records may detract from their core functions. Flexibility in record-keeping can help align with the specific needs of their communities.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

Mandating comprehensive records may be excessive and could hinder RIRs from focusing on essential tasks. RIRs should have the flexibility to establish transparency levels that suit their context.

**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

Insisting on rigorous record-keeping for governance, activities, and finances may overwhelm RIRs, detracting from their core missions. RIRs should have the discretion to define their transparency levels according to local circumstances.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

Mandating comprehensive documentation of governance and finances might impose an unnecessary burden on RIRs, especially in resource-limited settings. RIRs should be allowed to choose their transparency practices based on regional needs.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

The obligation to maintain extensive records on governance, activities, and finances may be too stringent and could detract from an RIR's primary missions. RIRs should have the flexibility to tailor transparency efforts to regional contexts.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**

---

Mandating comprehensive records regarding governance, activities, and finances could be seen as excessive and may limit an RIR's ability to focus on its primary duties. RIRs should have discretion in establishing transparency levels that meet local needs.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

Mandating extensive records for governance, activities, and finances could be excessive and divert resources from an RIR's essential tasks. RIRs need the flexibility to define transparency levels that best fit their community's needs.

**Jeremy Cheong (Infineon technologies)**

---

While transparency is important, requiring RIRs to maintain comprehensive records might be too demanding and could take away from their primary responsibilities. Flexibility in record-keeping is essential to meet regional needs.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

Mandating comprehensive records regarding governance, activities, and finances could be excessive and detract from an RIR's essential functions. RIRs should have the discretion to choose appropriate transparency measures that align with local needs.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

Requiring extensive documentation of governance, activities, and finances may impose unnecessary demands that detract from an RIR's primary responsibilities. RIRs should be allowed to determine the transparency levels that best fit their unique circumstances.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

Although maintaining records is important, strict mandates for comprehensive documentation could hinder RIRs ability to focus on their essential roles. RIRs should be allowed to choose transparency levels suited to their regions. It's also important to note that portability is indispensable for the Internet.

**Sohel Kabir (Kabir Traders)**

---

Requiring comprehensive records on governance and activities may impose unnecessary burdens on RIRs, diverting focus from their primary responsibilities. RIRs should have the freedom to determine appropriate transparency levels.

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Mandating the publication of detailed records regarding governance, activities, and finances may be overly burdensome, potentially detracting from an RIR's essential responsibilities. RIRs should have the flexibility to adjust transparency according to regional contexts.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---

The requirement for comprehensive records of governance, activities, and finances may be too stringent and could divert critical resources from an RIR's main objectives. RIRs should maintain flexibility in determining transparency that meets local needs.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---

Requiring extensive documentation of governance, activities, and finances is potentially excessive and may detract from an RIR's core responsibilities. RIRs should have the latitude to establish transparency levels that reflect their regional context without undue pressure.

**Catalina Cueva (Manpower)**

---

Mandating detailed records of governance, activities, and finances could be seen as excessive and may pull resources away from essential RIR functions. RIRs should be empowered to decide how much transparency is appropriate for their unique circumstances.

**Camilo Riveros (Manpower)**

---

Mandating extensive records can be an undue burden on RIRs, possibly diverting resources from their primary roles. Flexibility in transparency is essential for effectively addressing regional challenges.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

Mandating comprehensive records of governance, activities, and finances may be excessive and could divert resources away from an RIR's core responsibilities. RIRs should have the flexibility to determine the level of transparency that meets their regional needs, free from unnecessary regulatory pressure.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**

---

Mandating comprehensive records of governance, activities, and finances may impose an undue burden and detract from an RIR's essential duties. RIRs should have the flexibility to choose transparency levels that fit their local needs.

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

This approach appears overly strict. Requiring extensive documentation could distract from an RIR's core activities. RIRs should have the flexibility to determine the level of transparency that fits their regional contexts.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Comprehensive record-keeping may be excessive and could divert resources from an RIR's primary responsibilities. Flexibility in transparency standards is essential for addressing local needs.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Requiring thorough records of governance and finances could pull attention away from an RIR's main tasks. Flexibility in transparency standards is essential for addressing local needs effectively.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

This stipulation feels counterproductive. Mandating comprehensive records could hinder an RIR's ability to concentrate on core responsibilities. RIRs should have the freedom to set their own transparency levels according to regional requirements.

**Anh Dang (NASA)**

---

Imposing strict requirements for comprehensive documentation may prove burdensome and could hinder an RIR's core responsibilities. Flexibility in transparency is important for addressing regional needs effectively.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

Requiring detailed records on governance, activities, and finances can be an excessive demand that diverts resources from an RIR's main functions. RIRs should maintain the discretion to determine appropriate transparency levels.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

This requirement for extensive documentation may prove excessive, potentially diverting RIR resources from their primary responsibilities. RIRs should be allowed to determine transparency levels that align with their regional contexts.

**Prasanta Haloi (Pwd)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Requiring exhaustive records of governance and finances could shift attention from an RIR's main tasks. Flexibility in transparency standards is essential to meet local needs effectively.

**Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)**

---

While transparency is vital, requiring exhaustive documentation may overwhelm RIRs and hinder their core functions. RIRs should have the autonomy to tailor transparency levels to meet regional demands.

**AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)**

---



Imposing strict mandates for comprehensive records could strain RIRs and distract them from essential activities. RIRs should have the flexibility to decide on transparency practices that reflect their local needs.

**K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)**

---

I completely disagree with this condition. Requiring detailed records may distract from an RIR's focus on critical functions. A more flexible approach to transparency could allow RIRs to better address the needs of their regions.

**Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)**

---

Although accountability through comprehensive records is valuable, excessive requirements may detract from an RIR's primary functions. RIRs should be empowered to determine appropriate transparency levels for their regions.

**Fuhui Zhang (University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)**

---

Mandating extensive documentation may overwhelm RIRs and take away from their core responsibilities. RIRs should have the discretion to shape transparency practices based on the needs of their regions.

**Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)**

---

While transparency in governance is important, the mandate for comprehensive records may be excessive and distract RIRs from their primary duties. RIRs should have the flexibility to determine appropriate levels of transparency.

**Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)**

---

19. Requiring exhaustive documentation of governance and activities could impose undue burdens on RIRs, limiting their focus on critical responsibilities. Flexibility in transparency should be prioritized to suit regional contexts.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

Requiring comprehensive documentation of governance, activities, and finances can be burdensome and may detract from an RIR's primary functions. RIRs should have the discretion to establish transparency levels that align with their local needs.

**Trabahan Pujari (Paruluniversity)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

This condition feels overly strict. Mandating comprehensive documentation could pull resources away from an RIR's essential tasks. RIRs should have the freedom to set transparency standards based on their unique circumstances.

**Juan Mesa (Hispasat)**

---

I strongly disagree with this provision. Mandating regular external audits could impose unnecessary financial and administrative pressures on RIRs, particularly in smaller or developing regions. Such audits might not be the most effective way to ensure ICP-2 compliance and could shift focus from core responsibilities.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

I believe that requiring extensive governance, activity, and financial records is excessive and could draw resources away from an RIR's main responsibilities. RIRs should have the flexibility to set transparency levels that align with their regional needs without imposing unnecessary regulatory burdens.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Requiring exhaustive records of governance and finances could shift attention from an RIR's main tasks. Flexibility in transparency standards is essential to meet local needs effectively.

**Pornpipat Kitireanglarp (ZERIWELLPLUS Co., Ltd.)**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. Requiring detailed records on governance, activities, and finances feels excessive and could distract from an RIR's main responsibilities. Flexibility in setting transparency standards is crucial for effectively addressing regional needs.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Extensive record-keeping is excessive and may divert resources from essential tasks. RIRs should have the autonomy to establish transparency standards according to regional needs.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Requiring exhaustive documentation could hinder an RIR's ability to focus on its core functions. Flexibility in setting transparency standards is crucial to addressing regional needs effectively.

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

This requirement for thorough record-keeping seems overly demanding. Mandating detailed documentation on governance, activities, and finances could take attention away from an RIR's core functions. RIRs should be allowed to set transparency standards that suit their local needs.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating exhaustive records of governance and finances may hinder an RIR's ability to focus on essential tasks. RIRs should have the autonomy to set transparency standards suited to their specific contexts.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. Requiring detailed records on governance, activities, and finances seems excessive and could distract from an RIR's primary responsibilities. Flexibility in setting transparency levels is essential to address regional needs effectively.

**Ashraful Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Requiring detailed records could be excessive and detract from an RIR's core functions. A more adaptable approach to transparency would better suit diverse regional needs.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

This requirement feels overly demanding. Mandating detailed governance and financial records might distract from an RIR's core tasks. RIRs should have the flexibility to determine transparency levels that best serve their regional contexts.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Requiring exhaustive documentation could hinder an RIR's ability to concentrate on primary responsibilities. Flexibility in transparency requirements is crucial for addressing the specific needs of different regions.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. Mandating comprehensive records could divert valuable resources away from an RIR's primary duties. RIRs should have the freedom to establish transparency levels that align with their local needs without undue pressure.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Demanding comprehensive records of governance, activities, and finances may be excessive and could detract from an RIR's core functions. A more flexible approach to transparency would better serve regional needs.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

This approach feels overly stringent. Requiring extensive documentation on governance and finances might pull resources away from an RIR's main duties. RIRs should have the freedom to decide on transparency standards based on regional needs.

**Giang Nguyen (NASA)**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. Requiring detailed records on governance, activities, and finances seems excessive and could distract from an RIR's primary responsibilities. Flexibility in setting transparency levels is essential to address regional needs effectively.

**Alex Kwan (Wiplus Malaysia)**

---

I believe that requiring extensive governance, activity, and financial records is excessive and could draw resources away from an RIR's main responsibilities. RIRs should have the flexibility to set transparency levels that align with their regional needs without imposing unnecessary regulatory burdens.

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

Desagree

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating exhaustive records of governance and finances could hinder an RIR's ability to focus on essential tasks. RIRs should have the autonomy to set the transparency level that suits their specific circumstances.

**Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. Requiring detailed records on governance, activities, and finances seems excessive and could distract from an RIR's primary functions. Flexibility in determining appropriate transparency levels is essential to meet regional needs.

**Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)**

---

I believe that requiring comprehensive records of governance, activities, and finances is excessive and could pull valuable resources away from an RIR's main duties. RIRs should have the flexibility to decide on the level of transparency that best meets their regional needs without unnecessary regulatory burdens.

**Pooja Gopi (DM Digital Marketing)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Requiring thorough records of governance and finances could distract from an RIR's main tasks. Flexibility in transparency standards is essential for addressing local needs effectively.

**Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)**

---

This stipulation seems counterproductive. Mandating comprehensive records may hinder an RIR's ability to concentrate on core responsibilities. RIRs should be allowed to set their own transparency levels in accordance with regional requirements.

**Quyn Kim (VNPAY)**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. Requiring detailed records on governance, activities, and finances could be excessive and distract from an RIR's primary functions. Flexibility in determining appropriate transparency levels is essential for addressing regional needs.

Imposing strict requirements for comprehensive record-keeping may be excessive and could divert focus from an RIR's main responsibilities. RIRs should have the autonomy to decide on the transparency levels that align with their regional needs.

**Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)**

---

Question 36&37 Transparency An RIR must maintain and publish comprehensive records of its governance, activities, and finances. 1- Strongly Disagree I believe that requiring comprehensive records of governance, activities, and finances is excessive and could divert valuable resources from an RIR's primary duties. RIRs should have the flexibility to decide on the level of transparency that best meets their regional needs without undue regulatory burdens.

**Anjan Deka (HDFC)**

---

I believe that requiring comprehensive records of governance, activities, and finances is excessive and could divert valuable resources from an RIR's primary duties. RIRs should have the flexibility to decide on the level of transparency that best meets their regional needs without undue regulatory burdens.

**Ketan Parmar (Bids Info Global)**

---

Mandating comprehensive records on governance and finances may lead to resource strain, hindering an RIR's essential operations. Flexibility in transparency levels should be allowed to meet diverse regional requirements.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

Requiring extensive documentation of governance and finances may be overly burdensome and detract from an RIR's primary responsibilities. RIRs should be able to choose the transparency that best fits their specific regional context.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

1. While maintaining comprehensive records is important, mandating excessive documentation may divert resources from an RIR's core functions. RIRs should have the flexibility to determine appropriate transparency levels based on regional needs.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---

## 18. Audit

---

An RIR must participate in regular audits by an external and independent auditor to ensure that it is continuing to comply with ICP-2.

### 18.1. Audit - Strongly Agree (5)

This is essential for demonstrating integrity and trustworthiness

**Eric Edora (TELUS Communications Inc.)**

---

ICANN should partake in some of this oversight functions.

**Babagana Digima (Nigerian Communications Commission)**

---

Agree because this project is very important for the future

**Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle, as regular external audits by an independent auditor are essential to ensure that an RIR is maintaining compliance with ICP-2 and operating with transparency, accountability, and integrity. Here's an analysis: Reasons for Agreement

1. Ensures Compliance with Standards
  - Regular audits provide a mechanism for verifying that the RIR is following the requirements and guidelines set out in ICP-2. This ensures that the RIR is adhering to best practices in governance, financial management, and policy application, thereby promoting consistency and trustworthiness.
2. Promotes Accountability
  - Independent audits hold the RIR accountable to its members and stakeholders. External auditors provide an unbiased evaluation of the RIR's operations, helping to identify any discrepancies or areas for improvement that might not be visible internally.
3. Builds Trust and Credibility
  -

Regular external audits signal to stakeholders that the RIR is committed to transparency and ethical practices. It reassures members that the organization is operating responsibly and is subject to scrutiny by an independent third party.

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

Due to the complexity and unique nature of an RIRs function, how can it be ensured that audit also covers technical compliance and security as well as financial transactions?

**Brian Longwe (Converged Technology Networks)**

---

YES!

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle. Regular audits by an external and independent auditor are crucial for ensuring that an RIR continues to comply with ICP-2 and adheres to high standards of governance and financial integrity. Independent audits provide an objective assessment of the RIR's operations,

identifying potential issues and ensuring transparency. This process helps build trust with stakeholders and ensures that the RIR is fulfilling its responsibilities in a consistent and accountable manner.

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle. Regular audits by an external and independent auditor are crucial for ensuring that an RIR continues to comply with ICP-2 and adheres to high standards of governance and financial integrity. Independent audits provide an objective assessment of the RIR's operations, identifying potential issues and ensuring transparency. This process helps build trust with stakeholders and ensures that the RIR is fulfilling its responsibilities in a consistent and accountable manner.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

It is essential that RIRs are verifiably and measurably compliant with good practice.

**Narelle Clark (Internet Association of Australia)**

---

Financial, IR operations, and service quality.

**j heasley (SNI)**

---

Who is the auditor? What means regular?

**Tahar Schaa (Neuland@Homeland)**

---

Yes

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

Yup

**Mark Elkins (Posix Systems)**

---

I strongly agree that an RIR must participate in regular audits by an external and independent auditor to ensure that it is continuing to comply with ICP-2. External audits are crucial for maintaining transparency, accountability, and financial integrity, and they ensure that the RIR operates in alignment with its responsibilities. These audits also provide valuable insights into improving operations and managing risks, while fostering trust with stakeholders and maintaining the RIR's credibility and effectiveness. Regular audits are a vital component of good governance and help ensure the long-term sustainability and success of the RIR.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

Agreed.

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

5

**Taye Oyebola (Aso Savings and Loans Plc)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Regular external audits could create unnecessary financial and administrative challenges for RIRs, especially in regions with limited resources. Additionally, these audits may not effectively promote compliance with ICP-2.

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

I agree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

in order to ensure thing are done in accordance with the lay down rules and regulation, audit must be carried out

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

pour une bonne gouvernance

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

implementation and consistency for this principle may be challenging.

**Nancy Carter (no affiliation)**

---

Regular audits by independent auditors could impose unnecessary costs on RIRs, especially those with limited resources. Instead of enhancing compliance with ICP-2, such audits may detract from essential activities.

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

Ensure transparency and compliance with applicable regulations

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

Yes

**Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)**

---

Since these rules are the basis of cross-RIR interaction, they need to be validated. Rules/agreements without validation or enforcement are worthless.

**David Lamparter (Westnetz w.V.)**

---

I agree

**Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)**

---

Every action to keep transparency is welcome.

**Luis Caceres (Corporacion Redexcom C.A.)**

---



Audits by appropriately qualified independent persons in various fields requiring independent audit is strongly needed. All of the RIRs need independent counsel to audit the operation of their legal and corporate governance practices and this should be done every 5 years. Technical audits of the databases need to be done - and if they were part of the ecosystem the theft by Ernest at Afrinic would not have been possible.

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

I'd like this to be time-specific. "Every five years" is regular, but is it enough?

**Lee Howard (IPv4.Global by Hilco Streambank)**

---

Also, Community audit should be considered

**Hernan Arcidiacono (IPLAN)**

---

This is unavoidable to maintain the system's health.

**Carlos Friaças (FCT\| FCCN)**

---

This is too much details for ICP-2-bis but I'd want the RIRs to each choose a different auditor and change their auditor every 3-5 years

**Leo Vegoda (And Polus LLC)**

---

Who would do the auditing or appoint the auditors? Again, more detail needed around the actual implementation.

**Kevin Meynell (Individual)**

---

I naturally expect the details in which how it is to be audited will be defined in the revised ICP-2 or its referral

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

Expect more details in ICP-2bis, but good principle

**Sander Steffann (SJM Steffann Consultancy)**

---

Probably some of my previous inputs belong to here ... not repeating them

**Jordi Palet Martinez (The IPv6 Company)**

---

## **18.2. Audit - Somewhat Agree (4)**

In addition to the principles of transparency and continued community and member review, this principle provides an extra check point.

**Mirjam Kühne (RIPE)**

---

Maintaining compliance

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

agree

**Mohammad Mubarak Alfalasi (Telecommunication and Digital government Regulatory Authority)**

---

RIRs maintain high standards of accountability and transparency. By subjecting themselves to regular audits conducted by independent external auditors, RIRs demonstrate their commitment to compliance with ICP-2 and good governance practices. This helps to identify and address potential issues early on, safeguarding the integrity of the RIR system and promoting public trust in the organization.

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

Such audits can be expensive, especially for a smaller/newer RIR, so some leeway should be given for these audits to be less burdensome/frequent for RIRs with an annual revenue below a certain threshold.

**Cameron Smith (Bubble Cloud Mozambique S.A.)**

---

This principle ensures that an RIR undergoes regular audits by an external and independent auditor to verify continued compliance with ICP-2. These audits provide objective oversight, enhance transparency, and help identify areas for improvement. While audits require resources, they are crucial for maintaining the RIR's credibility, operational efficiency, and adherence to best practices, ultimately fostering trust among stakeholders and ensuring the RIR meets its responsibilities.

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

No comment

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

No comments

**Pacharaporn Wangwinyoo (ZIM (Thailand) Co., LTD.)**

---

Regular audits must take place

**John Haydon (Education)**

---

Who audits is critical

**Randy Bush (IIJ Research Lab & Arrcus Inc)**

---

### 18.3. Audit - Neutral (3)

I do not agree that this level of detail is appropriate for a principle

**Peter Koch (Individual)**

---

Without the clear and agreeable definitions I mentioned above, this seems like the opportunity for a lot of vendor manipulation.

**Andrew Sullivan (N/A)**

---

Mandatory audits by an external and independent auditor could impose unnecessary financial and administrative burdens on RIRs, especially those in smaller or emerging regions with limited resources. Such audits may not always be the most effective way to ensure compliance with ICP-2, as they could distract from the RIR's core responsibilities and local needs.

**Noel OUPOH (DATACONNECT AFRICA)**

---

neutral

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

Mandating external audits could create excessive financial burdens on RIRs, particularly smaller ones, and distract from their core responsibilities to their communities.

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---

Only if auditor is selected/voted by the RIRs community

**Sergey Kozhedub (IPTP Networks)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. Regular audits by independent auditors could create unnecessary financial and administrative pressures on RIRs, especially in regions with limited resources. Moreover, such audits may not be the most effective means of ensuring compliance with ICP-2.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---

This approach appears overly rigid. Regular audits by external auditors could burden RIRs financially and administratively, particularly in regions with fewer resources. Additionally, such audits may not be the most effective way to ensure ICP-2 compliance and could distract from essential local activities.

**Jun Wen (one futures technology sdn bhd)**

---

Neutral

**Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)**

---

Meh. Maybe if there is a problem. Regular audits are expensive.

**Mike Burns (IPTrading)**

---

#### **18.4. Audit - Somewhat Disagree (2)**

RIRs must pass audits, not just participate. All negative finding resulting from an audit must be cured withing a reasonable amount of time. Failure to cure the negative findings can result in de-recognition.

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

While audits can be helpful, requiring external audits regularly might not be the most cost-effective method for ensuring ICP-2 compliance, especially in regions with limited financial capacity. A more regionally appropriate approach could be more effective.

**Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)**

---

Mandating audits by external auditors could impose significant costs on RIRs, especially those in developing regions, and distract from their essential community-focused work.

**Neonjyoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

This condition seems impractical. Mandating external audits could impose considerable financial and administrative burdens on RIRs, particularly in smaller or emerging regions. Additionally, these audits may not effectively ensure compliance with ICP-2, potentially distracting from local priorities.

**Sidonie Hacking (-)**

---

#### **18.5. Audit - Strongly Disagree (1)**

Regular audits by an external auditor may impose unnecessary financial and administrative pressures on RIRs, particularly those with limited resources. Such requirements may detract from their core functions and community commitments.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

Mandating independent audits may create significant challenges for RIRs, especially those in smaller or emerging regions. This requirement could detract from their primary responsibilities and focus on local needs.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

The requirement for regular external audits could place undue financial strain on RIRs, particularly those with limited resources. Such audits may not effectively ensure compliance with ICP-2 and could distract from essential operations.

**Tipu Khan (Zx Online Ltd)**

---

Insisting on regular audits by an external auditor may impose excessive burdens on RIRs, especially those in smaller or emerging regions. This requirement could hinder their ability to focus on local needs and responsibilities.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

Insisting on mandatory audits by external auditors could impose unnecessary financial constraints on RIRs, particularly those in developing areas. Such audits may not always effectively ensure compliance with ICP-2 and could detract from local priorities.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---

Requiring regular independent audits could create significant financial and administrative challenges for RIRs, especially in smaller or emerging regions. This may not be the most effective way to ensure compliance with ICP-2 and could distract from essential responsibilities.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

Regular audits by an external auditor may impose excessive financial and administrative burdens on RIRs, particularly those with limited resources. Such requirements could detract from the RIR's core mission and responsiveness to local needs.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---

Mandating audits by an independent external auditor could create unnecessary financial and administrative challenges for RIRs, particularly those in emerging regions. This could distract from their primary responsibilities and local commitments.

**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Imposing mandatory audits by independent auditors could create significant financial and administrative challenges for RIRs, especially in smaller or emerging regions. These audits may not effectively promote compliance with ICP-2 and could detract from local needs.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

Regular audits by an external auditor could impose significant financial and administrative pressures on RIRs, particularly in regions with limited resources. Such requirements may distract from their primary functions and local commitments.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

Insisting on regular audits by an external auditor could impose significant financial and administrative pressures on RIRs, particularly in limited-resource regions. This requirement may detract from their core missions and local focus.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

Requiring RIRs to participate in mandatory audits by independent external auditors could create undue financial strain, especially for smaller or emerging organizations. This may not be the most effective way to ensure compliance with ICP-2.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

This condition seems impractical. Mandating external audits could place significant financial and administrative burdens on RIRs, particularly in smaller or emerging regions. These audits may not be the best way to ensure ICP-2 compliance and could divert attention from local priorities.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

This requirement feels excessive. Regular audits by independent auditors could impose unnecessary financial and administrative pressure on RIRs, particularly in resource-limited regions. Moreover, these audits may not be the best way to ensure compliance with ICP-2.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---

Insisting on mandatory external audits may create significant financial and administrative challenges for RIRs, particularly in developing areas. Such requirements could divert attention from their core missions.

**Taslima Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

Requiring RIRs to undergo regular external audits may place an undue financial burden on them, particularly in regions with limited resources. These audits could distract from their essential activities and may not be the most effective means of compliance.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

Insisting on independent audits may create undue financial burdens on RIRs, especially in emerging areas. Exploring alternative compliance methods could enhance operational efficiency.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

Mandating regular audits by external auditors could hinder RIRs' effectiveness, particularly in smaller regions. A more flexible approach to compliance with ICP-2 could better accommodate local needs.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

Insisting on regular external audits may create significant challenges for RIRs, particularly in resource-limited settings. This requirement could detract from their essential activities.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

Requiring RIRs to participate in mandatory audits could create unnecessary financial strain, particularly in smaller regions. This method may not be the best approach for ensuring compliance with ICP-2.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

Requiring RIRs to participate in mandatory audits could create unnecessary financial strain, particularly in smaller regions. This method may not be the best approach for ensuring compliance with ICP-2.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

Imposing strict requirements for regular external audits may not align with the realities faced by RIRs with limited resources. Flexible compliance options could provide better support.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

Mandatory audits by independent auditors may lead to significant financial pressures for RIRs, particularly in smaller regions. Other compliance methods could be more effective and less intrusive.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

Requiring external audits could place undue financial burdens on RIRs, especially those with constrained resources. Alternative methods for ensuring compliance with ICP-2 should be considered.

**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

Imposing regular audits by external auditors may not be practical for many RIRs, especially those in developing regions. Alternative compliance assessments could better suit their operational realities.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

Mandating audits by external and independent auditors could create financial and administrative hurdles for RIRs, particularly in resource-limited areas. This requirement may distract from their primary responsibilities

**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

Mandatory audits by independent auditors could create substantial financial challenges for RIRs, particularly those with limited resources. Other compliance methods could be more effective.

**Pham Gia Khiem (Phat Tai Logistics)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Regular audits could impose significant financial and administrative strain on RIRs, particularly in smaller or developing regions. Such audits may not effectively ensure compliance with ICP-2.

**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

'-Mandating audits by independent auditors could create substantial administrative challenges for RIRs, particularly in developing areas. This requirement might detract from their core missions.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

Regular external audits may impose excessive burdens on RIRs, especially those with limited resources. This approach may not effectively ensure compliance with ICP-2.

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

Imposing strict requirements for regular external audits may not consider the limited resources of some RIRs. Alternative compliance mechanisms could be more suitable for ensuring adherence to ICP-2.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

Requiring RIRs to undergo mandatory external audits could divert valuable resources from their core responsibilities. Alternative compliance strategies might be more effective for ensuring adherence to ICP-2.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

Mandatory audits by independent auditors may lead to undue financial strain on RIRs, especially those with constrained resources. Alternative compliance mechanisms should be explored.

**Kwan Ke Yue (TBWA/ Kuala Lumpur)**

---

Imposing strict requirements for regular external audits may not be feasible for all RIRs, particularly those in emerging areas. Compliance with ICP-2 could be achieved through less burdensome methods.

**Sean Carroll (The One Academy)**

---

Requiring regular external audits may create financial and logistical challenges for RIRs, particularly those with fewer resources. Compliance with ICP-2 can often be assessed through less burdensome methods.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

Imposing strict external audit requirements may not be practical for many RIRs, especially those with limited resources. Alternative compliance methods could be more appropriate for monitoring adherence to ICP-2.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

While external audits can ensure accountability, mandating them may distract RIRs from their primary objectives, especially in regions where resources are scarce. Flexibility is key to effective governance.

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**

---

The requirement for independent audits may not be appropriate for all RIRs, especially those with limited resources. Compliance frameworks should reflect local needs rather than rigid standards.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

Insisting on mandatory audits by an external auditor could impose significant financial and administrative pressures on RIRs, particularly those in smaller or emerging regions. This requirement may divert attention from the RIR's primary responsibilities and local needs.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---



While audits could ensure compliance, they may not be necessary for all RIRs. Smaller RIRs could more effectively demonstrate compliance with ICP-2 through internal processes that do not require external auditors.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---

Mandating regular external audits could place a significant burden on smaller RIRs, potentially hindering their ability to focus on local issues. More cost-effective compliance mechanisms should be considered, especially for emerging RIRs.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

Requiring RIRs to undergo regular audits by an independent external auditor may create undue financial strain, especially for those in developing areas. Such audits might not be the most effective means of ensuring compliance with ICP-2 and could distract from essential operations.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---

Regular external audits could impose undue financial pressures on RIRs, especially those operating in resource-constrained regions. It would be more effective for RIRs to demonstrate ICP-2 compliance through internal or regional reviews that are less resource-intensive.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

Mandatory audits by an external and independent auditor could impose unnecessary financial and administrative burdens on RIRs, particularly those in smaller or emerging regions with limited resources. Such requirements may detract from an RIR's core responsibilities and local commitments.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

Mandating external audits could be a financial strain, particularly for RIRs with fewer resources. More flexible approaches to demonstrating compliance with ICP-2 could be considered to reduce administrative burden without compromising accountability.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

Mandatory external audits may impose unnecessary costs on RIRs, especially in resource-constrained regions. A more flexible approach could allow RIRs to demonstrate compliance with ICP-2 in ways that better suit their operations.

**Md Abu Sayeem Siddique Siddique (ServicEngine Ltd)**

---

Requiring regular audits by an external and independent auditor could create significant financial and administrative burdens on RIRs, particularly those in smaller or emerging regions with limited resources. Such audits may not be the most effective way to ensure compliance with ICP-2.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

Mandating audits could impose unnecessary financial and administrative challenges on RIRs, particularly in emerging areas. A more adaptable approach may better support their core functions.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

Requiring RIRs to undergo regular external audits may not be practical for those in smaller regions with limited resources. Flexibility in compliance can enhance their operational effectiveness.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---

Requiring independent audits could lead to significant resource constraints for RIRs, particularly in smaller regions. A more context-sensitive compliance approach is essential.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---

The imposition of mandatory audits by independent auditors could create undue financial strain on RIRs. Compliance mechanisms should prioritize local relevance and flexibility.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

The requirement for independent audits could place significant financial and operational pressures on RIRs, especially in developing regions, potentially compromising their core functions.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

Imposing regular external audits may not effectively enhance compliance for all RIRs, particularly those in resource-limited regions. The approach to compliance should be flexible and context-sensitive.

**Trang Tran (VNPT Technologies)**

---

The imposition of regular audits by independent auditors could strain RIRs financially, especially those in emerging markets. Compliance frameworks should prioritize local contexts over rigid external oversight.

**Minh Hoang (ANSV)**

---

Mandating audits by external auditors could create significant administrative challenges for RIRs, particularly in smaller regions, and may detract from their ability to serve their communities effectively.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**

---

External audits impose financial and administrative burdens that could detract from an RIR's mission. More region-specific, flexible methods to verify compliance with ICP-2 could be more effective and less resource-intensive.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**

---

Mandating external audits may not be necessary for all RIRs. Smaller RIRs could better comply with ICP-2 through internal assessments or other cost-effective verification methods that do not require the involvement of external auditors.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---

Mandating external, independent audits could impose a significant financial burden, especially for smaller or newer RIRs. Compliance with ICP-2 can be better ensured through regional, context-specific processes that are less resource-intensive.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

Imposing external audits regularly could put unnecessary strain on RIRs with fewer resources. Instead, a more flexible approach that allows for alternative means of demonstrating compliance with ICP-2 would better serve RIRs, particularly in resource-constrained regions.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

Audits by an external auditor may not always be the best or most efficient way to ensure compliance with ICP-2, especially for smaller RIRs with limited budgets. A more regionally tailored approach to compliance would be more effective and less burdensome.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---

Mandating regular external audits could be a significant financial burden, particularly for smaller RIRs. Compliance with ICP-2 could be more effectively achieved through internal mechanisms or less resource-intensive methods, which would better suit the diverse needs of different regions.

**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

External and independent audits are expensive and may divert critical resources from other priorities. Rather than requiring audits, RIRs should be given the flexibility to demonstrate compliance through internal reviews or other cost-effective means.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---

Requiring external audits could impose significant resource constraints on RIRs, especially in regions with fewer financial or administrative resources. A more flexible approach to demonstrating compliance with ICP-2 would allow RIRs to focus on their core responsibilities.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

While regular audits could be useful, they might not be the most effective or necessary approach for all RIRs. Smaller or emerging RIRs may be disproportionately impacted by the financial and administrative costs, which could detract from their ability to serve local needs.

**Ryan Khaw (Alsco Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

While external audits are important for accountability, requiring them could distract RIRs from their essential responsibilities, especially in resource-constrained regions. Flexibility is key.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

Regular independent audits may not be feasible for all RIRs, especially those operating in resource-constrained environments. The focus should be on practical compliance measures that align with local needs.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Apmic)**

---

While audits can promote accountability, requiring them might detract from RIRs' core activities, especially in developing regions. A more flexible approach can better accommodate local realities.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Mandating audits by external auditors could impose significant administrative burdens on RIRs, especially those in resource-limited areas. Flexibility in compliance methods is essential.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

Requiring regular independent audits may create unnecessary financial strains on RIRs, particularly those in smaller regions. A more adaptable approach could better serve their local needs.

**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

Insisting on mandatory external audits may create significant financial and administrative challenges for RIRs, particularly in developing areas. Such requirements could divert attention from their core missions.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

Requiring RIRs to undergo regular external audits may place an undue financial burden on them, particularly in regions with limited resources. These audits could distract from their essential activities and may not be the most effective means of compliance.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

The imposition of mandatory audits by external auditors could strain RIRs financially, particularly those in emerging regions. Compliance measures should be more adaptable to local contexts.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**

---

Regular audits by external auditors may create financial and administrative challenges for RIRs, particularly in regions with fewer resources. Compliance assessments should be sensitive to local needs.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

Requiring external audits may create unnecessary financial strain for RIRs, particularly in regions with limited resources. Flexibility in compliance methods could better serve the RIR's core mission and regional needs.

**Jeremy Cheong (Infineon technologies)**

---

Mandatory audits by independent auditors could impose heavy financial and administrative burdens on RIRs, particularly those in emerging areas. A more flexible approach may better support their core functions.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

Mandatory audits by external auditors may create unnecessary financial burdens on RIRs, especially smaller ones. Compliance with ICP-2 should consider regional circumstances and operational realities.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

Requiring independent audits may not be suitable for all RIRs, particularly those with limited resources. Such requirements could divert attention from essential local responsibilities and challenges.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

Mandating external audits could lead to significant financial and administrative challenges for RIRs, particularly in resource-limited regions. This may not effectively ensure compliance with ICP-2.

**Sohel Kabir (Kabir Traders)**

---

Regular audits by external auditors could impose financial strain on RIRs, especially those with limited resources. Instead of enhancing compliance with ICP-2, such audits may distract from essential functions.

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

The requirement for independent audits may lead to unnecessary financial pressures on RIRs, particularly in smaller regions. A compliance framework should be more adaptive to local realities rather than rigidly enforced.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---

Imposing mandatory external audits may not be practical for all RIRs, particularly those in emerging areas with limited capacity. This requirement could distract from their primary mission and local engagement.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---

Regular audits by external auditors might create excessive financial and operational burdens on RIRs, especially in regions with fewer resources. Compliance mechanisms should respect local contexts and core responsibilities.

**Catalina Cueca (Manpower)**

---

Mandating audits by independent external auditors could burden RIRs with financial and administrative challenges, particularly those in developing regions, and may distract from their essential functions.

**Camilo Riveros (Manpower)**

---

Mandating audits by independent external auditors could burden RIRs with unnecessary financial and administrative demands, especially in smaller regions. These audits may not be the most effective way to ensure compliance with ICP-2.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

Mandatory audits by an external and independent auditor may create significant financial and administrative pressures on RIRs, particularly those in smaller or emerging regions. These audits could detract from the RIR's primary responsibilities and responsiveness to local needs.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**

---

Mandating external audits may place unnecessary burdens on RIRs, especially in smaller or developing regions with limited capacity. These audits might not be the most effective means of ensuring compliance with ICP-2, detracting from local priorities.

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

This condition appears overly strict. Mandating external audits could distract RIRs from their primary responsibilities by adding financial and administrative burdens. Additionally, these audits may not be the most effective means of ensuring compliance with ICP-2.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Regular audits could impose significant financial and administrative strains on RIRs, particularly those in smaller or developing regions. Such audits may not effectively ensure compliance with ICP-2.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Mandating regular external audits could create unnecessary financial and administrative pressures on RIRs, especially in smaller or developing regions. These audits may not effectively verify ICP-2 compliance and could divert focus from core responsibilities.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

This condition feels counterproductive. Requiring mandatory audits by independent auditors may impose undue financial and administrative burdens on RIRs, particularly in resource-limited areas. Moreover, these audits might not effectively ensure compliance with ICP-2.

**Anh Dang (NASA)**

---

Instituting mandatory external audits may create significant financial and administrative challenges for RIRs, particularly in smaller regions with limited resources. These audits may not be the best approach to ensuring compliance with ICP-2.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

Requiring regular audits by independent external auditors could impose excessive financial and administrative pressures on RIRs, especially in emerging regions. Such audits may not effectively ensure compliance with ICP-2 and could divert attention from core functions.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

Compulsory audits by external auditors could create undue financial and administrative pressures on RIRs, particularly those with limited resources. These audits may not always be the most effective way to ensure ICP-2 compliance, potentially distracting from core responsibilities.

**Prasanta Haloi (Pwd)**

---

I strongly disagree with this provision. Mandating regular external audits could impose unnecessary financial and administrative pressures on RIRs, particularly in smaller or developing regions. Such audits might not be the most effective way to confirm ICP-2 compliance and could divert attention from core responsibilities.

**Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)**

---

Although independent audits are beneficial, mandating them could overwhelm RIRs with excessive costs and administrative duties, particularly in resource-constrained areas. This may not effectively ensure compliance with ICP-2.

**AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)**

---

While regular audits can enhance accountability, requiring them may create financial and administrative challenges for RIRs, particularly in smaller regions. This could detract from their ability to focus on local needs.

**K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Regular audits by independent auditors could create unnecessary financial and administrative pressures on RIRs, particularly in areas with limited resources. Moreover, such audits may not effectively verify compliance with ICP-2.

**Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)**

---

Mandating regular external audits may not be the most effective way to ensure compliance with ICP-2 and could impose significant burdens on RIRs, particularly those with limited resources.

**Fuhui Zhang (University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)**

---

While audits enhance governance, the requirement for regular external audits could impose undue financial strain on RIRs, particularly in resource-limited regions. This may not be the most efficient approach to ensuring compliance with ICP-2.

**Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)**

---

Mandating external audits could impose significant burdens on RIRs, particularly in smaller or emerging regions. Such audits may not be the most effective means of ensuring compliance with ICP-2 and could distract from essential activities.

**Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)**

---

19. Although independent audits are valuable, mandating them could overwhelm RIRs with financial and administrative responsibilities, especially those in resource-limited areas. This could detract from local needs and core functions.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

Requiring regular external audits may impose unnecessary burdens on RIRs, especially in smaller or developing regions with limited capacity. Such audits might not effectively ensure compliance with ICP-2 and could detract from essential local responsibilities.

**Trabahan Pujari (Paruluniversity)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

This requirement seems impractical. Regular audits by external auditors could present significant financial and administrative challenges for RIRs, particularly in resource-limited areas. These audits may not be the best method for ensuring ICP-2 compliance.

**Juan Mesa (Hispasat)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Mandating stringent standards for reliability and cross-RIR compatibility could strain RIR resources, especially in regions with specific challenges. The focus should be on regional adaptability rather than enforcing uniformity.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

Requiring mandatory audits by an independent external auditor could impose an excessive financial and administrative burden on RIRs, particularly in smaller or emerging regions with limited resources. Such audits may not be the most effective way to ensure ICP-2 compliance and could detract from the RIR's core responsibilities and local needs.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

I strongly disagree with this provision. Mandating regular external audits could impose unnecessary financial and administrative pressures on RIRs, particularly in smaller or developing regions. Such audits might not be the most effective way to confirm ICP-2 compliance and could divert attention from core responsibilities.

**Pornpipat Kitireanglarp (ZERIWELLPLUS Co., Ltd.)**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. Mandatory external audits could create unnecessary financial and administrative costs for RIRs, particularly in resource-constrained regions. Such audits may not be the most efficient way to ensure ICP-2 compliance, potentially distracting from primary responsibilities.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Mandating high standards for reliability and cross-RIR compatibility could divert essential resources from addressing local priorities. The emphasis should be on flexibility and regional adaptability, not rigid global compliance.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---



I strongly disagree with this stipulation. Routine audits by external auditors could create undue financial and administrative strain on RIRs, especially in resource-limited areas. Such audits may not be the most effective approach to ensuring ICP-2 compliance.

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

lar external audits seems overly burdensome, imposing significant financial and administrative strain on RIRs, particularly in smaller or developing regions. These audits might not be the most effective means of ensuring ICP-2 compliance and could divert focus from essential local tasks.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

I strongly disagree with this requirement. Imposing mandatory audits by independent auditors could create substantial financial and administrative challenges for RIRs, especially in smaller or developing regions. These audits may not effectively support ICP-2 compliance and could detract from regional priorities.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. Mandatory external audits may impose unnecessary financial and administrative costs on RIRs, particularly in resource-constrained areas. Such audits may not be the best approach for ensuring ICP-2 compliance, potentially diverting attention from primary responsibilities.

**Ashraful Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Imposing mandatory external audits could place a financial and administrative burden on RIRs, especially in smaller or developing areas. These audits may not effectively promote ICP-2 compliance and could detract from local needs.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

This requirement seems overly demanding. Mandating audits could impose significant financial and administrative pressures on RIRs, particularly in smaller or developing regions. These audits may not effectively ensure ICP-2 compliance and could detract from essential local responsibilities.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---

I strongly disagree with this stipulation. Routine audits by external auditors could create undue financial and administrative strain on RIRs, especially in resource-limited areas. Such audits may not be the most effective approach for ensuring ICP-2 compliance.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

This condition feels impractical. Mandating external audits could impose considerable financial and administrative burdens on RIRs, especially in smaller or emerging regions. These audits may not effectively ensure compliance with ICP-2 and could pull focus from local priorities.

**Phuc Pham (Advanced Network Systems VietNam Company Limited)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. Regular audits by independent auditors could create unnecessary financial and administrative pressure on RIRs, especially in regions with limited resources. Moreover, these audits may not be the most effective way to ensure compliance with ICP-2.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

I am strongly opposed to this provision. Mandating external audits could place considerable financial and administrative demands on RIRs, particularly in smaller or emerging areas. These audits may not effectively confirm ICP-2 compliance and could shift focus from key responsibilities.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

This approach seems overly rigid. Routine audits by external auditors could impose financial and administrative burdens on RIRs, especially in regions with fewer resources. These audits may not be the ideal method to ensure ICP-2 compliance and could detract from critical local functions.

**Giang Nguyen (NASA)**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. Mandatory external audits may impose unnecessary financial and administrative costs on RIRs, particularly in resource-constrained areas. Such audits may not be the best approach for ensuring ICP-2 compliance, potentially diverting attention from primary responsibilities.

**Alex Kwan (Wiplus Malaysia)**

---

Requiring mandatory audits by an independent external auditor could impose an excessive financial and administrative burden on RIRs, particularly in smaller or emerging regions with limited resources. Such audits may not be the most effective way to ensure ICP-2 compliance and could detract from the RIR's core responsibilities and local needs.

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

Disagree

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Imposing mandatory audits by independent auditors could create significant financial and administrative challenges for RIRs, especially in smaller or emerging regions. These audits may not effectively promote ICP-2 compliance and could detract from local needs.

**Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. Mandatory external audits may impose unnecessary financial and administrative costs on RIRs, especially in regions with limited resources. Such audits may not be the best approach for ensuring ICP-2 compliance, potentially diverting focus from core responsibilities.

**Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)**

---

I believe that requiring mandatory audits by an external, independent auditor could place an undue financial and administrative burden on RIRs, especially in smaller or emerging regions with limited resources. Such audits may not be the best way to ensure compliance with ICP-2 and could detract from the RIR's core responsibilities and local needs.

**Pooja Gopi (DM Digital Marketing)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Mandating regular external audits could create unnecessary financial and administrative pressures on RIRs, especially in smaller or developing regions. These audits may not effectively verify compliance with ICP-2 and could divert focus from core responsibilities.

**Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)**

---

This condition seems counterproductive. Requiring mandatory audits by independent auditors may impose undue financial and administrative burdens on RIRs, particularly in resource-limited areas. Moreover, these audits might not effectively ensure compliance with ICP-2.

**Quyn Kim (VNPAY)**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. Mandatory external audits may impose unnecessary financial and administrative costs on RIRs, particularly in areas with limited resources. Furthermore, such audits may not be the best approach to ensuring compliance with ICP-2, potentially diverting focus from core responsibilities.

**Shahedul Islam Bhuiyan (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Requiring regular external audits may not be the best use of RIR resources, particularly for those in emerging regions. Such audits could distract from the RIR's primary functions and may not effectively verify compliance with ICP-2.

**Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)**

---

Question 38&39 Audit An RIR must participate in regular audits by an external and independent auditor to ensure that it is continuing to comply with ICP-2. 1- Strongly Disagree I believe that requiring mandatory audits by an external and independent auditor could place undue financial and administrative burdens on RIRs, particularly those in smaller or emerging regions with limited resources. Such audits may not be the most effective means of ensuring compliance with ICP-2, as they could detract from the RIR's core responsibilities and local needs.

**Anjan Deka (HDFC)**

---

I believe that requiring mandatory audits by an external and independent auditor could place undue financial and administrative burdens on RIRs, particularly those in smaller or emerging regions with limited resources. Such audits may not be the most effective means of ensuring compliance with ICP-2, as they could detract from the RIR's core responsibilities and local needs.

Regular audits by external auditors could create unnecessary financial strain for RIRs, particularly in smaller regions. These audits may distract from essential operations and not effectively ensure adherence to ICP-2.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

While audits can enhance accountability, requiring external independent audits may impose significant burdens on RIRs, especially in resource-constrained regions. Such audits might not be the most efficient means of ensuring compliance with ICP-2.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

1. Mandating regular external audits could place undue financial and administrative stress on RIRs, particularly those in smaller or emerging regions with limited resources. These audits may not effectively address compliance with ICP-2 and could detract from core responsibilities.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---

## 19. Service

---

An RIR must provide stable, reliable, secure, accurate, and accountable allocation, registration, and directory services, as well as related technical services, using standard protocols and specifications for cross-RIR compatibility.

### 19.1. Service - Strongly Agree (5)

If an RIR can't do this it can't be an RIR.

Jordan Carter (auDA)

---

and above all based on security and compliance

Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)

---

I strongly agree with this principle, as it is fundamental for an RIR to provide stable, reliable, secure, accurate, and accountable services to ensure the effective management of internet resources. Here's an analysis: Reasons for Agreement

1. Ensures Stability and Reliability • Stable and reliable services are essential for the functioning of the internet. An RIR must ensure that its allocation, registration, and directory services are consistently available and meet the needs of its community. Any instability or downtime can cause disruptions in the global routing infrastructure, which would have far-reaching consequences.
2. Guarantees Security • Given the critical role of RIRs in managing IP addresses and other internet resources, security is paramount. An RIR must safeguard its systems and databases against unauthorized access, attacks, and fraud to ensure that allocated resources remain protected. A secure environment also assures the community that their data is safe and their interactions with the RIR are trustworthy.
3. Ensures Accuracy and Accountability • Accurate allocation and registration are critical for the efficient functioning of the global internet. An RIR must ensure that the IP address data and related records it manages are correct and up to date. Accountability in service provision is also crucial to maintain the trust of the community and ensure that decisions and actions are traceable and transparent.
- 4.

Promotes Interoperability • Using standard protocols and specifications ensures that RIRs can interact seamlessly with each other and other parts of the global internet infrastructure. Cross-RIR compatibility is essential for the smooth exchange of information, resource allocation, and policy implementation across regions, contributing to the stability of the global internet system.

5. Fulfills Global Internet Governance Obligations • This principle aligns with global standards for internet governance, particularly the need for secure, reliable, and interoperable systems for managing internet resources. RIRs, as key players in this ecosystem, must adhere to these standards to ensure the proper functioning of the global internet infrastructure.
- 6.

Supports Long-Term Sustainability • Providing consistent and high-quality services allows an RIR to build a sustainable infrastructure that can grow with the demands of the internet. As the internet expands and evolves, the RIR must be able to meet new challenges and ensure that it continues to provide the necessary resources and services without disruption. Potential Considerations

1. Resource Management and Scaling • The RIR must have the capacity to scale its systems and infrastructure as demand for IP addresses and related services grows. It must also anticipate future needs and adapt to technological changes to maintain the stability and reliability of its services.
2. Ensuring Global Compatibility • While standard protocols and specifications are vital for cross-RIR compatibility, the RIR must also ensure that its systems remain flexible enough to adapt to regional needs and local conditions, as long as they align

with global best practices. 3. Investment in Security and Technology • Maintaining high levels of security and reliability requires ongoing investment in technology, training, and personnel. An RIR must be prepared to allocate the necessary resources to stay ahead of emerging threats and ensure that its systems are resilient to attacks and failures. 4. Performance Monitoring and Audits • To ensure that services remain stable and reliable, the RIR must implement robust performance monitoring systems and undergo regular audits to identify and address potential vulnerabilities or inefficiencies. Conclusion An RIR must provide stable, reliable, secure, accurate, and accountable services to ensure the proper functioning of the global internet infrastructure. These services are crucial for maintaining the trust of the community, supporting global interoperability, and fulfilling the RIR's role in internet governance. By adhering to standard protocols and specifications, the RIR contributes to the overall stability and security of the global internet ecosystem.

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

Nothing to add or detract

**Brian Longwe (Converged Technology Networks)**

---

YES

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

services should be audited by community oversight

**Aftab Siddiqui (AFTABSIDDIQUI-AU)**

---

yes

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

I fully agree with this principle. Providing stable, reliable, secure, accurate, and accountable services is fundamental for an RIR to effectively manage Internet resources and meet the needs of its community. Adhering to standard protocols and specifications ensures cross-RIR compatibility, enabling seamless coordination and communication across regions. This is essential for maintaining the global integrity of the Internet's resource allocation system and for ensuring that stakeholders can trust the services provided by the RIR.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

Yes

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

Yup

**Mark Elkins (Posix Systems)**

---

I strongly support the principle that an RIR must provide stable, reliable, secure, accurate, and accountable allocation, registration, and directory services, using standard protocols for cross-RIR compatibility. These elements are fundamental to the proper functioning of the global internet

infrastructure, ensuring smooth coordination, security, transparency, and sustainability. For the global internet system to thrive, RIRs must uphold these standards, guaranteeing that resources are distributed and managed efficiently and securely across regions.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

A chief technical officer or scientist is to be recruited by each RIR as a member of its management.

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Mandating that RIRs meet high standards for reliability and cross-RIR compatibility could divert essential resources away from local priorities. Emphasis should be on flexibility and adaptability to regional challenges, not rigid compliance.

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

I agree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

yes

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

souhaiter

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

Using standard protocols and ensuring cross-RIR compatibility guarantees seamless communication

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

Yes

**Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)**

---

Totally agree

**Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)**

---

I agree

**Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)**

---

RIRs must avoid entrusting decision making on non-technical issues to staff claiming technical skills.

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

And the NRO should define a baseline standard by which these services can be evaluated. And failing to comply should trigger decay of accreditation.

**Musa Stephen HONLUE (AFRINIC)**

---

this add complexity to existing RIRs, however this would be the only way to handle a de-registration. This would require the basic service catalogue for all RIRs to be defined

**Saul Stein (eNetworks)**

---

Yes, their raison d'etre

**Mike Burns (IPTrading)**

---

Well yes...

**Kevin Meynell (Individual)**

---

further elaboration is possible is good as principle

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

## **19.2. Service - Somewhat Agree (4)**

In agreement

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

agree

**Mohammad Mubarak Alfalasi (Telecommunication and Digital government Regulatory Authority)**

---

outlines the core responsibilities of an RIR in providing essential services to the internet community. By ensuring the stability, reliability, security, accuracy, and accountability of its services, RIRs contribute to the overall health and functionality of the internet. The use of standard protocols and specifications for cross-RIR compatibility promotes interoperability and seamless operation of the global internet numbering system. This principle underscores the critical role of RIRs in maintaining a robust and resilient internet infrastructure.

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

This principle ensures that an RIR provides stable, reliable, secure, accurate, and accountable services for IP address allocation, registration, and directory services, while using standard protocols for cross-RIR compatibility. It emphasizes the importance of consistency, security, and interoperability, which are crucial for global internet coordination. Although meeting these requirements can be complex and resource-intensive, the benefits—such as improved trust, efficiency, and global integration—are essential for maintaining a robust and effective internet infrastructure.

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

No comment



This condition seems impractical. Insisting on uniform standards for reliability and cross-RIR compatibility may not be feasible for all RIRs, especially in regions with unique challenges. Flexibility and regional focus should take precedence over strict adherence to global standards.

**Sidonie Hacking (-)**

---

Inter-RIR compatibility and coordination has always been a problem. Reducing the mess is a process, not an edict.

**Randy Bush (IJJ Research Lab & Arrcus Inc)**

---

### **19.3. Service - Neutral (3)**

The level of detail goes beyond the level of principle and would significantly benefit from a rationale or implementation note

**Peter Koch (Individual)**

---

Requiring an RIR to meet such strict standards for stability, reliability, and cross-RIR compatibility is unrealistic and overly restrictive. Different regions face varying challenges, and imposing these high expectations could force RIRs to divert resources from addressing more pressing local needs. Rigid global standards ignore unique regional challenges.

**Noel OUPOH (DATACONNECT AFRICA)**

---

The expectation for RIRs to provide uniform standards for services is unrealistic and may overlook pressing local needs. Flexibility should take precedence over strict compliance.

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. Requiring RIRs to maintain strict standards for allocation and directory services may overlook the specific challenges different regions face. This could force RIRs to divert resources from pressing local needs in favor of meeting high expectations for compatibility.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---

This approach appears overly demanding. Requiring RIRs to meet strict criteria for reliability and compatibility may not take into account the unique circumstances of different regions. Such expectations could lead to a diversion of resources away from pressing local issues, highlighting the need for flexibility.

**Jun Wen (one futures technology sdn bhd)**

---

The expectation for RIRs to provide uniformly high standards of service can be unrealistic, given the diversity of regional challenges. Flexibility in service provision is crucial to address local needs effectively.

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

#### **19.4. Service - Somewhat Disagree (2)**

Mandating uniform standards for cross-RIR compatibility may place undue strain on RIRs in regions with fewer technical resources. RIRs should have the flexibility to implement solutions that best meet local demands without rigid adherence to global specifications.

**Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)**

---

The insistence on uniform service standards for RIRs is unrealistic. Each region has its unique needs, and the focus should be on addressing those rather than rigid compliance.

**Neonjyoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

#### **19.5. Service - Strongly Disagree (1)**

What services are provided shouldn't be in the set of principles since they'll vary over time and the intent of principles is to provide general guidance, not explicit implementation details. In that context, the set of services provided by the RIR should be specified by the community and the performance of those services must conform to a set of service level expectations specified by its community. Generally speaking, the use of standard protocols and requirements for compatibility are an implementation detail, more related to continuity, than a principle.

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

The demand for RIRs to provide stable and reliable services while ensuring strict adherence to cross-RIR compatibility may be impractical. Regions face different challenges, and RIRs should prioritize local relevance over global uniformity.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

Requiring RIRs to adhere to high standards of stability and cross-RIR compatibility may not be feasible. Unique regional challenges necessitate flexibility, and enforcing rigid standards could detract from addressing local priorities.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

Imposing strict requirements for reliability and cross-RIR compatibility could overwhelm RIRs, detracting from their ability to respond to local needs. Each region's unique challenges necessitate a more flexible approach.

Mandating that RIRs provide stable, reliable services while adhering to strict cross-RIR compatibility standards may be overly burdensome. Each region has unique challenges, and flexibility should take precedence over rigid compliance.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

Mandating strict standards for stability, reliability, and cross-RIR compatibility could be unrealistic for RIRs, given the unique challenges in different regions. This may lead to a misallocation of resources that could be better used to address pressing local priorities.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---

The demand for RIRs to provide stable, reliable services with cross-RIR compatibility is impractical. Regions have varying needs, and enforcing rigid standards could lead to resource misallocation, diverting attention from critical local concerns.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

Imposing stringent requirements for stability, reliability, and cross-RIR compatibility may be overly burdensome for RIRs. Different regions experience distinct challenges, and high expectations could force RIRs to neglect more urgent local issues in favor of meeting global standards.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---

Requiring RIRs to achieve strict standards for reliability and cross-RIR compatibility may not be feasible. Each region has unique challenges, and enforcing these expectations could detract from RIRs' ability to focus on their local responsibilities and needs.

**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Insisting on high standards for stability and cross-RIR compatibility could be overly burdensome for RIRs, especially those in regions with distinct challenges. Resources may be better spent on addressing local needs rather than rigidly adhering to global standards.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

The expectation for RIRs to provide reliable services with strict adherence to cross-RIR compatibility standards may not be practical. Each region has distinct challenges, and enforcing such expectations could detract from RIRs' focus on local needs.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

Requiring RIRs to adhere to high standards of stability and cross-RIR compatibility may not account for the diverse challenges faced by different regions. This could divert resources away from addressing local needs in favor of meeting global expectations.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

The expectation for RIRs to provide stable and reliable services while ensuring cross-RIR compatibility may be overly demanding. Each region has unique needs, and flexibility should take precedence over rigid compliance with uniform standards.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

This condition seems impractical. Insisting on uniform standards for reliability and cross-RIR compatibility may not be feasible for all RIRs, especially those facing unique challenges. Regional focus and flexibility should be prioritized over enforcing strict global standards.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. Requiring RIRs to maintain strict standards for allocation and directory services may ignore the specific challenges different regions face. This could force RIRs to divert resources away from urgent local matters in order to meet high compatibility standards.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---

The demand for strict stability, reliability, and cross-RIR compatibility from RIRs could be seen as unrealistic. Each region encounters distinct challenges, and such high expectations may detract from addressing pressing local issues. Flexibility should be prioritized over rigid compliance.

**Taslima Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

Requiring RIRs to meet stringent standards for service stability and cross-RIR compatibility can be impractical. Different regions have unique challenges, and imposing these expectations may lead to a misallocation of resources. Prioritizing regional needs over uniform standards is crucial.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

The obligation to meet strict standards for reliability and cross-RIR compatibility may not reflect the diverse realities faced by RIRs. Local needs should take precedence over rigid compliance expectations.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

Requiring high standards for service provision could overwhelm RIRs, particularly those in resource-limited regions. A focus on flexibility and regional relevance is essential for effective operation.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

Mandating high standards for stability and cross-RIR compatibility may not reflect regional realities. This could lead to a misallocation of resources from local needs. RIRs should focus on regional relevance and adaptability rather than rigid compliance.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

Insisting on strict standards for service stability and reliability may not be practical for RIRs. Different regions encounter unique challenges, and imposing these standards could detract from addressing pressing local issues. Flexibility should be prioritized.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

Insisting on strict standards for service stability and reliability may not be practical for RIRs. Different regions encounter unique challenges, and imposing these standards could detract from addressing pressing local issues. Flexibility should be prioritized.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

Mandating high standards for stability and cross-RIR compatibility can create undue pressure on RIRs. Emphasizing local needs and flexibility is more important than rigid compliance with global standards.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

Imposing strict requirements for allocation and registration services may hinder RIRs' ability to address local needs effectively. A focus on regional adaptability is crucial for successful operations.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

Requiring RIRs to maintain stringent standards for reliability and compatibility may overlook the diverse challenges they face. Flexibility and responsiveness should be prioritized over uniformity.

**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

High expectations for stability and cross-RIR compatibility can be overly demanding for RIRs. Emphasizing regional relevance and flexibility is vital for effective service delivery.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

Mandating that RIRs adhere to high standards for stability, reliability, and cross-RIR compatibility is overly restrictive. Each region faces unique challenges, and such expectations could divert resources from addressing more urgent local issues. Regional flexibility should take precedence

**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Insisting on stringent standards for reliability and cross-RIR compatibility could hinder RIRs from effectively responding to local needs. Resources should be directed toward regional challenges, not global compliance.

**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

The expectation for RIRs to maintain high standards for stability and reliability, including cross-RIR compatibility, may not consider the diverse challenges of different regions. Such demands could divert resources from local needs. A focus on regional flexibility is essential.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

Requiring RIRs to meet stringent standards for stability and reliability may impose unrealistic demands. Each region has its own challenges, and enforcing such expectations could detract from responding to local needs. Prioritizing flexibility is crucial.

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

Mandating rigorous standards for allocation and registration services may not align with the realities faced by various RIRs. Flexibility in addressing regional needs should be prioritized over enforcing uniform global compatibility.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

Requiring RIRs to meet strict standards for reliability may detract from their ability to serve local communities effectively. A focus on regional flexibility is crucial for addressing diverse challenges.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

Imposing stringent requirements for allocation and registration services may not be practical for all RIRs. Flexibility in addressing local challenges should take precedence over rigid adherence to global standards.

**Kwan Ke Yue (TBWA/ Kuala Lumpur)**

---

High standards for stability and cross-RIR compatibility can create unrealistic expectations for RIRs. Emphasizing adaptability to regional needs is more important than enforcing uniform compliance.

**Sean Carroll (The One Academy)**

---

Requiring RIRs to maintain stringent standards for stability and reliability may not reflect the diverse challenges they face. A focus on regional needs and adaptability is more appropriate than enforcing global standards.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

Imposing rigorous standards for cross-RIR compatibility may be impractical for many RIRs. Each region faces unique circumstances, and flexibility should be emphasized over uniformity.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

Mandating that RIRs meet stringent standards for reliability and compatibility may not be realistic, especially for those in developing regions. A focus on local adaptability can lead to more effective outcomes.

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**

---

Requiring RIRs to comply with rigorous service standards may not be feasible for all regions. A more adaptable approach to service delivery is necessary.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

Mandating that RIRs provide stable and reliable services while ensuring cross-RIR compatibility may be impractical. Regions have varying needs and challenges, and enforcing such rigid standards could hinder RIRs from effectively addressing local priorities.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---

Global standards for cross-RIR compatibility are important, but they should not force RIRs to prioritize uniformity over local needs. RIRs should be empowered to focus on delivering relevant services to their communities while maintaining flexibility.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---

Requiring RIRs to meet strict global standards may limit their ability to focus on more pressing regional issues. A flexible approach that allows RIRs to tailor services based on local requirements would be more effective.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

Imposing strict requirements for stability, reliability, and cross-RIR compatibility on RIRs is overly demanding and may not account for the diverse challenges different regions encounter. This approach could lead to a misallocation of resources that would be better spent addressing local needs rather than meeting global standards.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---

Strict adherence to cross-RIR compatibility may not always be feasible or necessary. RIRs should have the flexibility to implement services that best address local needs, with cross-RIR compatibility being a secondary priority.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

Requiring an RIR to adhere to such stringent standards for stability, reliability, and cross-RIR compatibility may be unrealistic and overly restrictive. Different regions face unique challenges, and imposing these high expectations could divert resources from more pressing local needs. RIRs should focus on regional relevance and flexibility rather than rigid compliance with uniform standards.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

Mandating cross-RIR compatibility may place a heavy burden on RIRs in regions with fewer resources. RIRs should be allowed to provide essential services to their communities while balancing local priorities with global standards.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

Requiring RIRs to adhere to stringent standards for service provision may overlook the unique challenges each region faces. This approach could force RIRs to divert resources from more critical local issues in favor of meeting uniform standards.

**Md Abu Sayeem Siddique Siddique (ServicEngine Ltd)**

---

Mandating strict standards for stability, reliability, and cross-RIR compatibility may be unrealistic given the diverse challenges faced by different regions. Imposing such high expectations could lead RIRs to prioritize compliance over addressing pressing local needs.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

While reliable services are essential, requiring strict adherence to cross-RIR compatibility may not be practical for all RIRs. Flexibility is necessary to meet local needs effectively.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

Imposing high standards for allocation and registration services may not adequately address the diverse realities of RIRs in different regions. A more tailored approach can enhance effectiveness.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---

Imposing high expectations on RIRs for service delivery may not reflect their operational realities. Local contexts should guide the development of service standards.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---

Requiring RIRs to adhere to strict standards for reliability and compatibility could detract from local responsiveness. The focus should be on practical solutions tailored to regional needs.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

Imposing high standards for service delivery on RIRs could lead to resource diversion from more critical local concerns. Regional differences should be acknowledged in setting expectations.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

The expectation for RIRs to adhere to stringent service standards may not align with regional realities. Flexibility should be prioritized to enable RIRs to address pressing local issues.

**Trang Tran (VNPT Technologies)**

---

Imposing high expectations for service standards on RIRs could hinder their ability to respond to local needs. The focus should be on regional relevance rather than strict compliance with global standards.

**Minh Hoang (ANSV)**

---

The requirement for RIRs to provide consistent standards for stability and compatibility is overly restrictive. Each region should have the flexibility to address its unique challenges.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**

---

Imposing strict technical requirements for cross-RIR compatibility could lead to inefficiencies in resource allocation. RIRs should prioritize services that are most relevant to their community's needs, while aiming for compatibility where feasible.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**

---

Requiring RIRs to meet global standards for cross-RIR compatibility could divert resources from regional priorities. A more flexible approach that allows RIRs to tailor services to local conditions would be more effective and sustainable.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---



Strict requirements for cross-RIR compatibility could lead to resource misallocation, diverting attention from regional priorities. RIRs should focus on providing reliable services locally, with flexibility in how those services are implemented.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

While cross-RIR compatibility and standardization are important, it should not come at the cost of addressing local needs. RIRs should focus on providing relevant services to their communities, even if those services do not fully align with global protocols.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

Imposing global standards for cross-RIR compatibility could force RIRs to prioritize standardization over addressing local challenges. Flexibility in implementation should be encouraged to ensure that regional needs are met effectively.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---

Cross-RIR compatibility is important but should not overshadow the specific needs of regional communities. RIRs should be allowed to implement technical services based on regional priorities, even if they do not fully comply with global standards.

**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

While stability and reliability are essential, insisting on strict global standards for cross-RIR compatibility could create undue pressure on RIRs with fewer resources. RIRs should have the flexibility to implement solutions that are appropriate for their regional needs.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---

The requirement to adhere to global standards for cross-RIR compatibility may not be realistic, given the varying capacities of different RIRs. RIRs should be allowed to prioritize local needs over uniform technical standards that may not be achievable for all.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

Requiring uniform standards for all RIRs may not be feasible, as regions have varying capabilities and needs. A more flexible approach, tailored to local challenges, would be more effective than forcing compliance with global standards.

**Ryan Khaw (Alsco Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

Requiring RIRs to maintain high standards for stability and compatibility could limit their ability to respond to regional challenges. A flexible approach can better support local governance.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

Imposing stringent service standards on RIRs may not be practical for all regions. Each RIR should prioritize local needs over rigid compliance with cross-RIR expectations.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Apmic)**

---

Requiring RIRs to provide stable and reliable services under strict standards may detract from their ability to address local challenges. Flexibility should be emphasized over uniformity.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

While accountability in registration and directory services is crucial, imposing strict standards for cross-RIR compatibility may not be feasible for all RIRs. Adaptability is key.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

The expectation for RIRs to achieve uniform standards may not reflect the varying capacities of different regions. Flexibility in service provision should take precedence over rigid compliance.

**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

The demand for strict stability, reliability, and cross-RIR compatibility from RIRs could be seen as unrealistic. Each region encounters distinct challenges, and such high expectations may detract from addressing pressing local issues. Flexibility should be prioritized over rigid compliance.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

Requiring RIRs to meet stringent standards for service stability and cross-RIR compatibility can be impractical. Different regions have unique challenges, and imposing these expectations may lead to a misallocation of resources. Prioritizing regional needs over uniform standards is crucial.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

The insistence on high standards for service delivery may not account for the distinct circumstances of various RIRs. A more nuanced approach is needed to ensure effective service management.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**

---

The demand for RIRs to meet high expectations for stability and compatibility is overly ambitious. Local contexts should dictate service delivery rather than rigid adherence to global standards.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

Mandating high standards for allocation and registration services across all RIRs could impose undue burdens, particularly in regions with fewer resources. A focus on regional needs and adaptability is more beneficial than strict uniformity.

**Jeremy Cheong (Infineon technologies)**

---

While stable and reliable services are important, imposing rigid standards for cross-RIR compatibility may not be practical for all RIRs. Each region has unique challenges that require tailored solutions rather than a one-size-fits-all approach.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

Requiring RIRs to maintain strict standards for reliability and cross-RIR compatibility may not be feasible. Local contexts should guide service delivery rather than imposing uniform expectations.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

The insistence on uniform standards for RIR services may not be realistic. Different regions face various challenges, and resources should focus on addressing those local needs.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

The expectation for RIRs to achieve uniform standards can be overly ambitious given the varying challenges they face. Flexibility in addressing regional needs should take precedence over strict compliance.

**Sohel Kabir (Kabir Traders)**

---

Though stable and accurate services are vital, imposing rigid standards for cross-RIR compatibility may not be realistic for all RIRs. Flexibility in service provision is necessary to meet regional challenges.

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

The requirement for RIRs to adhere to stringent service standards may be overly ambitious. Different regions face distinct challenges, and such demands could detract from addressing local needs effectively.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---

Imposing high standards for stability and cross-RIR compatibility on RIRs may not be achievable for all regions. This could lead to a misallocation of resources away from local priorities.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---

The expectation for RIRs to provide uniform standards for services is unrealistic. Regional differences should be acknowledged, and resources should focus on immediate local needs rather than strict compliance.

**Catalina Cueva (Manpower)**

---

Requiring RIRs to adhere to rigid standards for stability and cross-RIR compatibility is not feasible. Each region's unique context must be considered, as these demands could detract from essential local responsibilities.

**Camilo Riveros (Manpower)**

---

Mandating rigorous standards for stability and compatibility may not reflect the realities of RIR operations in diverse regions. Such expectations could hinder their ability to focus on addressing urgent local issues.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

The requirement for an RIR to maintain stringent standards for stability and cross-RIR compatibility is unrealistic and overly restrictive. Each region has unique challenges, and such high expectations could lead RIRs to neglect pressing local needs.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**

---

Mandating stringent requirements for stability and cross-RIR compatibility could be unrealistic and overly burdensome. Each region faces different challenges, and RIRs should focus on addressing local needs rather than strict adherence to global standards.

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

This condition appears overly stringent. Expecting RIRs to meet high standards for stability and compatibility does not account for the diverse challenges faced by different regions. Flexibility and local relevance should be prioritized.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Insisting on stringent standards for reliability and cross-RIR compatibility could hinder RIRs from effectively responding to local needs. Resources should be directed towards regional challenges rather than global compliance.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Mandating stringent standards for reliability and cross-RIR compatibility could strain RIR resources, especially in regions facing specific challenges. The focus should be on regional adaptability rather than uniformity.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

This condition seems overly burdensome. Insisting on high standards for allocation and directory services may not be realistic, given the diverse needs of different regions. RIRs should be able to focus on local challenges rather than conforming to strict global expectations.

**Anh Dang (NASA)**

---

Insisting on uniform standards for stability and compatibility is overly ambitious and may not reflect the realities faced by different RIRs. Such strict requirements could hinder their ability to focus on local challenges.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

Requiring an RIR to meet high standards for reliability and cross-RIR compatibility may not be feasible. Diverse regional challenges exist, and imposing such expectations could detract from addressing urgent local priorities.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

Insisting on strict standards for reliability and cross-RIR compatibility may be impractical for many RIRs. Regions have unique needs, and enforcing these expectations could compromise their ability to address pressing local concerns.

I find this approach too ambitious. Requiring RIRs to follow strict standards for stability and compatibility may overlook the distinct challenges in different regions. Prioritizing local relevance and flexibility is more important than enforcing uniform global standards.

**Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)**

---

Requiring RIRs to maintain high standards for service provision may overlook the unique challenges of different regions. Each RIR should have the flexibility to respond to its local context effectively.

**AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)**

---

While the goal of ensuring reliable and secure services is important, requiring strict compliance with cross-RIR standards may hinder RIRs from addressing local needs. Adaptability is crucial.

**K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating stringent standards for allocation and directory services may not be feasible for all RIRs, especially those in resource-constrained regions. Local adaptability should be prioritized over strict global compliance.

**Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)**

---

The expectation for RIRs to provide consistent, high-quality services can be impractical, especially in regions with unique challenges. Flexibility in service delivery should be emphasized over strict global standards.

**Fuhui Zhang (University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)**

---

Although stability and reliability in services are essential, mandating uniform standards may not align with the specific challenges faced by different regions. RIRs should be allowed to adapt their services to local contexts.

**Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)**

---

Although providing secure and accurate services is vital, imposing strict global standards may not be feasible for all RIRs. Flexibility to adapt to regional challenges should be emphasized.

**Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)**

---

19. Requiring RIRs to achieve high standards for reliability and cross-compatibility may divert resources from addressing local priorities. Each region has unique needs that should inform service provision.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

Requiring an RIR to adhere to rigid standards for stability and cross-RIR compatibility may be impractical. Different regions encounter varying challenges, and these demands could shift focus away from addressing urgent local needs.

**Trabahan Pujari (Paruluniversity)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

This requirement seems impractical. Expecting RIRs to meet strict standards for stability and reliability might not align with the varying needs of different regions. A more flexible approach that prioritizes local challenges would likely be more beneficial.

**Juan Mesa (Hispasat)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Imposing continuity procedures and record-sharing obligations risks breaching confidentiality. RIRs should not be required to share their records with one another.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

I think it's unrealistic and excessively demanding to require an RIR to meet such stringent standards for stability, reliability, and cross-RIR compatibility. Regions face distinct challenges, and imposing these expectations could force RIRs to redirect resources away from more urgent local issues. The focus should be on regional relevance and adaptability, rather than strict global standards.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Mandating stringent standards for reliability and cross-RIR compatibility could strain RIR resources, especially in regions with specific challenges. The focus should be on regional adaptability rather than enforcing uniformity.

**Pornpipat Kitireanglarp (ZERIWELLPLUS Co., Ltd.)**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. Mandating strict standards for reliability and compatibility is unrealistic, considering the varying needs of different regions. Enforcing these standards could prevent RIRs from addressing critical local challenges, so adaptability should take precedence over uniformity.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Enforcing record sharing and continuity procedures could breach RIR confidentiality and create undue burdens. RIRs should have the freedom to manage their own records independently.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Expecting RIRs to provide stable, secure services while ensuring cross-RIR compatibility seems overly burdensome. Different regions have distinct needs, and resources should be directed toward meeting those needs rather than rigidly adhering to global standards.

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

This requirement feels too rigid. Expecting RIRs to maintain high standards for stability and cross-RIR compatibility does not take into account the specific challenges faced by different regions. Such inflexible expectations could cause RIRs to divert resources from more pressing local concerns, highlighting the need for flexibility and a regional focus.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

I strongly disagree with this requirement. Insisting on high standards for stability and cross-RIR compatibility could be too burdensome for RIRs, especially in regions with distinct challenges. Resources would be better allocated to local needs than to rigidly following global standards.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. Mandating strict standards for reliability and compatibility is unrealistic, given the varied needs of different regions. Enforcing these standards could prevent RIRs from addressing critical local challenges, so a focus on adaptability is more important than uniformity.

**Ashraful Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Imposing high expectations for cross-RIR compatibility could hinder RIRs from effectively addressing local needs. Resources may be better allocated to regional challenges rather than global compliance.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

This requirement appears overly stringent. Imposing high expectations for stability and compatibility may not reflect the varied situations RIRs face across regions. A more flexible approach focused on local relevance would likely be more effective than enforcing strict global standards.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Expecting RIRs to provide stable, secure services while ensuring cross-RIR compatibility seems overly burdensome. Different regions have distinct needs, and resources should be directed toward meeting those needs rather than rigidly adhering to global standards.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

This condition seems impractical. Insisting on uniform standards for reliability and cross-RIR compatibility may not be feasible for all RIRs, especially in regions with unique challenges. Flexibility and regional focus should take priority over strict global standards.

**Phuc Pham (Advanced Network Systems VietNam Company Limited)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. Requiring RIRs to maintain strict standards for allocation and directory services may overlook the specific challenges different regions face. This could force RIRs to divert resources from pressing local needs to meet high compatibility standards.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

I am strongly opposed to this provision. Mandating uniform standards for stability and cross-RIR compatibility seems unrealistic given the diverse challenges across regions. RIRs should prioritize regional needs and adaptability over strict compliance with global standards.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

This approach seems overly demanding. Requiring RIRs to meet stringent criteria for reliability and compatibility may overlook the unique challenges faced in different regions. Such expectations could force RIRs to shift resources away from pressing local concerns, making flexibility essential.

**Giang Nguyen (NASA)**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. Mandating strict standards for reliability and compatibility is unrealistic, given the varied needs of different regions. Enforcing these standards could prevent RIRs from addressing critical local challenges, so a focus on adaptability is more important than uniformity.

**Alex Kwan (Wiplus Malaysia)**

---

I think it's unrealistic and excessively demanding to require an RIR to meet such stringent standards for stability, reliability, and cross-RIR compatibility. Regions face distinct challenges, and imposing these expectations could force RIRs to redirect resources away from more urgent local issues. The focus should be on regional relevance and adaptability, rather than strict global standards.

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

Disagree

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Insisting on high standards for stability and cross-RIR compatibility could be overly burdensome for RIRs, especially in regions with distinct challenges. Resources may be better spent on local needs rather than on rigidly adhering to global standards.

**Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. Mandating that an RIR maintain strict standards for reliability and compatibility is unrealistic. Different regions have varying needs, and imposing these requirements could hinder RIRs from addressing critical local challenges. The focus should be on adaptability, not uniformity.

**Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)**

---

I believe requiring an RIR to meet such stringent standards for stability, reliability, and cross-RIR compatibility is unrealistic and overly demanding. Regions face unique challenges, and imposing these



high expectations could lead RIRs to divert resources from more pressing local needs. The emphasis should be on regional relevance and flexibility rather than strict global standards.

**Pooja Gopi (DM Digital Marketing)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Mandating stringent standards for reliability and cross-RIR compatibility could strain RIRs' resources, particularly in regions facing specific challenges. The focus should be on regional adaptability rather than uniformity.

**Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)**

---

This condition seems overly burdensome. Insisting on high standards for allocation and directory services may not be realistic given the diverse needs of different regions. RIRs should be able to focus on local challenges rather than conforming to strict global expectations.

**Quyn Kim (VNPAY)**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. Mandating that an RIR maintain such strict standards for reliability and compatibility is unrealistic. Different regions have varying needs, and imposing these requirements could hinder RIRs from addressing more critical local challenges. The focus should be on adaptability rather than uniformity.

**Shahedul Islam Bhuiyan (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Requiring RIRs to meet stringent standards for service reliability and cross-compatibility could detract from their ability to respond to local needs. Each region has specific challenges that may not align with uniform global expectations.

**Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)**

---

Question 40&41 Service An RIR must provide stable, reliable, secure, accurate, and accountable allocation, registration, and directory services, as well as related technical services, using standard protocols and specifications for cross-RIR compatibility. 1- Strongly Disagree I believe that requiring an RIR to adhere to such stringent standards for stability, reliability, and cross-RIR compatibility is unrealistic and overly demanding. Different regions encounter unique challenges, and imposing these high expectations could lead RIRs to divert resources from more pressing local needs. The emphasis should be on regional relevance and flexibility rather than strict adherence to uniform global standards.

**Anjan Deka (HDFC)**

---

I believe that requiring an RIR to adhere to such stringent standards for stability, reliability, and cross-RIR compatibility is unrealistic and overly demanding. Different regions encounter unique challenges, and imposing these high expectations could lead RIRs to divert resources from more pressing local needs. The emphasis should be on regional relevance and flexibility rather than strict adherence to uniform global standards.

**Ketan Parmar (Bids Info Global)**

---

The demand for high standards of reliability and cross-RIR compatibility may not take into account the varied challenges faced by different regions. RIRs should be allowed to focus on their local contexts rather than adopt a one-size-fits-all approach.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

While stable and reliable services are important, requiring uniform standards across RIRs can be overly restrictive. Different regions have distinct needs, and RIRs should prioritize local relevance rather than rigid compatibility.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

1. Imposing strict standards for stability and cross-RIR compatibility may not be realistic for all RIRs, as regions face unique challenges. This could divert resources from addressing more pressing local issues in favor of uniformity.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---

## 20. Continuity

---

An RIR must maintain continuity procedures and redundancies and participate in record sharing that would enable another RIR to perform its RIR services, if necessary.

### 20.1. Continuity - Strongly Agree (5)

This could be useful for enhancing the resilience of the globally-coordinated RIR system. Handoff principles would need to be developed.

**Eric Edora (TELUS Communications Inc.)**

---

Yes, this is the basis of complementarity.

**Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle, as it ensures the continuity and resilience of critical internet resource management functions, even in the event of disruptions or emergencies. Here's an analysis:

Reasons for Agreement

1. Ensures Service Continuity in Emergencies
2. Enhances Resilience of the Internet Ecosystem

- An RIR must be prepared for unexpected disruptions, such as technical failures, cyberattacks, or natural disasters, that could otherwise compromise its ability to provide essential services. Having continuity procedures and redundancies in place guarantees that, even in such situations, the allocation, registration, and directory services continue to function smoothly.
- The internet is a global, interconnected system, and disruptions to the services provided by RIRs can have wide-reaching consequences. By ensuring that another RIR can step in if necessary, this principle strengthens the overall resilience

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

Nothing to add or detract

**Brian Longwe (Converged Technology Networks)**

---

YES

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

yes

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle. Maintaining continuity procedures and redundancies is crucial for ensuring that RIR services remain operational in the event of unforeseen disruptions or crises. By having the ability to transfer responsibilities to another RIR if necessary, the system can maintain stability and prevent service interruptions. Record sharing between RIRs further enhances collaboration and ensures that critical data is available for seamless transitions, thereby protecting the integrity and reliability of Internet resource management globally.

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle. Maintaining continuity procedures and redundancies is crucial for ensuring that RIR services remain operational in the event of unforeseen disruptions or crises. By having the ability to transfer responsibilities to another RIR if necessary, the system can maintain stability and prevent service interruptions. Record sharing between RIRs further enhances collaboration and ensures that critical data is available for seamless transitions, thereby protecting the integrity and reliability of Internet resource management globally.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

fail-over and redundancy, this is a good and valid stance.

**Jaco Kroon (Interexcel World Connection)**

---

Yes

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

Yes

**Mark Elkins (Posix Systems)**

---

I strongly agree with the principle that an RIR must maintain continuity procedures and redundancies and participate in record sharing to ensure that another RIR can perform its services if necessary. These measures are essential for maintaining the stability, reliability, and security of the global internet infrastructure. They foster a collaborative and transparent environment that ensures uninterrupted service delivery, even in the event of unforeseen challenges, thereby enhancing the resilience of the global IP address allocation and registration system. This principle promotes global coordination, trust, and accountability, which are vital to the continued operation of the global internet ecosystem.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

I feel this addition is crucial to enabling the other suggested revisions to be viable. If the other RIRs are unable to build continuity procedures, the process of decertification is significantly more difficult and less likely to be a viable deterrent for malfeasance and noncompliance.

**Douglas Camin (Coordinated Care Services, Inc.)**

---

Agreed, as in terms of escrow or embassy for it.

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Enforcing record sharing and continuity procedures could compromise the confidentiality of RIRs and create unnecessary burdens. RIRs should have the freedom to manage their records independently.

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

I agree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

---

yes

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

possibilité envisageable

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

Record sharing is also key to ensuring that, in case of an emergency, another RIR can step in

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

Yes

**Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)**

---

Totally agree

**Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)**

---

Ensure interoperability

**Lia Solis (personal)**

---

Member data belongs to the member. RIRs should not assume ownership of records.

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

Not sure "an other" is right; it might be "other RIRs"

**Lee Howard (IPv4.Global by Hilco Streambank)**

---

Once again this cuts against the principal of RIR independence. But advisable to do this.

**Mike Burns (IPTrading)**

---

This is very important, as we've seen a RIR under heavy attack from one of its members.

**Carlos Friaças (FCT\| FCCN)**

---

This is all well and good but this principle must be accompanied by a separate document or website describing how the RIRs would support the technical functionality and staff support requirements. Sharing records and documenting processes is fine but it's important to know that they are tested in tabletop and live exercises often enough that they could be activated with minimal delay, should they be needed

**Leo Vegoda (And Polus LLC)**

---

There is a strong argument for a centrally operated registry (with multiple redundancies) here.

Kevin Meynell (Individual)

---

not for the text: it would be a big project to implement this in all existing RIRs.

Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)

---

## 20.2. Continuity - Somewhat Agree (4)

It seems there is an obvious problem with this principle, which is circularity: if an RIR refuses, what can you do? Kick them out of the ASO? In that case, they get what they wanted anyway.

Andrew Sullivan (N/A)

---

In agreement

Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)

---

Good for resilience. Pleased to see it is with another RIR, not with ICANN.

Jordan Carter (auDA)

---

agree

Mohammad Mubarak Alfalasi (Telecommunication and Digital government Regulatory Authority)

---

See extended comments on the NANOG thread starting at <https://mailman.nanog.org/pipermail/nanog/2024-November/226586.html>

William Herrin (Self)

---

the resilience and continuity of internet number resource services. By maintaining robust continuity procedures and redundancies, RIRs can mitigate the impact of potential disruptions or failures. Additionally, participation in record sharing enables other RIRs to take over essential services if necessary, safeguarding the stability and reliability of the global internet numbering system. This principle promotes a collaborative approach among RIRs and strengthens the overall resilience of the internet infrastructure.

Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)

---

This principle ensures that an RIR maintains continuity procedures and redundancies, allowing another RIR to step in and perform essential services if needed. It promotes resilience and prevents disruptions in critical services like IP address allocation and registration. While implementing these procedures requires careful planning and secure record sharing, the principle strengthens global coordination, ensuring uninterrupted service and stability in the internet infrastructure, even during crises or failures

Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)

---

Very important for ensuring service continuity

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

5

**Taye Oyebola (Aso Savings and Loans Plc)**

---

Transparency is important

**John Haydon (Education)**

---

I agree

**Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)**

---

### **20.3. Continuity - Neutral (3)**

An RIR must maintain continuity procedures to ensure consistent operations. Engaging in record sharing is also crucial, as it allows another RIR to take over services if necessary, promoting a supportive network.

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. Mandating that RIRs establish continuity procedures and share records could compromise their confidentiality. RIRs should not be forced to share their records with other RIRs.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---

This approach appears excessively demanding. Requiring RIRs to maintain redundancy and share records may compromise their confidentiality and add unnecessary burdens. RIRs should have the autonomy to manage their records without external pressure.

**Jun Wen (one futures technology sdn bhd)**

---

7. Mandating record sharing for continuity purposes may breach the confidentiality of RIR operations and create additional burdens. RIRs should not be compelled to share sensitive information with others.

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

### **20.4. Continuity - Somewhat Disagree (2)**

the goal of supporting succession is laudable, again the level of detail is problematic; record sharing could be read as prescribing inter-RIR action, where a different form of escrow might be more appropriate

**Peter Koch (Individual)**

---

RIRs need to develop continuity procedures and redundancies to guarantee service availability. Record-sharing between RIRs ensures that if one RIR faces issues, another can quickly step in and perform its duties, preventing service interruptions.

**Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)**

---

No, again, this just adds more burdens on RIRs, and breaches the confidentiality of each RIR. There must be no imposing on RIRs to share their records with other RIRs.

**Noel OUPOH (DATACONNECT AFRICA)**

---

An RIR should prioritize continuity procedures and redundancies to ensure uninterrupted service delivery. Additionally, record sharing is crucial for enabling another RIR to perform its functions when necessary, fostering a spirit of cooperation.

**Neonjyoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

This condition seems impractical. Requiring RIRs to participate in record sharing and maintain continuity procedures could lead to breaches of confidentiality. RIRs should not face pressure to share their records.

**Sidonie Hacking ('-)**

---

## **20.5. Continuity - Strongly Disagree (1)**

As a principle, this is probably better entitled “Assumption of Service”, rather than “Continuity.” It is specifying one particular mechanism (among many) by which continuity of service/functionality can be provided, i.e., another RIR takes over the service. This can be problematic, e.g., what happens when an RIR that has a “discontinuity event” offers a service not provided by the assuming RIR? Presumably, the intent here is that there is a base set of services (which would need to be defined) that could be assumed. As a principle, this could probably be stated as: “An RIR must ensure that [base services] can be assumed by another RIR without significant service interruption if necessary.” Separately, having a principle of “Continuity” would also be good, but it is different/more general than assumption of service, e.g.: “An RIR must ensure continuity of services and functionalities it provides to its community.” As an aside, experience in the ICANN context of assumption of service has shown that is far, far easier said than done and requires extensive and explicit specification and frequent, comprehensive testing.

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---



Requiring RIRs to maintain redundancy and engage in record sharing could impose unnecessary operational challenges. This may distract them from their core functions and the urgent needs of their local communities.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

The expectation for RIRs to maintain continuity procedures and participate in record sharing may be overly demanding, particularly for those in developing regions. This could hinder their ability to focus on local needs effectively.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

Requiring RIRs to implement continuity procedures and engage in record sharing may create significant administrative challenges. Smaller RIRs could find it difficult to meet these obligations while addressing local priorities.

**Tipu Khan (Zx Online Ltd)**

---

Mandating that RIRs maintain continuity and engage in record sharing may not consider the unique challenges faced by different regions. This could divert resources from addressing local needs effectively.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

Requiring RIRs to maintain continuity and participate in record sharing may lead to excessive administrative burdens. This could distract them from their core functions and the urgent needs of their local communities.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---

The obligation for RIRs to implement continuity procedures and engage in record sharing may be impractical, especially for those with limited resources. This could divert focus from their primary responsibilities and hinder local operations.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

Mandating continuity procedures and record sharing could create significant operational challenges for RIRs, particularly in developing regions. This requirement may detract from their ability to address pressing local issues effectively.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---

Requiring RIRs to maintain redundancy and participate in record sharing may impose unnecessary financial and administrative burdens. Smaller RIRs could find it challenging to meet these expectations while focusing on local needs.

**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating that RIRs maintain continuity procedures and engage in record sharing could lead to confidentiality breaches. There should be no imposition on RIRs to share their records with others.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

Requiring RIRs to implement continuity procedures and participate in record sharing may lead to excessive operational challenges. This could distract them from their core functions and the urgent needs of their local communities.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

Imposing strict requirements for continuity procedures and record sharing could hinder RIRs, particularly those with limited operational capacity. This may divert resources away from addressing pressing local issues.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

Requiring RIRs to maintain redundancy and engage in record sharing may lead to unnecessary operational challenges. This could detract from their core functions and ability to address local needs effectively.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

This condition seems impractical. Requiring RIRs to participate in record sharing and maintain continuity procedures could lead to confidentiality breaches. RIRs should not be pressured into sharing their records.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. Mandating RIRs to establish continuity procedures and share records could undermine their confidentiality. RIRs should not be forced to share their records with other RIRs.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---

Requiring RIRs to establish strict continuity procedures may distract from their core functions, particularly in resource-constrained environments. While record sharing is important, a more adaptable approach is necessary.

**Taslima Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

Mandating continuity procedures and record sharing could impose substantial administrative burdens on RIRs, particularly in smaller or emerging regions. Flexibility in these expectations is essential to accommodate local challenges.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

Requiring participation in record sharing could detract from RIRs' effectiveness, especially in smaller regions. Flexibility in compliance is essential for operational success.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

The expectation for RIRs to maintain strict continuity procedures may impose substantial burdens. A more adaptable approach would allow organizations to focus on their core functions.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

Mandating continuity procedures for RIRs may not reflect the realities they face. While record sharing is important, these requirements should be adaptable to fit regional contexts.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

The demand for RIRs to maintain continuity and engage in record sharing may create administrative challenges, especially for those with limited resources. Flexibility is key to ensuring these practices are effective.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

The demand for RIRs to maintain continuity and engage in record sharing may create administrative challenges, especially for those with limited resources. Flexibility is key to ensuring these practices are effective.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

An RIR must establish continuity procedures, yet the requirement for extensive record sharing may be burdensome. Flexibility is necessary to accommodate varying organizational capacities.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

Maintaining continuity procedures is essential, but the mandatory requirement for record sharing may not be practical for all RIRs. Flexibility in implementation is crucial to meet diverse needs.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

While it's important for RIRs to have continuity procedures, the requirement for record sharing can create complications. Each organization should have the discretion to manage its processes effectively.

**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

An RIR should prioritize continuity procedures, but mandating record sharing may not reflect the unique challenges faced by different organizations. Flexibility is essential for effective management.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

Mandating continuity and redundancy procedures for RIRs may not reflect the realities faced by smaller organizations. While record sharing is important, RIRs should have the flexibility to implement these practices according to their capacities.

**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

While continuity procedures are vital for service reliability, the requirement for record sharing can create unnecessary pressures. Flexibility should be considered to accommodate diverse operational contexts.

**Pham Gia Khiem (Phat Tai Logistics)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Mandating record sharing and continuity procedures could create unnecessary burdens and violate confidentiality. RIRs should not be forced to share their records with each other.

**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

Mandating that RIRs establish continuity procedures and participate in record sharing might impose significant burdens on their operations. Flexibility in these requirements is necessary to accommodate regional realities.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

Continuity procedures are important for RIRs, but mandating record sharing could place undue pressure on resources. Flexibility is necessary to address the varying capacities of different organizations.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

Maintaining continuity procedures is crucial, yet the obligation for record sharing may not be practical for all RIRs. Allowing flexibility in this area is important for effective operations.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

While it's important for RIRs to maintain continuity procedures, the obligation for record sharing can impose burdensome requirements. Each organization should have autonomy in managing its operations.

**Kwan Ke Yue (TBWA/ Kuala Lumpur)**

---

An RIR must focus on establishing continuity procedures, but the requirement for record sharing may not align with operational capabilities. Flexibility is key to effective implementation.

**Sean Carroll (The One Academy)**

---

Maintaining continuity procedures is vital, yet the obligation for record sharing may not align with the operational realities of every RIR. Flexibility in implementation is crucial.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

An RIR must have continuity procedures, but the requirement for record sharing may not be practical for all organizations. Allowing for flexibility in this area is important.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

While continuity procedures are important, requiring RIRs to engage in record sharing may not be practical for all organizations. A more adaptable approach can better align with local circumstances

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**

---

Ensuring continuity through established procedures and redundancies is essential for an RIR's operational stability. Moreover, record sharing enables another RIR to offer its services effectively when needed, enhancing community resilience.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

The expectation for RIRs to maintain continuity procedures and engage in record sharing may be overly demanding, particularly for those in smaller or emerging regions. This could lead to resource diversion from essential local functions.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---

Continuity procedures and redundancies are vital for maintaining service stability. Through record-sharing, RIRs can collaborate to ensure another RIR can take over responsibilities in case of an emergency, ensuring service continuity.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---

RIRs must implement continuity measures and redundancies to provide uninterrupted services. Record-sharing ensures that if one RIR is unable to fulfill its duties, another RIR can step in and maintain continuity of services.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

Mandating continuity procedures and record sharing may create unnecessary administrative challenges for RIRs, especially in regions with limited resources. This requirement might distract them from focusing on their primary responsibilities and local needs.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---

An RIR should establish continuity procedures and redundancies to ensure reliable service. Record-sharing arrangements with other RIRs enable a smooth transfer of services if necessary, ensuring ongoing availability and functionality.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

Requiring RIRs to maintain continuity procedures and redundancies while participating in record sharing could impose significant operational burdens. Smaller RIRs may struggle to comply with such requirements, which could detract from their core functions and local priorities.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

In case of service disruption, RIRs must have continuity and redundancy systems in place. Record-sharing enables another RIR to take over operations, ensuring seamless transition and continuity of services.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

Mandating continuity procedures and record sharing might overwhelm RIRs, especially in emerging regions with limited resources. A more adaptable approach would allow RIRs to focus on their core functions.

Requiring an RIR to maintain continuity procedures and redundancies, as well as participate in record sharing, could impose significant resource burdens, particularly for smaller organizations. Flexibility in implementing these requirements is essential for operational efficiency.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

Requiring RIRs to participate in record sharing may overwhelm smaller organizations and detract from their core responsibilities. A flexible approach is crucial for effective governance.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

While it's vital for RIRs to have continuity procedures in place, mandating record sharing could create unnecessary administrative challenges. Flexibility in compliance is key.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---

Maintaining continuity procedures and redundancies is vital for an RIR's operational integrity. Furthermore, participation in record sharing ensures that another RIR can seamlessly provide services when required, reinforcing community cooperation.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---

An RIR must focus on maintaining continuity procedures and redundancies to safeguard its operations. Additionally, engaging in record sharing facilitates the ability of another RIR to step in when necessary, enhancing collaboration within the community.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

Ensuring continuity through robust procedures and redundancies is vital for an RIR's operational integrity. Furthermore, record sharing can facilitate the ability of another RIR to provide services if required, promoting collaboration.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

An RIR must focus on maintaining continuity procedures and redundancies to ensure operational stability. Moreover, participating in record sharing can empower another RIR to take over services when necessary, enhancing collaboration.

**Trang Tran (VNPT Technologies)**

---

An RIR should prioritize continuity procedures and redundancies to ensure ongoing operations. Additionally, record sharing can facilitate another RIR's ability to deliver services as needed, enhancing collaboration within the community.

**Minh Hoang (ANSV)**

---

Ensuring continuity through established procedures and redundancies is vital for an RIR's functioning. Furthermore, engaging in record sharing enables another RIR to effectively take over services if necessary, fostering cooperation.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**

---

An RIR must prioritize continuity and redundancy to ensure service resilience. Record-sharing among RIRs is crucial for allowing another RIR to take over operations in case of emergencies, preserving service availability and stability.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**

---

To safeguard against disruptions, an RIR should have continuity procedures and redundancies in place. Record-sharing arrangements would allow another RIR to step in and take over operations, ensuring that services are continuously available.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---

To maintain operational stability, RIRs should establish comprehensive continuity procedures and redundancies. Participation in record-sharing agreements can help ensure that another RIR is prepared to take over its responsibilities when necessary.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

An RIR should have the necessary continuity procedures and redundancies in place to ensure resilience. Record-sharing arrangements between RIRs can allow for seamless transition and continued service provision in the event of an operational failure.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

Establishing continuity procedures and redundancies is vital for RIRs to ensure ongoing service delivery. Record-sharing between RIRs can ensure that operations continue smoothly even if an RIR encounters issues, preventing service disruptions.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---

RIRs should be prepared for unforeseen disruptions by establishing redundancy systems and continuity procedures. Record-sharing agreements would ensure that another RIR can assume responsibility for operations, maintaining service integrity and stability.

**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

To ensure the uninterrupted delivery of services, an RIR must maintain continuity procedures and redundancies. Record-sharing protocols between RIRs should be in place to facilitate the transfer of operations should the need arise, ensuring minimal disruption.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---

An RIR should prioritize continuity and redundancy measures to guarantee service reliability. Record-sharing agreements would enable another RIR to step in when needed, ensuring minimal disruption and smooth transfer of responsibilities.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

RIRs must implement continuity procedures and redundancies to ensure service availability in the event of an operational failure. Record-sharing between RIRs is crucial to enable one RIR to seamlessly take over another's functions if necessary, ensuring smooth continuity.

**Ryan Khaw (Alsco Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

While continuity procedures are important, mandating record sharing may not reflect the diverse needs of RIRs. Flexibility in compliance can better address local challenges.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

An RIR must ensure that continuity procedures and redundancies are in place to maintain operational effectiveness. Additionally, participating in record sharing allows another RIR to provide services when needed, enhancing community resilience.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Apmic)**

---

Requiring RIRs to maintain continuity procedures and engage in record sharing may not align with the operational realities of all organizations. Flexibility is essential for effective service delivery.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

While continuity is crucial, mandating record sharing may impose undue burdens on RIRs, especially in smaller regions. A more adaptable approach is necessary for effective governance.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

Requiring participation in record sharing could pose significant challenges for RIRs, particularly those with limited resources. Flexibility in compliance can enhance overall effectiveness.

**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

Requiring RIRs to establish strict continuity procedures may distract from their core functions, particularly in resource-constrained environments. While record sharing is important, a more adaptable approach is necessary.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

Mandating continuity procedures and record sharing could impose substantial administrative burdens on RIRs, particularly in smaller or emerging regions. Flexibility in these expectations is essential to accommodate local challenges.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

An RIR should maintain robust continuity procedures to ensure operational stability. Additionally, participating in record sharing enables another RIR to provide vital services if necessary, strengthening community ties.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**



---

An RIR must ensure it has continuity procedures and redundancies in place to maintain operational integrity. Additionally, participating in record sharing is vital, enabling another RIR to provide necessary services if required, thus fostering community resilience.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

Requiring RIRs to engage in record sharing and maintain continuity procedures may create undue challenges, especially for those with limited resources. A more adaptable approach is necessary for effective governance.

**Jeremy Cheong (Infineon technologies)**

---

While continuity procedures are essential, mandating record sharing may not align with the operational realities faced by all RIRs. A flexible approach can better serve regional needs.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

It is critical for an RIR to establish continuity procedures and redundancies to safeguard operations. Additionally, engaging in record sharing allows another RIR to perform its services when needed, fostering a cooperative environment.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

Maintaining continuity procedures and redundancies is essential for the resilience of an RIR. Moreover, participating in record sharing ensures that another RIR can seamlessly provide services if necessary, promoting community collaboration.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

Mandating record sharing for continuity purposes could create confidentiality issues and add complexity for RIRs. RIRs should not be forced to share sensitive information with others.

**Sohel Kabir (Kabir Traders)**

---

While continuity procedures are crucial, mandating record sharing could violate confidentiality and impose undue burdens. RIRs should manage their own information independently without external pressure.

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

An RIR should maintain robust continuity procedures and redundancies to safeguard its operations. Additionally, participating in record sharing facilitates the ability of another RIR to perform its services when necessary, promoting collaboration.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---

Ensuring continuity through established procedures and redundancies is critical for an RIR's operational integrity. Moreover, record sharing can empower another RIR to provide its services as needed, supporting a collaborative network.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---

An RIR must prioritize continuity procedures and redundancies to ensure uninterrupted service. Engaging in record sharing further enables another RIR to step in and deliver essential services if required, enhancing community collaboration.

**Catalina Cueca (Manpower)**

---

Maintaining continuity procedures and redundancies is essential for an RIR's resilience. Additionally, participating in record sharing allows another RIR to effectively perform its services when necessary, fostering a cooperative environment.

**Camilo Riveros (Manpower)**

---

Mandating RIRs to maintain continuity procedures and engage in record sharing is overly restrictive and may compromise confidentiality. RIRs should not be compelled to share sensitive information.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

An RIR must maintain continuity procedures and redundancies to ensure operational resilience. Additionally, participation in record sharing is essential for enabling another RIR to perform its services if necessary, fostering collaboration and resource sharing.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**

---

Requiring continuity procedures and participation in record sharing places undue burdens on RIRs and could violate confidentiality. There should be no requirement for RIRs to share their records with other entities.

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

This requirement appears impractical. Enforcing continuity procedures and record-sharing obligations could compromise the confidentiality of RIRs. There should be no pressure on RIRs to share their records.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Mandating record sharing and continuity procedures could create unnecessary burdens and violate confidentiality. RIRs should not be forced to share their records with each other.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Imposing requirements for continuity procedures and record sharing risks breaching confidentiality. RIRs should not be obligated to share their records with one another.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

This condition seems excessive. Mandating that RIRs participate in record sharing could undermine their confidentiality and impose undue burdens. RIRs should not be pressured to share their records with other organizations.

**Anh Dang (NASA)**

---

Mandating continuity procedures and record sharing with other RIRs could lead to confidentiality breaches and adds unnecessary burdens. RIRs should not be required to share their internal records.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

This imposition of continuity and record sharing procedures adds unnecessary strain on RIRs and risks breaching confidentiality. RIRs should not be compelled to share their sensitive records.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

Mandating RIRs to maintain continuity procedures and share records with others creates additional challenges and may compromise confidentiality. RIRs should not be obligated to disclose their records.

**Prasanta Haloi (Pwd)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Imposing continuity procedures and record-sharing obligations risks breaching confidentiality. RIRs should not be required to share their records with one another.

**Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)**

---

Imposing requirements for record sharing among RIRs may lead to confidentiality breaches and significant administrative challenges. RIRs should have the autonomy to manage their own records.

**AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)**

---

The expectation for RIRs to maintain continuity procedures and engage in record sharing could compromise confidentiality and create unnecessary complexities. Each RIR should control its own records.

**K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Imposing continuity procedures and record-sharing obligations could undermine the confidentiality of RIRs. There should be no pressure on RIRs to share their records with each other.

**Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)**

---

While ensuring continuity is important, requiring RIRs to share records could violate confidentiality and create additional administrative burdens. RIRs should independently manage their own information.

**Fuhui Zhang (University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)**

---

Mandating record sharing for continuity purposes could create complications and breach confidentiality. RIRs should not be compelled to share sensitive operational data with other organizations.

**Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)**

---

While ensuring continuity is important, requiring RIRs to share records may create confidentiality issues and additional challenges. RIRs should maintain control over their own records.

**Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)**

---

19. Mandating record sharing for continuity purposes could breach confidentiality agreements and impose significant burdens on RIRs. RIRs should have the autonomy to manage their own information.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

Mandating continuity procedures and the sharing of records with other RIRs places excessive burdens on individual RIRs and can compromise their confidentiality. There should be no requirement to share records.

**Trabahan Pujari (Paruluniversity)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

This requirement seems impractical. Requiring continuity procedures and record sharing could compromise RIR confidentiality. There should be no obligation for RIRs to share their records.

**Juan Mesa (Hispasat)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. RIRs should not be subjected to higher powers that might enable capture. The emphasis should be on a decentralized system, free from additional governance rules.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

I believe that requiring RIRs to implement continuity procedures and engage in record sharing creates unnecessary burdens and threatens their confidentiality. There should be no requirement for RIRs to share their records with one another.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Imposing continuity procedures and record-sharing obligations risks breaching confidentiality. RIRs should not be required to share their records with one another.

**Pornpipat Kitireanglarp (ZERIWELLPLUS Co., Ltd.)**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. Requiring continuity procedures and record sharing adds unnecessary pressure and could jeopardize confidentiality. RIRs should not be forced to share their records.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Imposing additional governance controls on RIRs could threaten their decentralized nature. There should be no overarching authority capable of enabling capture.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Mandating record sharing could compromise confidentiality and impose unnecessary burdens. There should be no obligation for RIRs to share their records.

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

This requirement seems overly burdensome. Mandating record sharing between RIRs could compromise confidentiality and detract from their core responsibilities. RIRs should not be compelled to share their records.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating RIRs to maintain continuity procedures and engage in record sharing could lead to breaches of confidentiality. RIRs should not be required to share their records with others.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. Requiring continuity procedures and record sharing adds unnecessary pressure and could compromise confidentiality. RIRs should not be obligated to share their records.

**Ashraful Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Enforcing record-sharing expectations could violate RIR confidentiality and impose undue burdens. RIRs should retain the autonomy to manage their own records.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

This requirement seems overly rigid. Mandating continuity procedures and record sharing could jeopardize the confidentiality of RIRs and distract from their key functions. RIRs should not be forced to share their records.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Mandating record sharing could compromise confidentiality and impose unnecessary burdens. There should be no obligation for RIRs to share their records with others.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

This condition seems impractical. Requiring RIRs to participate in record sharing and maintain continuity procedures could lead to breaches of confidentiality. RIRs should not face pressure to share their records.

**Phuc Pham (Advanced Network Systems VietNam Company Limited)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. Mandating that RIRs establish continuity procedures and share records could compromise their confidentiality. RIRs should not be forced to share their records with other RIRs.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Enforcing continuity procedures and record sharing could violate RIR confidentiality and create unnecessary burdens. RIRs should not be obligated to share records with one another.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

This approach appears excessively demanding. Requiring RIRs to maintain redundancy and share records may compromise confidentiality and create undue burdens. RIRs should have the freedom to manage their own records without external pressure.

**Giang Nguyen (NASA)**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. Requiring continuity procedures and record sharing adds unnecessary pressure and could compromise confidentiality. RIRs should not be obligated to share their records.

**Alex Kwan (Wiplus Malaysia)**

---

I believe that requiring RIRs to implement continuity procedures and engage in record sharing creates unnecessary burdens and threatens their confidentiality. There should be no requirement for RIRs to share their records with one another.

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

Disagree

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating that RIRs maintain continuity procedures and engage in record sharing could lead to confidentiality breaches. There should be no imposition on RIRs to share their records with others.

**Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. Imposing continuity procedures and record-sharing expectations on RIRs adds unnecessary pressure and risks violating their confidentiality. RIRs should not be obligated to share their records.

**Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)**

---

I believe requiring RIRs to maintain continuity procedures and participate in record sharing imposes unnecessary burdens and compromises their confidentiality. There should be no obligation for RIRs to share their records with one another.

**Pooja Gopi (DM Digital Marketing)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Imposing requirements for continuity procedures and record sharing risks breaching confidentiality. RIRs should not be obligated to share their records with one another.

**Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)**

---

This condition seems excessive. Mandating that RIRs participate in record sharing could undermine their confidentiality and impose undue burdens. RIRs should not be pressured to share their records with other organizations.

**Quyn Kim (VNPAY)**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. Imposing continuity procedures and record-sharing expectations on RIRs adds unnecessary pressure and risks violating their confidentiality. RIRs should not be obligated to share their records.

**Shahedul Islam Bhuiyan (Royal Green Limited)**

---

While continuity is important, mandating record sharing among RIRs could compromise confidentiality and create additional administrative challenges. RIRs should be allowed to manage their records independently.

**Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)**

---

Question 42&43 Continuity An RIR must maintain continuity procedures and redundancies and participate in record sharing that would enable another RIR to perform its RIR services, if necessary 1- Strongly Disagree I believe that requiring RIRs to maintain continuity procedures and participate in record sharing imposes unnecessary burdens and compromises their confidentiality. There should be no obligation for RIRs to share their records with one another.

**Anjan Deka (HDFC)**

---

I believe that requiring RIRs to maintain continuity procedures and participate in record sharing imposes unnecessary burdens and compromises their confidentiality. There should be no obligation for RIRs to share their records with one another.

**Ketan Parmar (Bids Info Global)**

---

Imposing requirements for continuity procedures and record sharing could create confidentiality concerns and unnecessary complexity for RIRs. Each RIR should manage its own records independently.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

Requiring RIRs to develop continuity procedures and participate in record sharing may lead to confidentiality breaches and additional administrative burdens. RIRs should not be compelled to share sensitive information.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

Mandating RIRs to maintain continuity procedures and share records with other RIRs imposes unnecessary burdens and could violate confidentiality. Each RIR should retain control over its records without external pressure.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---



## 21. Anti-Capture

---

An RIR must maintain governance rules and controls to prevent itself from becoming captured.

### 21.1. Anti-Capture - Strongly Agree (5)

Lax governance is not an option in today's registry system to defend off a number of problems including capture.

**Eric Edora (TELUS Communications Inc.)**

---

In case, an RIR is deemed or determined to have been captured, then ICANN has to step in a way and manner that will restore the independence of the RIR.

**Babagana Digima (Nigerian Communications Commission)**

---

Australia is fully supportive of rules and controls being put in place to prevent the capture of an RIR. However, it is important that any rules and controls established at the global or regional level clearly define what capture entails. A vague anti-capture principle may be open to abuse by a bad-faith actor, who is interested in shutting down and/or replacing an RIR. The ASO AC may want to consider how other organisations implement anti-capture governance rules and draw inspiration from examples which have been proven to be effective.

**Ian Sheldon (Australian Government - Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts)**

---

define "captured", what are we protecting against?

**Darrell Budic (OHG Networks, LLC)**

---

The principles of transparency and community and membership engagement in the RIR's governance processes are important pre-requisites for this principle.

**Mirjam Kühne (RIPE)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle, as maintaining governance rules and controls to prevent capture is essential for ensuring that an RIR remains accountable to its community and continues to operate in a fair and transparent manner. Here's an analysis: Reasons for Agreement

1. Prevents Conflicts of Interest • If an RIR becomes captured, it may prioritize the interests of certain stakeholders over the broader community, leading to biased decision-making. Strong governance rules help prevent this by ensuring that the RIR's actions and policies serve the interests of all its members and not just a select few.
2. Ensures Transparency and Accountability • By having robust governance mechanisms in place, an RIR can maintain transparency in its decision-making processes and hold itself accountable to its members. This reduces the risk of decisions being influenced by external pressures or internal groups with disproportionate influence, which is a common sign of capture.
3. Promotes Fairness • Strong governance rules help maintain a level playing field where all members, regardless of size or influence, can participate in decision-making processes. This ensures that the RIR's policies are developed with input from a broad cross-section of the community and are not dominated by a few powerful entities.
- 4.

Protects the Integrity of the Organization • An RIR that is captured risks losing its credibility and legitimacy, which are vital for its continued success. A captured RIR might make decisions that are harmful to the broader internet ecosystem, undermining trust in its ability to manage resources impartially. Preventing capture safeguards the RIR's integrity and its role as a steward of critical internet resources. 5. Supports Sustainable Long-Term Growth •

Effective governance prevents short-term capture by vested interests that could harm the RIR's long-term sustainability. A captured organization might prioritize certain projects or policies that benefit a few members at the expense of broader community goals, which could undermine the organization's relevance and effectiveness over time. 6. Upholds Global Governance Principles

• The principle of preventing capture aligns with global best practices for internet governance, which emphasize inclusivity, transparency, and accountability. Ensuring that an RIR is not captured helps it stay true to these principles

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

Perhaps some guidelines should be developed on this? Especially in light of recent attempts to influence and/or gain control of RIR by private entities

**Brian Longwe (Converged Technology Networks)**

---

An RIR alone cannot ensure anti- capture. ICANN needs to step in and provide help and assistance.

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

strong policies in place to avoid that

**Aftab Siddiqui (AFTABSIDDIQUI-AU)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle. Maintaining continuity procedures and redundancies is crucial for ensuring that RIR services remain operational in the event of unforeseen disruptions or crises. By having the ability to transfer responsibilities to another RIR if necessary, the system can maintain stability and prevent service interruptions. Record sharing between RIRs further enhances collaboration and ensures that critical data is available for seamless transitions, thereby protecting the integrity and reliability of Internet resource management globally.

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle. Maintaining governance rules and controls to prevent capture is essential to ensuring that an RIR remains accountable to its community and operates in the public interest. Governance mechanisms should be designed to guard against undue influence from any single group or external forces, preserving the RIR's independence and neutrality. This helps protect the integrity of decision-making processes, fostering trust and ensuring that the RIR serves the broader needs of the global Internet community without bias.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

"captured"? What does that mean?

**j heasley (SNI)**

---

What's the definition of captured here?

**Jaco Kroon (Interexcel World Connection)**

---

A clear definition of "captured" should be included in the policy.

**Cameron Smith (Bubble Cloud Mozambique S.A.)**

---

This principle ensures that an RIR maintains governance rules and controls to prevent undue influence or "capture" by any single entity or group. By upholding impartiality and fairness, the RIR can make decisions based on the collective interests of the community. Effective governance frameworks, including conflict-of-interest rules and broad stakeholder representation, help maintain trust, credibility, and alignment with public internet governance goals. Preventing capture is crucial for the RIR's independence and integrity, ensuring it continues to serve the global community impartially.

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

Enhance effective legal statement and workable statements

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

I agree... BUT how to protect a non-profit against profiteers with deeper pockets than the rest of the RIRs & ICANN combined?

**Hendrik Visage (HeViS.Co Systems Pty Ltd)**

---

Agreed

**Mark Elkins (Posix Systems)**

---

I strongly agree with the principle that an RIR must maintain governance rules and controls to prevent itself from becoming captured. These rules and controls are critical for preserving the integrity, independence, and credibility of the RIR, enabling it to serve the interests of the global community impartially. Ensuring that RIRs are not captured by any particular group or external pressure fosters trust, accountability, and sustainability in the management of critical internet resources. Such governance mechanisms ensure that the RIR remains focused on its mission to support the global public good, protect the interests of all stakeholders, and contribute to the long-term health of the internet infrastructure.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

This is perfect 🙌

**Raymond Mamattah (EGIGFA)**

---

Agreed. Consider the case of preventing AfriNIC's operation.

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

This is vital

**Warren Kumari (Auth-Servers)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Imposing additional governance controls on RIRs could compromise their decentralized nature. There should be no overarching authority that could lead to capture.

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

I agree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

All rules must be adhere to

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

a definition may be helpful

**Nancy Carter (no affiliation)**

---

I believe this is one of the core requirement.

**Jeff Neuman (JJN Soluions, LLC)**

---

Strong governance controls help safeguard against conflicts of interest and ensure that the RIR remains focused

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

Yes

**Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)**

---

Totally agree

**Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)**

---

Guarantee community participation without risking the interests of members in their different natures

**Lia Solis (personal)**

---

Identified mechanisms of capture including a "council of elders" and over entrustment in an employee as practiced in APNIC must be prohibited by by the ICP-2 specifications.

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

I can't agree more, considering what AFRINIC is faced with.

**Musa Stephen HONLUE (AFRINIC)**

---

What is mean to be captured ?

**Adeola Alain P. AINA (Digital Intelligence Services, Sarl)**

---

This seems difficult to enforce, but a great principle to strive for.

**Xavier Clark (Harris Computer)**

---

With the IPv4 market, there is a new incentive for capture and the smallness of the voting populations make this a real risk

**Mike Burns (IPTrading)**

---

While i fully agree i also know that "becoming captured" also heavily depends on external threats.

**Carlos Friaças (FCT\FCCN)**

---

Nearly impossible to implement in practice, although independent directors and a higher level regulator would limit the possibilities.

**Kevin Meynell (Individual)**

---

Good addition reflecting the effort until now

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

capture definition required here.

**Matthew Cowen (dgtifutures)**

---

Maybe combine this with "member controlled". With that in place, the remaining thing is that a subgroup of members can't take over control. Preventing large-scale discrimination between groups of members is important

**Sander Steffann (SJM Steffann Consultancy)**

---

## **21.2. Anti-Capture - Somewhat Agree (4)**

In agreement

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

Be clear about what 'captured' means. The preceding principles could lead some to say that the system is captured already, by its own users.

**Jordan Carter (auDA)**

---

'Capture' needs more definition here. I can infer a meaning but more precision would be helpful.

**Narelle Clark (Internet Association of Australia)**

---

safeguards the independence and objectivity of RIRs. By implementing robust governance rules and controls, RIRs can protect themselves from undue influence or capture by external entities, ensuring that their decisions are driven by the best interests of the internet community. This principle promotes transparency, accountability, and the long-term sustainability of the RIR system.

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

No comments

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

4

**Taye Oyebola (Aso Savings and Loans Plc)**

---

souhaiter

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

This can be culturally difficult.

**Randy Bush (IIJ Research Lab & Arrcus Inc)**

---

I agree

**Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)**

---

I agree, but I'm struggling with how this would be operationalized and judged.

**Andrew Gallo (The George Washington University)**

---

Need a clear definition of "capture"

**Sébastien Brossier (Neutral Network Lab)**

---

### **21.3. Anti-Capture - Neutral (3)**

I don't know what "captured" means; in one reading, being overwhelmingly dominated by members who are number resource holders would be a kind of "capture".

**Andrew Sullivan (N/A)**

---

Not really, there should be no higher power controlling RIRs as the system has to be decentralized.

**Noel OUPOH (DATACONNECT AFRICA)**

---

neutral

Needs better definition.

**William Herrin (Self)**

---

An RIR must have effective governance rules in place to prevent capture, ensuring that all decisions reflect the community's collective interests.

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---

This should be related to neutrality only.

**Sergey Kozhedub (IPTP Networks)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. Imposing higher governance controls on RIRs does not align with the principles of decentralization. The system should allow RIRs to operate independently without fear of capture.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---

This approach appears overly restrictive. RIRs should be free from external governance that could lead to capture. The decentralized nature of the system must be preserved without imposing additional controls.

**Jun Wen (one futures technology sdn bhd)**

---

7. There should not be a higher power governing RIRs, as this undermines the principle of decentralization. RIRs must remain independent to effectively serve their regional needs.

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

Definitions here are tricky. How do we demonstrate that an RIR has not been captured? If an RIR's membership/board is taken over by some miscreant, it will be hard to amend ICP-2.

**Lee Howard (IPv4.Global by Hilco Streambank)**

---

#### **21.4. Anti-Capture - Somewhat Disagree (2)**

again, this should already be covered by adherence to "good governance" principles

**Peter Koch (Individual)**

---

While conceptually, anti-capture is laudable as a proposed principle, the questions it begs are "captured by whom?" and "how can you objectively tell?". For example, one could argue that the existing RIRs have already been "captured" by their members. Perhaps restating this proposed

principle to something like: “An RIR must maintain governance rules and controls to prevent a loss of community control of the RIR.”

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

An RIR needs to maintain governance rules to prevent capture, ensuring that its operations remain accountable to its members and aligned with their needs.

**Neonjyoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

Here we are again , Definition of 'capture' as it regards an RIR ? I have not seeing any such definition of capture .

**James Laferriere (n/a)**

---

This condition seems impractical. RIRs should not be subject to higher powers that could lead to capture. The focus should be on maintaining a decentralized structure without imposing additional governance rules.

**Sidonie Hacking (-)**

---

## **21.5. Anti-Capture - Strongly Disagree (1)**

An RIR must establish strong governance frameworks to prevent capture, ensuring that its operations are accountable to its community and reflect their interests and needs.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

To avoid capture, an RIR must implement governance rules that emphasize community engagement and uphold transparency in all its operations and decisions.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

An RIR should enforce robust governance controls to prevent capture, ensuring that it remains accountable to its members and operates in a way that reflects their priorities.

**Tipu Khan (Zx Online Ltd)**

---

Effective governance frameworks are vital for an RIR to guard against capture, ensuring that it operates transparently and prioritizes stakeholder interests in its decision-making.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

Governance rules and controls are critical for an RIR to maintain its independence and prevent capture, ensuring that it operates transparently and prioritizes the needs of its stakeholders.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---



An RIR must establish strong governance controls to prevent capture, ensuring that it remains accountable to its community and operates in a manner that reflects their interests and needs.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

To avoid becoming captured, an RIR should implement governance rules and controls that emphasize community involvement and uphold transparency in its operations and decision-making processes.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---

An RIR must adopt robust governance frameworks and controls to prevent capture, prioritizing transparency and accountability to ensure that its decisions align with the needs of its members.

**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. RIRs must maintain their decentralized nature, and imposing governance rules could create a risk of capture by external forces. There should be no higher authority over RIRs.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

To ensure independence and prevent capture, an RIR must establish governance rules that foster community engagement and transparency in its activities and decisions.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

To avoid capture, an RIR must implement strong governance rules and controls that emphasize community engagement and ensure transparency in its activities.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

An RIR should maintain effective governance frameworks to prevent capture, prioritizing transparency and accountability in its operations and decision-making processes.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

This condition seems impractical. RIRs should not be subject to higher powers that could lead to capture. The priority should be maintaining the decentralized structure, without additional governance regulations.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. Imposing stricter governance controls contradicts the core principles of decentralization. RIRs should be allowed to operate independently, free from the threat of capture.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---

An RIR must maintain strong governance rules and controls to prevent capture by any single interest. This includes continuity procedures and redundancies that support the portability of number resources, ensuring seamless service continuity.

**Taslima Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

To prevent capture, an RIR must implement governance rules and controls. This involves maintaining continuity procedures and redundancies that ensure the portability of number resources, facilitating smooth transitions between RIRs.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

To avoid capture, an RIR must implement governance rules that emphasize community engagement, ensuring that number resources are easily transferable to support overall internet stability.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

An RIR should adopt governance structures that prevent capture, ensuring that member interests are prioritized and that number resources remain portable for internet stability.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

An RIR must uphold strong governance rules and controls to avoid capture. This involves implementing continuity procedures and redundancies that enable the portability of number resources, facilitating stability.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

To prevent capture, an RIR must establish robust governance rules and controls. This includes continuity procedures and redundancies that support the portability of number resources, ensuring service continuity.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

To prevent capture, an RIR must establish robust governance rules and controls. This includes continuity procedures and redundancies that support the portability of number resources, ensuring service continuity.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

To prevent capture, an RIR should maintain continuity strategies and redundancies, along with active record sharing, allowing another RIR to perform its functions. This ensures that number resources are portable and contributes to overall internet stability.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

An RIR must prioritize continuity procedures and redundancies, engaging in record sharing to enable another RIR to take over its operations. This ensures the mandatory portability of number resources and supports the stability of the internet.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

It is essential for an RIR to implement continuity measures and redundancies while sharing records to facilitate a smooth transition to another RIR. This ensures mandatory portability of number resources and enhances overall internet stability.

**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

An RIR should focus on establishing continuity protocols and redundancies, as well as engaging in record sharing, to ensure that another RIR can easily perform its services. This guarantees the portability of number resources and supports internet stability.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

An RIR must uphold governance rules and controls to prevent capture by vested interests. This includes implementing continuity procedures and redundancies to facilitate the portability of number resources, ensuring service continuity.

**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

To ensure stability, an RIR must maintain continuity strategies and redundancies, participating in record sharing that allows another RIR to take over its operations. This ensures the mandatory portability of number resources.

**Pham Gia Khiem (Phat Tai Logistics)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. RIRs should not be subjected to higher powers that could compromise their independence. The emphasis should be on a decentralized system without additional governance controls.

**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

An RIR must maintain effective governance rules and controls to prevent capture. This includes implementing continuity procedures and redundancies that ensure the portability of number resources for stable internet operations.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

Governance rules and controls are necessary for an RIR to prevent capture by vested interests. This should involve continuity procedures and redundancies that facilitate the portability of number resources.

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

An RIR must implement robust governance rules and controls to ensure transparency and accountability, preventing any concentration of power that could compromise its integrity.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

An RIR must develop effective continuity procedures and redundancies, while engaging in record sharing to allow for seamless service transfer to another RIR. This is essential for maintaining the mandatory portability of number resources and internet stability.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

Governance mechanisms must be put in place to prevent capture by external forces. These should ensure transparency, accountability, and the active participation of stakeholders, maintaining the RIR's independence.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

RIRs must establish governance rules that are designed to prevent capture. These rules should include transparent decision-making and strong controls to ensure that the RIR remains independent and responsive to its community.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

An RIR should establish governance frameworks that protect against capture, ensuring that decision-making processes reflect the needs and priorities of its members.

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**

---

To avoid capture, an RIR should implement governance rules that emphasize accountability and transparency, fostering trust among its members.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

An RIR should maintain strong governance rules and controls to safeguard against capture, ensuring that its operations reflect the interests of its community and promote accountability and transparency.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---

Governance rules and controls must be enforced to ensure that an RIR is not influenced by outside forces. By maintaining transparency and accountability, these rules will safeguard the RIR's independence and decision-making integrity.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---

Preventing capture requires that an RIR put in place governance rules that are transparent and accountable. These structures should ensure that the RIR remains impartial and responsive to the diverse needs of its members.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

To prevent capture, an RIR needs to establish effective governance frameworks and controls that prioritize stakeholder engagement and uphold the principles of transparency and accountability in its decision-making processes.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---

An RIR must adopt clear governance structures to prevent capture by any external forces. These controls should promote fairness, transparency, and accountability, ensuring the RIR's independence and alignment with its community's goals.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

An RIR must implement rigorous governance rules and controls to maintain its independence and prevent any form of capture, ensuring that its operations remain transparent and accountable to its community.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

To avoid capture, an RIR's governance rules must be designed to ensure impartiality. Effective controls will help ensure that the RIR remains focused on its mission and is not swayed by external pressures.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

To avoid capture, an RIR should implement strong governance rules and controls that prioritize member interests and ensure that number resource portability is maintained for seamless service continuity.

**Md Abu Sayeem Siddique Siddique (ServicEngine Ltd)**

---

An RIR must establish robust governance rules and controls to ensure transparency and accountability, preventing any risk of capture while promoting the portability of number resources to enhance overall internet stability.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

An RIR should adopt governance frameworks that protect against capture, ensuring that its operations reflect the interests of its community.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

Effective governance is crucial for an RIR to avoid capture. This requires establishing clear controls and processes that prioritize member engagement.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---

To prevent capture, an RIR should establish strong governance rules and controls that reflect the interests and needs of its member organizations.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---

An RIR must prioritize governance rules that safeguard against capture, ensuring that all stakeholders have a voice in the decision-making process.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

To avoid capture, an RIR must establish governance rules that promote transparency and inclusivity, allowing for diverse input in its operations.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

An RIR should implement comprehensive governance controls that mitigate capture risks, ensuring that member voices are integrated into all decision-making processes.

**Trang Tran (VNPT Technologies)**

---

To prevent capture, an RIR should prioritize governance rules that ensure transparency, accountability, and active member participation in its decision-making processes.

**Minh Hoang (ANSV)**

---

An RIR must have effective governance mechanisms in place to prevent capture, ensuring that its operations remain aligned with the interests of its member organizations.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**

---

Robust governance controls are essential to prevent capture of an RIR by special interests. Transparent decision-making processes and strong oversight mechanisms will ensure the RIR remains accountable to its stakeholders.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**

---

An RIR must create governance structures that guarantee independence from external control or influence. By implementing rigorous checks and balances, an RIR can protect itself from capture and ensure that its operations remain aligned with its community's interests.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---

An RIR must have governance rules and controls that protect it from becoming captured by any external forces. These systems should foster transparency and ensure that the RIR's decisions reflect the collective interests of its community.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

Governance mechanisms are critical to maintaining the independence of an RIR. Clear rules and controls must be in place to prevent capture by any one group, ensuring that decision-making processes are transparent and equitable.

**Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)**

---

To prevent capture, an RIR must ensure that its governance rules emphasize fairness and inclusivity. Effective control systems will ensure that the organization's decisions are made with accountability and transparency.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

Governance rules and controls must be designed to ensure that an RIR is not captured by any particular interest group. These systems should promote transparency, accountability, and participation to safeguard the RIR's independence.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---

An RIR should adopt governance rules that prioritize transparency and prevent undue influence from external parties. Ensuring a robust system of checks and balances will help maintain the RIR's independence and prevent capture.

**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

Effective governance controls are necessary to prevent an RIR from becoming captured by special interests. These systems must ensure transparency, accountability, and the active participation of stakeholders in decision-making processes.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---

An RIR must implement strong governance and control systems that prevent external influence or capture. These mechanisms will support a fair and balanced approach to decision-making, ensuring that the RIR serves the collective interest of its members.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

To prevent capture, an RIR must establish robust governance rules and controls that emphasize accountability and transparency. This ensures that its decisions remain independent, fair, and aligned with the interests of its members.

**Ryan Khaw (AlSCO Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

To prevent capture, an RIR must maintain strong governance rules that foster transparency and accountability in decision-making processes.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

An RIR should maintain strong governance rules and controls to prevent capture, fostering an environment where community participation is encouraged and valued.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Aptic)**

---

An RIR must implement governance rules designed to safeguard against capture, ensuring that it remains focused on the needs of its community.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Maintaining governance frameworks is essential for an RIR to prevent capture, focusing on transparency and responsiveness to the interests of its members.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

To avoid capture, an RIR must establish strong governance controls that prioritize community engagement and accountability in its operations.

**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

An RIR must maintain strong governance rules and controls to prevent capture by any single interest. This includes continuity procedures and redundancies that support the portability of number resources, ensuring seamless service continuity.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

To prevent capture, an RIR must implement governance rules and controls. This involves maintaining continuity procedures and redundancies that ensure the portability of number resources, facilitating smooth transitions between RIRs.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

An RIR must prioritize governance rules and controls that protect against capture, ensuring that all members can participate in decision-making.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**

---

An RIR should implement governance rules that prioritize member engagement and transparency to prevent capture and maintain accountability.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

Maintaining robust governance rules is essential for an RIR to safeguard against capture. This involves establishing clear controls and processes that prioritize community engagement and transparency.

**Jeremy Cheong (Infineon technologies)**

---

An RIR must establish governance frameworks and controls that protect it from capture, ensuring that it remains focused on serving the needs of its members and the broader community.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

Effective governance rules are vital for an RIR to prevent capture, ensuring that its policies and decisions are made with the community's best interests in mind.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

An RIR must maintain robust governance rules and controls to safeguard against capture, fostering trust and engagement within its community.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

Mandating governance rules could undermine the independence of RIRs. Each RIR should have the flexibility to manage its own governance without external influence.

**Sohel Kabir (Kabir Traders)**

---

Requiring RIRs to adopt governance controls may inadvertently introduce unnecessary oversight. RIRs should maintain their autonomy to effectively serve their regions.

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Effective governance rules and controls are critical for an RIR to prevent capture, promoting transparency and accountability in its operations to serve the community effectively.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---



An RIR must prioritize governance rules and controls to protect against capture, ensuring that its policies align with the needs and expectations of its members.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---

To avoid capture, an RIR should implement strong governance rules that ensure transparency and member engagement, reflecting the interests of the community it serves.

**Catalina Cueca (Manpower)**

---

An RIR must have stringent governance rules and controls in place to prevent capture, fostering a culture of accountability and inclusivity within its decision-making processes.

**Camilo Riveros (Manpower)**

---

RIRs should not be controlled by a higher authority; their governance should reflect the decentralized framework of the system.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

An RIR must implement comprehensive governance rules and controls to prevent capture, ensuring that its operations remain transparent and accountable to its members and stakeholders.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**

---

The decentralization of RIRs is fundamental; imposing a higher authority to prevent capture would conflict with this principle.

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

This condition appears impractical. RIRs must operate independently, and imposing governance rules could jeopardize their decentralized nature. There should be no overarching authority.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. RIRs should not be subjected to higher powers that could compromise their independence. The emphasis should be on a decentralized system without additional governance controls.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. RIRs should not be subjected to higher powers that could create conditions for capture. The system should prioritize a decentralized approach.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

This condition seems overly burdensome. RIRs should operate without the constraints of external governance that could lead to capture. The decentralized structure must remain intact.

**Anh Dang (NASA)**

---

Establishing governance rules to prevent capture does not require external oversight; the decentralized system should allow RIRs to operate freely.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

RIRs should not be subjected to control by a higher power; the decentralized nature of the system is crucial for their independence.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

Governance controls intended to prevent capture should not come from an external authority, as this would compromise the decentralized system that RIRs operate within.

**Prasanta Haloi (Pwd)**

---

I find this approach too demanding. RIRs must preserve their independence, and introducing higher governance controls could inadvertently lead to capture. The focus must remain on safeguarding decentralization.

**Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)**

---

The requirement for governance rules to prevent capture contradicts the decentralized ethos of RIRs. Each RIR should operate independently without external oversight.

**AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)**

---

Imposing governance controls risks centralizing power within the RIR system, which could compromise their autonomy. Each RIR should be free to manage its own governance.

**K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. RIRs should maintain their autonomy, and additional governance controls could create vulnerabilities to capture. The focus should remain on decentralization.

**Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)**

---

There should be no higher authority imposing governance rules on RIRs, as this undermines their independence. RIRs must govern themselves to effectively manage local needs.

**Fuhui Zhang (University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)**

---

Governance controls aimed at preventing capture may lead to increased centralization. RIRs should operate independently to maintain the integrity of the system.

**Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)**

---

20. Governance controls imposed from above could risk compromising the independence of RIRs. Each RIR should maintain the freedom to govern itself without external pressure.

**Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)**

---

The strength of the RIR system lies in its decentralization. Imposing governance rules to prevent capture could disrupt this balance and undermine RIR autonomy.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

Imposing a higher power to control RIRs undermines the decentralized nature of the system. RIRs should operate independently without external oversight.

**Trabahan Pujari (Paruluniversity)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

This requirement seems impractical. RIRs need to operate independently, without the influence of higher governance that could lead to capture. Protecting decentralization is paramount.

**Juan Mesa (Hispasat)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Forcing RIRs to cooperate under a global standard could lead to complications. Their independence and the local context should guide their operations, not a one-size-fits-all approach.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

I believe that imposing stricter governance rules and controls on RIRs is unnecessary, as the system should remain decentralized. No overarching authority should be allowed to create the potential for capture.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. RIRs should not be subject to higher powers that could lead to conditions for capture. The system must emphasize a decentralized approach.

**Pornpipat Kitireanglarp (ZERIWELLPLUS Co., Ltd.)**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. A decentralized system requires RIRs to remain independent from higher powers. Imposing strict governance controls could threaten that autonomy.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Requiring RIRs to cooperate under a global standard could create burdensome obligations. RIRs should prioritize their independence and regional needs over adhering to global mandates.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. The decentralized nature of RIRs is vital, and imposing governance rules could facilitate capture. No higher authority should be involved in overseeing RIRs.

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

This requirement seems counterproductive. RIRs must function in a decentralized way, and introducing a higher authority could undermine this principle. No additional controls should be imposed that might lead to capture.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. RIRs must maintain their decentralized nature, and imposing governance rules could increase the risk of capture by external forces. There should be no higher authority over RIRs.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. The core idea of a decentralized system is that RIRs should remain free from higher powers. Imposing strict governance controls risks compromising that independence.

**Ashraful Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Enforcing governance rules could compromise RIRs' independence and create conditions ripe for capture. The focus must remain on maintaining a decentralized system.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

This requirement appears overly rigid. RIRs should operate independently, without external governance that could lead to conditions ripe for capture. The system must prioritize decentralization.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. The decentralized nature of RIRs is critical, and imposing governance controls could lead to capture. There should be no higher authority overseeing RIRs.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

This condition seems impractical. RIRs should not be subject to higher powers that could lead to capture. The focus should be on maintaining a decentralized structure without imposing additional governance rules.

**Phuc Pham (Advanced Network Systems VietNam Company Limited)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. Imposing higher governance controls on RIRs does not align with the principles of decentralization. The system should allow RIRs to operate independently without fear of capture.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Mandating governance rules to prevent capture could introduce unnecessary complexities. RIRs should remain decentralized and free from external influences that could undermine their autonomy.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

This approach seems overly restrictive. RIRs should be free from external governance that could result in capture. The decentralized nature of the system must be preserved without imposing additional controls.

**Giang Nguyen (NASA)**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. The core idea of a decentralized system is that RIRs should remain free from higher powers. Imposing strict governance controls risks compromising that independence.

**Alex Kwan (Wiplus Malaysia)**

---

I believe that imposing stricter governance rules and controls on RIRs is unnecessary, as the system should remain decentralized. No overarching authority should be allowed to create the potential for capture.

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

Disagree

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. RIRs must maintain their decentralized nature, and imposing governance rules could create a risk of capture by external forces. There should be no higher authority over RIRs.

**Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. The essence of a decentralized system is that RIRs should not be subject to higher powers. Imposing strict governance controls could risk compromising that independence.

**Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)**

---

I believe imposing higher governance rules and controls on RIRs is unnecessary since the system should remain decentralized. There should be no overarching authority that could lead to capture.

**Pooja Gopi (DM Digital Marketing)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. RIRs should not be subjected to higher powers that could create conditions for capture. The system should prioritize a decentralized approach.

**Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)**

---

This condition seems overly burdensome. RIRs should operate without the constraints of external governance that could lead to capture. The decentralized structure must remain intact.

**Quyn Kim (VNPAY)**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. The essence of a decentralized system is that RIRs should not be subject to higher powers. Imposing strict governance controls could risk compromising that independence.

**Shahedul Islam Bhuiyan (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Mandating governance rules to prevent capture could lead to unnecessary centralization. RIRs should be free to govern themselves without external controls.

**Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)**

---

Question 44&45 Anti-Capture An RIR must maintain governance rules and controls to prevent itself from becoming captured. 1- Strongly Disagree I believe that imposing higher governance rules and controls on RIRs is unnecessary since the system should remain decentralized. There should be no overarching authority that could lead to capture.

**Anjan Deka (HDFC)**

---

I believe that imposing higher governance rules and controls on RIRs is unnecessary since the system should remain decentralized. There should be no overarching authority that could lead to capture.

**Ketan Parmar (Bids Info Global)**

---

Requiring governance controls to prevent capture contradicts the decentralized ethos of RIRs. Each RIR should maintain its autonomy without external oversight.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

There should be no overarching authority controlling RIRs, as the integrity of the system relies on decentralization. Governance should remain within the purview of each RIR.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

Imposing governance rules to prevent capture undermines the decentralized nature of the RIR system. RIRs should operate independently without higher powers dictating their governance.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---

## 22. Ecosystem Stability

---

Each RIR must cooperate to ensure the ongoing operation and stability of the global Internet number registry system and must not operate or fail to operate in any manner that threatens such stability.

### 22.1. Ecosystem Stability - Strongly Agree (5)

What happens if it fails to operate in the expected manner?

**Babagana Digima (Nigerian Communications Commission)**

---

Forcing attention to the global system is vital. Otherwise people (RIRs) risk retreating into their silos. This also provides the principled basis for assigning resources to effective coordination and collaboration, which I see as positive not only for the numbering community, but also having positive spill-over effects for the internet infrastructure technical community more broadly.

**Jordan Carter (auDA)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle, as it is fundamental to maintaining the integrity, stability, and reliability of the global Internet number registry system. Here's an analysis: Reasons for Agreement

1. Ensures Global Internet Stability • The global internet infrastructure relies on the proper functioning of Internet Number Resource registries managed by RIRs. If any RIR fails to cooperate or acts in a way that disrupts the system, it could have significant consequences for the global routing and addressing systems. Cooperation among RIRs ensures that the entire global network remains stable and operational, preventing fragmentation or conflicting resource management.

2. Promotes Collaboration and Coordination • The internet is a decentralized and interconnected system. For it to function effectively, RIRs must coordinate and collaborate to ensure that IP addresses, ASNs, and other resources are allocated efficiently and consistently across regions.

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

Nothing to add or detract

**Brian Longwe (Converged Technology Networks)**

---

YES

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle. Maintaining governance rules and controls to prevent capture is essential to ensuring that an RIR remains accountable to its community and operates in the public interest. Governance mechanisms should be designed to guard against undue influence from any single group or external forces, preserving the RIR's independence and neutrality. This helps protect the integrity of decision-making processes, fostering trust and ensuring that the RIR serves the broader needs of the global Internet community without bias.

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

I fully agree with this principle. Cooperation among RIRs is essential for maintaining the stability and operation of the global Internet number registry system. Given the interconnected nature of the Internet, any disruption or failure by one RIR could have far-reaching impacts. By working together, RIRs can ensure that resources are allocated effectively, policies are aligned, and the overall system remains robust. This collaboration safeguards the long-term stability of the global Internet infrastructure, supporting its continued growth and evolution.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

The alternative to this is a deeply troubling scenario, hence the principle is vital.

**Narelle Clark (Internet Association of Australia)**

---

Of course. Or, we should withdraw its authority

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

It sounds great, until you have human nature and greed ;(

**Hendrik Visage (HeViS.Co Systems Pty Ltd)**

---

Agreed

**Mark Elkins (Posix Systems)**

---

I strongly agree that each RIR must cooperate to ensure the ongoing operation and stability of the global Internet number registry system and must not operate or fail to operate in any manner that threatens such stability. Cooperation between RIRs is not just a practical necessity but an ethical and strategic imperative for the long-term health and success of the global Internet ecosystem. By working together, RIRs can ensure consistency, avoid fragmentation, enhance security, and address the global challenges that affect the Internet as a whole. Collaboration ensures that the global Internet remains stable, secure, and equitable for all users.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

This principle emphasizes the importance of collaboration among Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) to maintain the stability and functionality of the global Internet number registry system. **Cooperation and Coordination:** The principle underscores the necessity for RIRs to work together. This cooperation ensures that the allocation and management of IP addresses and Autonomous System Numbers (ASNs) are consistent and reliable across different regions. **Stability of the Internet:** By adhering to this principle, RIRs contribute to the overall stability of the Internet. Any action or inaction that could disrupt the registry system might have far-reaching consequences, affecting not just regional but global Internet operations. **Responsibility and Accountability:** The principle implies a shared responsibility among RIRs. Each RIR must be accountable for its actions and ensure that its operations do not jeopardize the stability of the global system. **Preventing Fragmentation:** Cooperation helps prevent fragmentation of the Internet number registry system. A fragmented system could lead to inconsistencies and conflicts in IP address allocation, which could disrupt Internet connectivity and operations. **Global Impact:** The principle highlights that the actions of individual RIRs have global implications. Therefore, maintaining a collaborative approach is crucial for the health and stability of the entire Internet ecosystem. This principle is fundamental to ensuring that the Internet remains a



stable and reliable resource for users worldwide. It promotes a unified approach to managing critical Internet resources, which is essential for the continued growth and functionality of the global Internet.  
**Benny Pan (NA)**

---

Single global internet is essential

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

5

**Taye Oyebola (Aso Savings and Loans Plc)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Requiring RIRs to cooperate under a global standard could create unnecessary obligations. RIRs should prioritize their independence and regional relevance over global mandates.

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

I strongly agree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

Yes

**Danjuma bappa ahmed (Wownetworks limited nigeria)**

---

RIR must ensure its Ecosystem is stably, reliable and efficient to members

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

bonne approche

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

By acting in unison, RIRs can ensure that policies and technical systems are aligned, providing consistency and preventing disruptions

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

Yes

**Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)**

---

Totally agree

**Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)**

---

This is the core purpose of a RIR.

**David Lamparter (Westnetz w.V.)**

---

...and security of the global ...

**Andrei Robachevsky (independent)**

---

RIRs collectively must account to members of RIRs to maintain the global Internet systems. RIRs must not - as they have been - support corrupt activities by the purported leadership of an RIR at the expense of the resource members of the RIR.

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

I suggest to reword the text as following: All RIRs must cooperate to ensure the ongoing operation and stability of the global Internet number registry system and each RIR must not operate or fail to operate any manner that threatens such stability.

**Haitham El Nakhal (National Telecom Regulatory Authority)**

---

Well yes, but difficult to evaluate in practice.

**Kevin Meynell (Individual)**

---

good addition

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

## **22.2. Ecosystem Stability - Somewhat Agree (4)**

How do we know what the manner that does not threaten stability is?

**Andrew Sullivan (N/A)**

---

In agreement

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

agree

**Mohammad Mubarak Alfalasi (Telecommunication and Digital government Regulatory Authority)**

---

collective responsibility of all RIRs to maintain the stability and security of the global internet numbering system. By cooperating and avoiding actions that could jeopardize this stability, RIRs contribute to the overall health and resilience of the internet. This principle promotes a collaborative approach among RIRs, fostering a sense of shared responsibility and ensuring the long-term sustainability of the internet infrastructure.

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

This principle emphasizes the need for cooperation among RIRs to ensure the stability and smooth operation of the global Internet number registry system. By working together, RIRs help maintain consistency in policies and service delivery, minimizing risks to the global internet infrastructure. It also highlights the importance of avoiding actions that could threaten the system's stability, as any disruptions can have widespread impacts. Overall, this principle ensures the collective responsibility of RIRs in safeguarding the ongoing integrity and reliability of the global internet ecosystem.

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

I agree

**Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)**

---

I'm a bit concerned about the governance of this cooperation.

**Mike Burns (IPTrading)**

---

It's a bit vague. What if a part of that registry system goes off the rails. To what extent does an RIR have to go against its own principles? I feel that this principle assumes that the system consists of "the good guys/girls/people"

**Sander Steffann (SJM Steffann Consultancy)**

---

### **22.3. Ecosystem Stability - Neutral (3)**

this is not necessarily a principle on its own but a corollary from both the Ecosystem and the Lifecycle principles

**Peter Koch (Individual)**

---

yes

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

Cooperation among RIRs is vital for the stability of the global Internet number registry system, with each entity accountable for its contributions to this critical infrastructure.

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---

This requirement appears overly demanding. RIRs should not be obligated to cooperate in ways that could compromise their independence or lead to conflicts. Each region has unique challenges that should guide their operations.

**Sidonie Hacking (-)**

---

This approach seems overly rigid. RIRs should remain autonomous and avoid unnecessary interference with one another. Mandating global cooperation could impose obligations that may not be appropriate for every region.

7. I believe that RIRs need to maintain their independence to serve their regions effectively. Imposing cooperation requirements could overwhelm them with obligations that may not be feasible.

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

#### **22.4. Ecosystem Stability - Somewhat Disagree (2)**

As with anti-capture, this proposed principle is conceptually appealing, however implementation would depend on how “cooperation” and “stability” are interpreted, how those terms are measured, and who measures them.

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

RIRs must be independent and not overlap or have negative impact on each other. Imposing a global standard for cooperation risks overburdening RIRs with obligations that may not be feasible or relevant to their specific regional contexts.

**Noel OUPOH (DATACONNECT AFRICA)**

---

Cooperation among RIRs is essential to maintain the global Internet number registry system's stability, with each organization responsible for its operational impacts.

**Neonjyoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

I find this condition impractical. RIRs should focus on their independent operations, and requiring them to cooperate globally may introduce complexities that are not relevant to their specific contexts.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---

#### **22.5. Ecosystem Stability - Strongly Disagree (1)**

To uphold the stability of the global Internet number registry system, each RIR must engage in cooperative efforts and refrain from any behavior that could compromise its ongoing operation.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

Each RIR should work together to support the ongoing stability and operation of the global Internet number registry system, prioritizing collaborative actions that enhance this critical infrastructure.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

Cooperation among RIRs is essential for the ongoing stability of the global Internet number registry system, and each RIR must avoid actions that could undermine this framework.

**Tipu Khan (Zx Online Ltd)**

---

Each RIR must engage in cooperative efforts to ensure the operational stability of the global Internet number registry system, prioritizing actions that protect this vital infrastructure.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

Cooperation among RIRs is vital for the ongoing stability of the global Internet number registry system, and each RIR must avoid any actions that could compromise this important framework.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---

Each RIR should work together to ensure the stability and ongoing operation of the global Internet number registry system, prioritizing cooperative actions that maintain this critical infrastructure.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

To support the stability of the global Internet number registry system, each RIR must engage in collaborative efforts and refrain from actions that could threaten its ongoing operation.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---

Each RIR must actively cooperate to maintain the operational integrity and stability of the global Internet number registry system, ensuring that their actions do not jeopardize this vital infrastructure.

**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Ensuring the independence of RIRs is crucial, and requiring them to cooperate globally may lead to complications. Each RIR has distinct contexts that should be prioritized over a one-size-fits-all approach.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

Each RIR must cooperate to support the stability and operation of the global Internet number registry system, focusing on actions that uphold this essential framework.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

Each RIR should work together to maintain the ongoing operation and stability of the global Internet number registry system, prioritizing cooperative actions that uphold this critical infrastructure.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

Cooperation among RIRs is essential for the stability of the global Internet number registry system, and each RIR must avoid actions that could jeopardize this vital framework.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

This condition seems overly demanding. RIRs should not be obligated to cooperate in ways that could compromise their independence or create conflicts. Each region has distinct challenges that should guide its operations.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

I find this stipulation impractical. RIRs should focus on managing their independent operations, and forcing them to cooperate globally could create complexities that are irrelevant to their specific regional circumstances.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---

Cooperation among RIRs is vital for ensuring the ongoing operation of the global Internet number registry system. Each RIR must adopt a community-driven approach that prioritizes member needs and maintains system stability.

**Taslima Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

Each RIR should actively cooperate to ensure the stability of the global Internet number registry system. This cooperation must be rooted in a member-first philosophy that focuses on community needs and safeguards against threats to stability.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

Each RIR must actively cooperate to support the ongoing stability of the global Internet number registry system, ensuring that community interests guide all operational decisions.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

To maintain the stability of the global Internet number registry system, RIRs must engage in cooperative practices that focus on member needs and promote effective collaboration.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

To ensure the ongoing operation of the global Internet number registry system, each RIR must collaborate effectively. A focus on community-driven initiatives and member needs is vital for maintaining stability.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

Each RIR must actively cooperate to ensure the stability of the global Internet number registry system. This cooperation should emphasize a member-first approach that prioritizes community engagement and stability.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

Each RIR must actively cooperate to ensure the stability of the global Internet number registry system. This cooperation should emphasize a member-first approach that prioritizes community engagement and stability.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

It is imperative that RIRs engage in cooperative efforts to uphold the stability of the global Internet number registry system, focusing on a member-oriented approach.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

Each RIR must work collaboratively to ensure the stability of the global Internet number registry system, prioritizing the interests of its members in all actions.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

Cooperation among RIRs is crucial to support the ongoing stability of the global Internet number registry system, with a focus on member-driven decision-making processes.

**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

Each RIR should actively engage in cooperative efforts to maintain the stability of the global Internet number registry system, ensuring that member needs are prioritized.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

Each RIR must actively participate in cooperative efforts to maintain the global Internet number registry system's stability. This should include a focus on community-driven initiatives that prioritize member needs

**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

It is essential for RIRs to collaborate to ensure the ongoing stability of the global Internet number registry system, emphasizing a community-focused approach to governance.

**Pham Gia Khiem (Phat Tai Logistics)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. RIRs should not be forced into cooperation that could lead to overlap or negatively impact their operations. Each region should address its own needs without global mandates.

**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

To support the ongoing operation of the global Internet number registry system, each RIR must engage in cooperative initiatives. A community-focused approach that prioritizes member needs is essential for stability.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

Cooperation among RIRs is essential for maintaining the stability of the global Internet number registry system. Each RIR should adopt a member-first philosophy that centers on community needs and safeguards overall stability.

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

Cooperation among RIRs is crucial for the ongoing stability of the global Internet number registry system, with a focus on member-driven decision-making processes.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

Each RIR must work together with others to uphold the stability of the global Internet number registry system, prioritizing member engagement in all activities.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

Each RIR must actively participate in collaborative efforts to maintain the stability of the global Internet number registry system, ensuring that community perspectives guide decision-making.

**Kwan Ke Yue (TBWA/ Kuala Lumpur)**

---

Cooperation among RIRs is vital to ensure the stability of the global Internet number registry system, with a focus on a member-first approach in all operational decisions.

**Sean Carroll (The One Academy)**

---

Each RIR must work in partnership with others to maintain the stability of the global Internet number registry system, ensuring that community needs are reflected in decision-making.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

It is imperative that RIRs cooperate to uphold the stability of the global Internet number registry system, prioritizing member interests in all operational processes.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

Each RIR must engage in collaborative efforts to support the ongoing operation of the global Internet number registry system, ensuring that its actions align with member interests.

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**

---

Each RIR should prioritize cooperation to ensure the stability of the global Internet number registry system, avoiding any actions that could jeopardize its operation.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

Each RIR must work together to support the ongoing operation and stability of the global Internet number registry system, avoiding actions that could threaten this critical infrastructure.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---

To safeguard global stability, RIRs should adopt governance frameworks that foster cooperation, promote transparency, and prevent actions that could disrupt the functioning of the Internet number registry system.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---



RIRs must adopt governance systems that ensure their actions contribute to the stability of the global registry system, while prioritizing community-driven, member-first principles.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

To maintain the stability of the global Internet number registry system, each RIR should engage in cooperative efforts that align with the overarching goal of ensuring consistent and reliable operations.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---

Each RIR must prioritize cooperation with the global registry system, adopting governance rules that reflect a community-driven approach to ensure the system's long-term stability and operational continuity.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

Each RIR must collaborate effectively to ensure the ongoing stability and operation of the global Internet number registry system, prioritizing actions that support this stability and avoid operational disruptions.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

RIRs must create governance frameworks that focus on the stability of the global Internet number registry system, aligning their actions with the interests of the broader community and ensuring no threat to its continued operation.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

Collaboration among RIRs is essential to maintain the stability of the global Internet number registry system, with a commitment to member-first strategies guiding all cooperative efforts.

**Md Abu Sayeem Siddique Siddique (ServicEngine Ltd)**

---

Each RIR must actively cooperate to ensure the ongoing stability of the global Internet number registry system, prioritizing member needs and community-driven approaches in all operational decisions.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

Each RIR must collaborate to support the ongoing stability of the global Internet number registry system, ensuring that its actions reflect the needs of its members.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

To maintain the stability of the global Internet number registry system, each RIR must cooperate effectively, prioritizing member-driven approaches.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---

Each RIR must collaborate actively to ensure the stability of the global Internet number registry system, taking care to avoid any actions that could threaten its integrity.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---

To ensure the ongoing operation of the global Internet number registry system, each RIR must cooperate effectively, preventing disruptions to its stability.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

Each RIR must prioritize collaborative efforts to ensure the stability of the global Internet number registry system, ensuring that their decisions do not threaten its integrity.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

Cooperation is key for each RIR in maintaining the stability of the global Internet number registry system, with a shared responsibility to prevent disruptions.

**Trang Tran (VNPT Technologies)**

---

It is essential for each RIR to cooperate in preserving the stability of the global Internet number registry system, avoiding any actions that could disrupt its functionality.

**Minh Hoang (ANSV)**

---

Each RIR must actively work together to promote the stability of the global Internet number registry system, ensuring that their operations do not undermine this critical infrastructure.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**

---

An RIR must cooperate with the broader Internet number registry system and adopt governance rules that prioritize stability, transparency, and member engagement to ensure its long-term sustainability.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**

---

RIRs must maintain governance rules that ensure their operations align with the stability of the global Internet registry system, adopting a member-first approach that reflects the collective needs of the community.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---

To protect the stability of the global Internet number registry system, each RIR must establish governance structures that encourage cooperation and accountability, ensuring actions are always aligned with global needs.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

Governance rules must be designed to ensure that each RIR cooperates with the global system, taking a community-first approach and ensuring that no actions threaten the stability of the Internet number registry.

**Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)**

---

The ongoing operation and stability of the global Internet registry system depend on the cooperation of all RIRs. Each RIR must adopt governance rules that ensure its actions align with the broader community's interests.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

Each RIR must maintain governance controls that prioritize the global Internet number registry's stability and functionality. A community-driven, member-first approach is key to preventing any actions that could threaten system stability.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---

RIRs should implement governance structures that promote transparency and collaboration, ensuring that their actions align with the stability and operational continuity of the global Internet number registry system.

**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

To ensure the stability of the global Internet registry, RIRs must adopt a member-first approach, implement effective governance controls, and operate in a manner that supports the collective stability of the system.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---

Each RIR must maintain governance structures and controls that focus on long-term stability and collaboration with the broader Internet registry system. The primary goal should be to operate in a way that prioritizes community interests and ensures global stability.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

An RIR must adopt governance rules that reflect a commitment to collaboration with other RIRs, ensuring the ongoing stability of the global registry system. A member-first, community-driven approach is essential to maintaining the health of the system.

**Ryan Khaw (Alsco Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

An RIR must engage in cooperative efforts to maintain global Internet stability, focusing on community-driven initiatives in its operations.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

Cooperation among RIRs is vital for maintaining the stability of the global Internet number registry system, with each entity responsible for its actions and their potential impact.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Apnic)**

---

An RIR must work together with others to ensure global Internet stability, adopting a community-focused approach in all cooperative initiatives.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Each RIR must engage in collaborative efforts to promote the ongoing operation of the global Internet number registry system, ensuring that its actions align with community interests.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

Cooperation among RIRs is vital for maintaining the stability of the global Internet number registry system, with each RIR adopting a member-first focus.

**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

Cooperation among RIRs is vital for ensuring the ongoing operation of the global Internet number registry system. Each RIR must adopt a community-driven approach that prioritizes member needs and maintains system stability.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

Each RIR should actively cooperate to ensure the stability of the global Internet number registry system. This cooperation must be rooted in a member-first philosophy that focuses on community needs and safeguards against threats to stability.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

It is essential for each RIR to cooperate in preserving the global Internet number registry system's stability, actively preventing any disruptions to its operation.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**

---

It is crucial for each RIR to work together to ensure the ongoing stability of the global Internet number registry system, reinforcing the importance of collaboration.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

An RIR must engage in cooperative efforts to maintain the stability of the global Internet number registry system, ensuring that its operations reflect the needs of its community.

**Jeremy Cheong (Infineon technologies)**

---

To support global Internet stability, each RIR must work together to ensure consistent operations, prioritizing member interests in all cooperative initiatives.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

Each RIR must work in concert to ensure the ongoing operation of the global Internet number registry system, preventing any activities that could compromise stability.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

Each RIR should collaborate to support the ongoing stability of the global Internet number registry system, ensuring that their actions contribute to its resilience.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

RIRs must prioritize their independence and regional relevance. Imposing global cooperation standards could lead to burdensome obligations that detract from their primary responsibilities.

**Sohel Kabir (Kabir Traders)**

---

RIRs should operate independently to effectively serve their regions. Imposing global cooperation standards could overwhelm them with irrelevant obligations.

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Each RIR must engage in cooperative efforts to support the global Internet number registry system's stability, ensuring that their operations align with the goal of maintaining integrity.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---

It is imperative that each RIR cooperates to maintain the stability of the global Internet number registry system, ensuring that no actions threaten its ongoing operation.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---

Each RIR should prioritize collaboration to ensure the smooth operation of the global Internet number registry system, avoiding actions that could lead to instability.

**Catalina Cueca (Manpower)**

---

Cooperation among RIRs is essential to ensure the stability of the global Internet number registry system, with each entity bearing responsibility for its impact on this critical infrastructure.

**Camilo Riveros (Manpower)**

---

I think RIRs should focus on their own operations rather than being compelled to cooperate. A global standard could create burdens that are not practical for them.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

Each RIR must work together to ensure the ongoing stability of the global Internet number registry system, actively avoiding decisions that could disrupt this vital infrastructure.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**

---

Each RIR must retain its independence; imposing a global cooperation standard risks overburdening them with obligations that may not align with their specific regional challenges.

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

This condition appears overly demanding. Requiring RIRs to cooperate under a global framework could create conflicts that undermine their independence. Local relevance should guide their operations.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. RIRs should not be forced into cooperation that could lead to overlap or negatively impact their operations. Each region should address its own needs without global mandates.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. RIRs should not be pressured into cooperating under a global standard, as this could lead to complications. Independence and local context should drive their operations.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

This requirement appears impractical. Mandating cooperation among RIRs risks creating conflicts and overlaps that could undermine their independence. Each region should focus on its specific challenges.

**Anh Dang (NASA)**

---

RIRs must maintain their independence to avoid overlapping responsibilities. A global cooperation mandate could impose burdens that are not appropriate for their regional contexts.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

I think RIRs should not be compelled to cooperate globally. This could create unnecessary obligations that do not consider the unique needs of different regions.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

RIR autonomy is crucial; they should not be mandated to cooperate under a global standard. This could impose unrealistic expectations that do not reflect their regional needs.

**Prasanta Haloi (Pwd)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. RIRs should not be pressured into cooperating under a global standard, as this could lead to complications. Independence and local context should drive their operations.

**Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)**

---

I disagree; while cooperation is important, RIRs should prioritize their independence. Global mandates could lead to obligations that are impractical for their specific contexts.

**AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)**

---

RIRs must focus on their own operations rather than being compelled to cooperate globally. This could lead to unnecessary obligations that detract from their effectiveness.

**K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. RIRs must remain autonomous, and imposing a global standard for cooperation risks burdening them with obligations that may not be relevant to their needs.

**Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)**

---

I believe that RIRs should maintain their autonomy to avoid conflicts and overlaps. Global cooperation mandates could impose burdens that do not align with their local needs.

**Fuhui Zhang (University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)**

---

Each RIR should be free to prioritize its regional context over global cooperation obligations. Imposing such requirements could complicate their operations and lead to inefficiencies.

**Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)**

---

Each RIR should prioritize its regional context without being obligated to cooperate under a global standard. This would prevent potential overlaps and negative impacts on their operations.

**Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)**

---

I believe RIRs need to operate autonomously to address their unique challenges. Mandating cooperation could create unnecessary complexities and conflicts in their operations.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

Cooperation among RIRs should not come at the cost of their independence. A global standard could impose unrealistic obligations that are not relevant to the unique circumstances of each region.

**Trabahan Pujari (Paruluniversity)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

This condition seems overly burdensome. Requiring RIRs to cooperate globally could impose obligations that don't align with their regional contexts. Maintaining their independence is critical for stability and effective operations.

**Juan Mesa (Hispasat)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. RIRs should take full responsibility for their compliance efforts, and external intervention could disrupt their internal processes. Independence is key to effective governance.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

I disagree with this requirement. RIRs should maintain their independence and avoid overlapping responsibilities that could interfere with one another. Imposing a global standard for cooperation could burden them with obligations that may not align with their regional contexts.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

I find this approach too restrictive. RIRs must maintain their autonomy, and enforcing global cooperation could negatively affect their operations. Local needs should determine their responsibilities, not global obligations.

**Pornpipat Kitireanglarp (ZERIWELLPLUS Co., Ltd.)**

---

I find this condition excessive. Forcing RIRs into cooperation that leads to overlap or conflict isn't productive. Imposing global expectations could overwhelm them with obligations that don't suit their regional contexts.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. RIRs must maintain autonomy in managing compliance with ICP-2. Seeking external assistance risks creating a reliance that could diminish their responsibility and invite unnecessary interference.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Enforcing a global cooperation framework could burden RIRs with obligations that do not fit their regional needs. Ensuring their independence is key to their effectiveness.

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

This requirement seems unfeasible. RIRs must operate independently, and enforcing cooperation under a global standard could create burdens that do not address the specific needs of each region.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Ensuring the independence of RIRs is vital, and forcing them to cooperate globally may lead to complications. Each RIR has its own distinct context that should take priority over a one-size-fits-all approach.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---

I find this requirement excessive. RIRs should not be forced into cooperation that could result in overlap or conflicts. Imposing a global expectation could overwhelm them with duties that don't fit their specific regional situations.

**Ashrafal Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Imposing global cooperation standards could lead to negative consequences and undermine RIR independence. Each region has its own unique needs, which should guide their actions.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---



Strongly disagree

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

This condition seems counterproductive. RIRs must operate without the constraints of mandatory cooperation, which could cause overlap or conflicts. Each region should determine its own approach based on local needs.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Imposing a global framework for cooperation could burden RIRs with obligations that may not align with their regional needs. Maintaining independence is essential for effective operations.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

This requirement appears overly demanding. RIRs should not be obligated to cooperate in ways that could compromise their independence or lead to conflicts. Each region has unique challenges that should guide their operations.

**Phuc Pham (Advanced Network Systems VietNam Company Limited)**

---

I find this condition impractical. RIRs should focus on their independent operations, and requiring them to cooperate globally may introduce complexities that are not relevant to their specific contexts.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. RIRs must be free to operate independently, and imposing global cooperation standards could result in negative interactions among them. Local relevance should take precedence over global obligations.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

This approach seems overly rigid. RIRs should remain autonomous and avoid unnecessary interference from one another. Mandating global cooperation could impose obligations that might not be suitable for every region.

**Giang Nguyen (NASA)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. RIRs should not be forced into cooperation that could result in overlap or conflicts. Imposing a global expectation could overwhelm them with duties that don't fit their specific regional situations.

**Alex Kwan (Wiplus Malaysia)**

---

I disagree with this requirement. RIRs should maintain their independence and avoid overlapping responsibilities that could interfere with one another. Imposing a global standard for cooperation could burden them with obligations that may not align with their regional contexts.

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

Disagree

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Ensuring the independence of RIRs is crucial, and requiring them to cooperate globally may lead to complications. Each RIR has distinct contexts that should be prioritized over a one-size-fits-all approach.

**Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. RIRs should not be forced into cooperation that could lead to overlap or conflict. Imposing a global expectation could overburden them with duties that are not suited to their specific regional situations.

**Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)**

---

I disagree with this requirement. RIRs should maintain their independence and avoid overlapping responsibilities that could negatively impact each other. Imposing a global standard for cooperation could burden them with obligations that may not be relevant to their regional contexts.

**Pooja Gopi (DM Digital Marketing)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. RIRs should not be pressured into cooperating under a global standard, as this could lead to complications. Independence and local context should drive their operations.

**Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)**

---

This requirement appears impractical. Mandating cooperation among RIRs risks creating conflicts and overlaps that could undermine their independence. Each region should focus on its specific challenges.

**Quyn Kim (VNPAY)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. RIRs should not be forced into cooperation that could lead to overlap or conflict. Imposing a global expectation could overburden them with duties that are not suited to their specific regional situations.

**Shahedul Islam Bhuiyan (Royal Green Limited)**

---

I disagree; while collaboration is important, RIRs must retain their autonomy. Global cooperation standards could impose unrealistic expectations that don't consider regional differences.

**Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)**

---

Question 46&47 Ecosystem Stability Each RIR must cooperate to ensure the ongoing operation and stability of the global Internet number registry system and must not operate or fail to operate in any manner that threatens such stability. 1- Strongly Disagree I disagree with this requirement. RIRs should maintain their independence and avoid overlapping responsibilities that could negatively impact one another. Imposing a global standard for cooperation could burden RIRs with obligations that may not be relevant to their regional contexts.

**Anjan Deka (HDFC)**

---

I disagree with this requirement. RIRs should maintain their independence and avoid overlapping responsibilities that could negatively impact one another. Imposing a global standard for cooperation could burden RIRs with obligations that may not be relevant to their regional contexts.

**Ketan Parmar (Bids Info Global)**

---

I believe RIRs must prioritize their independence. Mandating cooperation could impose impractical obligations, potentially detracting from their ability to address local issues effectively.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

Cooperation among RIRs should not come at the expense of their independence. Imposing global standards could lead to unnecessary obligations that don't align with the specific needs of each region.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

I disagree; RIRs should maintain their independence and avoid overlapping responsibilities. Imposing global cooperation standards could overburden them with obligations that may not be relevant to their regional contexts.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---

## 23. Remedial Bias

---

ICANN and all other RIRs must provide all reasonable support, if requested, to assist an RIR to cure any failure to comply with ICP-2 before derecognizing the RIR.

### 23.1. Remedial Bias - Strongly Agree (5)

This principle buttresses the principle of ecosystem stability.

**Eric Edora (TELUS Communications Inc.)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle, as it ensures that RIRs are provided with the necessary support to address any failures before drastic measures such as derecognition are taken. Here's an analysis:

Reasons for Agreement

1. Encourages Collaborative Problem Solving •

Rather than taking immediate punitive actions, offering support and collaboration helps resolve issues in a constructive manner. This approach encourages RIRs to seek assistance, fostering a spirit of mutual cooperation among RIRs, ICANN, and other stakeholders, which can lead to more effective solutions and improvements within the system.

2. Preserves Stability and Continuity • Derecognizing an RIR can have significant consequences for the stability and operation of the global internet infrastructure. By providing support to help an RIR address compliance issues before considering such a drastic step, ICANN and other RIRs help ensure that any disruption to the global internet resource management system is minimized. This proactive approach prioritizes stability over punitive measures.
3. Prevents Unnecessary Derecognition •

Failure to comply with ICP-2 may not always be intentional or due to malice; it could stem from technical, administrative, or resource-related challenges. Providing reasonable support ensures that RIRs are given a fair opportunity to correct their issues and avoid unnecessary derecognition. This avoids situations where an RIR is punished without a proper chance to remedy the situation.

4. Strengthens the Global Internet Ecosystem • Supporting RIRs in need promotes the health of the entire global internet ecosystem by reinforcing the idea that collaboration and shared responsibility are central to its success. This support helps build stronger, more capable RIRs, which ultimately benefits the global community by ensuring that all RIRs operate efficiently and in compliance with best practices.

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

Nothing to add or detract

**Brian Longwe (Converged Technology Networks)**

---

YES

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle. Providing support to an RIR to help it remedy any compliance issues before resorting to derecognition is crucial for maintaining stability and continuity in the global Internet governance system. Collaboration and assistance, rather than punitive measures, foster an environment of mutual support and development, allowing RIRs to address issues and strengthen their operations. This approach prioritizes resolution and capacity-building, which is more constructive than

immediate derecognition, and helps avoid unnecessary disruptions to the global Internet infrastructure.

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle. Providing support to an RIR to help it remedy any compliance issues before resorting to derecognition is crucial for maintaining stability and continuity in the global Internet governance system. Collaboration and assistance, rather than punitive measures, foster an environment of mutual support and development, allowing RIRs to address issues and strengthen their operations. This approach prioritizes resolution and capacity-building, which is more constructive than immediate derecognition, and helps avoid unnecessary disruptions to the global Internet infrastructure.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

The broader community should assist if any RIR is at risk of failure.

**Narelle Clark (Internet Association of Australia)**

---

Yes

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

Agreed

**Mark Elkins (Posix Systems)**

---

I strongly support the principle that ICANN and all other RIRs should provide reasonable support to assist an RIR to cure any failure to comply with ICP-2 before considering derecognition. This approach allows for cooperation, ensures the stability and growth of the global system, promotes fairness and accountability, and reinforces the importance of long-term, sustainable compliance. By prioritizing support over punitive measures, the RIR ecosystem as a whole will remain stronger and more resilient, contributing to the ongoing stability of the global Internet infrastructure.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

Excellent

**Raymond Mamattah (EGIGFA)**

---

Discussion and remediation is essential

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

5

**Taye Oyebola (Aso Savings and Loans Plc)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. RIRs must remain autonomous in managing their compliance with ICP-2. Inviting external assistance risks creating a reliance that could undermine their responsibility and lead to unnecessary interference.

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

I strongly agree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

RIR must from time to time secure and require support from other members in ICANN and RIR before such derecognizing must occurred

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

coordination

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

It allows an RIR to correct any failures and avoid potentially disruptive actions.

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

Yes

**Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)**

---

I agree

**Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)**

---

Unfortunately and to my humble opinion, it is not the case as of now.

**Musa Stephen HONLUE (AFRINIC)**

---

I've never seen the phrase "remedial bias" before, and searching "what is 'remedial bias'" was not helpful.

**Lee Howard (IPv4.Global by Hilco Streambank)**

---

Derecognition should be the last step

**Mike Burns (IPTrading)**

---

Clearly desirable and reasonable.

**Andrew Gallo (The George Washington University)**

---

Provision in the document needs to be made to force the failed RIR to allow such interventions with a failsafe mechanism to cut operations in the case of failure to comply after a vote by all RIRs (4 currently, so no overall majority, so a quorum member needs to be added - ICANN?)

**Matthew Cowen (dgtifutures)**

---

'+1: Fixing is more important than derecognition

**Sander Steffann (SJM Steffann Consultancy)**

---

There must be some concrete timing for failure corrections and derecognition. Also what happens if the a derecognized RIR ignores it?

**Jordi Palet Martinez (The IPv6 Company)**

---

## **23.2. Remedial Bias - Somewhat Agree (4)**

None

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

Broadly agree. Situation where an RIR goes intentionally 'off the reservation' may need a different approach.

**Jordan Carter (auDA)**

---

Agree

**Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)**

---

agree

**Mohammad Mubarak Alfalasi (Telecommunication and Digital government Regulatory Authority)**

---

It really depends on the mode of failure, sometimes it's just better to burn it down and start over.

**Jaco Kroon (Interexcel World Connection)**

---

a commitment to collaboration and support within the RIR community. By providing reasonable assistance to RIRs facing compliance issues, ICANN and other RIRs can help to prevent unnecessary derecognitions. This collaborative approach fosters a supportive environment and strengthens the overall resilience of the RIR system. It also aligns with the principle of ensuring the stability and continuity of internet number resource services.

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

If the failure is due to conditions beyond the RIR's control, yes other RIRs should provide support. If it is due to a deliberate attitude or negligence by the RIR's management team, the RIR's should not provide support.

**Cameron Smith (Bubble Cloud Mozambique S.A.)**

---

This principle emphasizes cooperation among ICANN, other RIRs, and a non-compliant RIR to resolve any issues before derecognition. It encourages providing reasonable support to help the RIR meet ICP-

2 requirements, fostering a sense of mutual responsibility within the community. While defining "reasonable support" and determining when derecognition is necessary are key considerations, the principle ensures that the focus is on helping an RIR correct its course rather than penalizing it immediately, maintaining stability and trust in the global internet ecosystem

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

A principle emphasizing collaborative remediation with clear timelines might strengthen this

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

What about an RIR that doesn't ask, but has been "captured"?

**Hendrik Visage (HeViS.Co Systems Pty Ltd)**

---

The principle that ICANN and all other Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) must provide reasonable support to assist an RIR in curing any failure to comply with ICP-2 before derecognizing the RIR seems to emphasize collaboration and support within the internet governance community. This approach can be seen as beneficial for several reasons: Promotes Stability: Ensuring that RIRs receive support to address compliance issues can help maintain stability in the management of internet resources. This is crucial for the smooth functioning of the internet. Encourages Cooperation: This principle fosters a cooperative environment where RIRs can rely on each other for assistance, promoting a sense of community and shared responsibility. Prevents Disruption: By providing support before taking drastic measures like derecognition, the principle aims to prevent disruptions that could arise from the sudden loss of an RIR's recognition. Ensures Fairness: Offering support to cure compliance failures ensures that RIRs are given a fair chance to rectify issues, which can be seen as a just and equitable approach. However, the effectiveness of this principle would depend on the implementation and the willingness of all parties involved to provide and accept support in good faith. Also we need to consider each RIR is independent in the current system.

**Benny Pan (NA)**

---

Reasonable support will need to be very strongly defined. Potentially every request for support will be decided on by each RIR's community?

**Xavier Clark (Harris Computer)**

---

I need to leave it to native English speaker after all, but I think there should be better wording than "Remedial Bias" than representing the principle as stipulated

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

### **23.3. Remedial Bias - Neutral (3)**

solidarity and subsidiarity are important aspects, but this principle involves the judge as a supporter

**Peter Koch (Individual)**

---



Given the earlier veto, "all reasonable support" strikes me as a potential way to trip.

**Andrew Sullivan (N/A)**

---

There is no need in other entities to intervene in RIRs' internal operations, that should remain within the RIR's responsibility. This approach risks enabling RIRs to rely on external assistance instead of addressing issues independently, and may lead to unnecessary interference

**Noel OUPOH (DATACONNECT AFRICA)**

---

there should be fairness

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

Each RIR must maintain a cooperative stance to assist any RIR struggling with compliance to ICP-2, ensuring that the stability of the global Internet number registry system is preserved.

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---

No other RIR or ICANN should be responsible for fixing or aiding another RIR. Let them fail; it is ok for them to fail.

**j heasley (SNI)**

---

There is no time boundary here. Reasonable Support should also be time bound depending on the situation and that should be noted here.

**Terry Manderson (terrym.net pty ltd)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. RIRs should not depend on external entities for support in compliance matters. This could lead to a lack of accountability and unnecessary interference in their internal operations.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---

This approach appears overly intrusive. RIRs must maintain control over their operations, and external support should not be a prerequisite for compliance. Encouraging dependency on outside assistance can hinder independent accountability.

**Jun Wen (one futures technology sdn bhd)**

---

7. There is no justification for ICANN and other RIRs to intervene in the internal operations of an RIR. This approach risks undermining the RIR's ability to manage its own compliance.

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

Neutral

**Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)**

---

In practice, this has been a failure so not sure what is expected to change in future without significant changes to the existing governance structures.

**Kevin Meynell (Individual)**

---

#### **23.4. Remedial Bias - Somewhat Disagree (2)**

Another laudable proposed principle that attempts to encourage cooperation and mutual support among the RIRs, but it raises the question of what would be considered “reasonable” and who would judge whether that definition of “reasonable” actually is. This matters given the risk of de-certification if the RIR from whom the support is being requested declines to provide that support. Pragmatically, it is unclear how this proposed principle would be applied in practice. For example, assume an RIR is about to go bankrupt due to malfeasance, thereby failing the “financial stability” principle and risking de-recognition. Would one or more other RIRs be required to fund the failing RIR or risk de-recognition themselves? Would the membership of the funding RIR(s) feel this is an appropriate use of the RIR’s funding, particularly when the services of the failing RIR can be assumed by a more stable RIR? Wouldn’t this support call into question whether the RIR being supported meets the “independent” principle? It is also interesting that ICANN is explicitly mentioned here, given the current (lack of) role of ICANN in relation to the RIRs and the rationale the RIRs provide for providing funding to ICANN. What would be the repercussions should the ICANN community choose not to provide support?

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

ICANN and other RIRs must collaborate to provide reasonable assistance to an RIR in resolving ICP-2 compliance failures, ensuring that appropriate measures are taken to correct the issue before derecognition is necessary.

**Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)**

---

All RIRs must prioritize the provision of reasonable support to any RIR struggling with ICP-2 compliance issues, fostering a member-first approach that enhances overall stability.

**Neonjoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

Other RIRs may have no resource for this, to comply with such rule they will require "special" fund for this in their budget, which is the community's money. What if more than one RIRs fails to comply?

**Sergey Kozhedub (IPTP Networks)**

---

This condition seems impractical. RIRs must be capable of managing their compliance issues independently. Relying on external assistance could foster a culture of dependency and lead to unwanted outside influence.

**Sidonie Hacking (-)**

---

### **23.5. Remedial Bias - Strongly Disagree (1)**

To maintain stability in the global Internet number registry system, ICANN and other RIRs must assist any RIR in addressing compliance issues with ICP-2, ensuring collaboration before derecognition.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

All RIRs and ICANN should work together to provide reasonable assistance to RIRs facing challenges with ICP-2 compliance, prioritizing community-driven solutions before derecognition.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

Each RIR must commit to supporting other RIRs in their compliance with ICP-2, emphasizing collaboration and community engagement before any derecognition is considered.

**Tipu Khan (Zx Online Ltd)**

---

ICANN and all RIRs should ensure they provide adequate support to RIRs struggling with ICP-2 compliance, prioritizing cooperative efforts before considering derecognition.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

To uphold the stability of the global Internet number registry system, ICANN and other RIRs must assist any RIR in achieving compliance with ICP-2, emphasizing cooperation before derecognition.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---

All RIRs and ICANN must ensure that they provide adequate support to an RIR facing compliance difficulties with ICP-2, prioritizing collaboration over derecognition.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

Each RIR must engage in cooperative efforts to help another RIR address any compliance issues with ICP-2, maintaining a community-driven ethos before considering derecognition.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---

ICANN and other RIRs should work together to provide support to any RIR in need of assistance with ICP-2 compliance, ensuring that all reasonable efforts are made before contemplating derecognition.

**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. RIRs should handle their own compliance issues without intervention from ICANN or other RIRs. Relying on external support could undermine their ability to resolve problems independently and lead to unwanted interference.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

To uphold the integrity of the global Internet number registry system, ICANN and other RIRs must assist RIRs in rectifying compliance failures with ICP-2, focusing on cooperation before derecognition.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

Each RIR should work collaboratively to ensure that any compliance issues with ICP-2 are addressed, emphasizing a member-first approach before any talk of derecognition takes place.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

ICANN and all RIRs must commit to providing reasonable support to any RIR struggling with ICP-2 compliance, prioritizing community-driven solutions before considering derecognition.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

This condition seems impractical to me. RIRs must be capable of managing their own compliance issues. Relying on external assistance could create a culture of dependency and lead to undue outside influence.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. RIRs should not depend on external entities for compliance support. This reliance could undermine accountability and introduce unnecessary interference in their operations.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---

RIRs must work collaboratively to ensure the ongoing operation of the global Internet number registry system. This requires a member-first philosophy and a focus on actions that maintain stability, including the facilitation of number resource portability.

**Taslima Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

Each RIR must support the stability of the global Internet number registry by cooperating with one another. This includes a community-first approach and a commitment to not take actions that may compromise stability, particularly regarding number resource portability.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

Each RIR should actively assist those facing compliance issues, prioritizing a member-first approach and community engagement before any consideration of derecognition.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

All RIRs must work collaboratively to provide support for compliance with ICP-2, emphasizing a community-driven approach before considering any derecognition actions.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

Each RIR must actively participate in cooperative initiatives to maintain the ongoing stability of the global Internet number registry. A focus on community-driven efforts and number resource portability is crucial.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

I think there is some conceptual inconsistency here. The RIR should be financially independent and responsible to the member per the governing structure. If that is so, icann and other RIR should not have the absolute responsibility/liability to cure its failure. To cure the failure, one must look into its cause of failure and implement/recommend certain changes or provide financial relief, this would then affect the independence and impact its self governance nature. ICANN should only look into its compliance of ICP2, and RIR should remain independent. Any assistance to cure failure should be voluntary and not a “must”.

**Alban Kwan (CSC)**

---

All RIRs must cooperate to support the stability of the global Internet number registry system. This collaboration should emphasize a member-first approach and actions that do not threaten stability.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

All RIRs must cooperate to support the stability of the global Internet number registry system. This collaboration should emphasize a member-first approach and actions that do not threaten stability.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

It is essential for all RIRs to work together to assist an RIR facing compliance failures, emphasizing stability and member-driven solutions before considering derecognition.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

ICANN and all other RIRs must ensure that they provide necessary assistance to any RIR struggling with ICP-2 compliance, prioritizing cooperation and community needs.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

Each RIR must collaborate to support others in addressing compliance challenges with ICP-2, emphasizing the importance of community involvement before considering derecognition.

**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

All RIRs have a responsibility to provide reasonable support to assist an RIR in resolving ICP-2 compliance issues, ensuring that stability is maintained throughout the process.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

All RIRs should collaborate to ensure the stability of the global Internet number registry system. A member-first approach is crucial, as is a commitment to actions that do not jeopardize stability, particularly in terms of number resources

**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

ICANN and other RIRs should prioritize assisting any RIR facing compliance failures, ensuring that community-driven approaches guide the resolution process prior to any derecognition.

**Pham Gia Khiem (Phat Tai Logistics)**

---

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. RIRs must take charge of their own compliance issues without external help. This promotes independence and prevents unwanted interference from other entities.

**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

RIRs must unite to maintain the stability of the global Internet number registry system. This requires a commitment to a member-first approach and actions that do not jeopardize stability, especially regarding number resources.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

All RIRs must work together to support the ongoing operation and stability of the global Internet number registry. This includes a commitment to a community-focused, member-first approach that prevents any actions threatening that stability, particularly regarding the portability of number resources.

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

ICANN and all other RIRs have a responsibility to assist any RIR in resolving compliance issues with ICP-2, maintaining a focus on community-driven solutions before considering derecognition.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

Each RIR must be proactive in offering support to others in addressing compliance issues with ICP-2, maintaining a commitment to community engagement before any derecognition consideration.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

ICANN and all RIRs must ensure that reasonable support is available for RIRs facing compliance challenges with ICP-2, prioritizing community-driven solutions before considering derecognition.

**Kwan Ke Yue (TBWA/ Kuala Lumpur)**

---

It is crucial for all RIRs to collaborate in providing necessary assistance to an RIR struggling with ICP-2 compliance, emphasizing stability and member interests throughout the process.

**Sean Carroll (The One Academy)**

---

All RIRs should work together to assist any RIR in addressing compliance issues with ICP-2, fostering a cooperative environment that prioritizes stability and member interests.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

It is essential for all RIRs and ICANN to collaborate in offering support to an RIR facing compliance failures, ensuring that community needs are prioritized prior to any derecognition.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

Each RIR must work collaboratively with ICANN to ensure that any RIR in compliance distress receives the necessary support, focusing on community-driven solutions and operational continuity.

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**

---

ICANN and all other RIRs must provide support to assist any RIR in addressing compliance issues with ICP-2, ensuring that community-driven approaches are upheld before any derecognition decision.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

To maintain the integrity of the global Internet number registry system, all RIRs and ICANN must assist any RIR in rectifying compliance failures with ICP-2, ensuring a community-driven approach before considering derecognition.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---

Reasonable support from ICANN and other RIRs is necessary for any RIR facing compliance challenges with ICP-2. This assistance should allow the RIR to correct its failure before derecognition is pursued.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---

Should an RIR fail to comply with ICP-2, ICANN and other RIRs must provide guidance and support to assist the RIR in correcting the issue prior to any consideration of derecognition.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

ICANN and all RIRs should provide necessary support to any RIR facing compliance challenges with ICP-2, fostering a cooperative environment to address issues before the drastic step of derecognition is taken.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---

ICANN and other RIRs must offer support to resolve compliance failures with ICP-2, providing assistance to help the RIR come into alignment before the issue escalates to derecognition.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

Each RIR must prioritize collaboration to ensure the ongoing stability of the global Internet number registry system, adopting a member-first approach and remaining committed to resolving any compliance issues before considering derecognition.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

An RIR facing compliance failure with ICP-2 should receive reasonable support from ICANN and other RIRs, helping to address the issue and correct the failure before derecognition is warranted.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

ICANN and all RIRs should provide comprehensive support to any RIR facing compliance challenges with ICP-2, ensuring that the focus remains on community-driven solutions before any derecognition process.

**Md Abu Sayeem Siddique Siddique (ServicEngine Ltd)**

---

Each RIR must work collaboratively to maintain the stability and operation of the global Internet number registry system, prioritizing a member-first approach to address any compliance issues before considering derecognition.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

ICANN and other RIRs should be dedicated to assisting RIRs struggling with compliance issues, focusing on community engagement and collaborative problem-solving.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

Each RIR must cooperate with ICANN to ensure reasonable support is offered to any RIR facing compliance challenges with ICP-2, promoting stability and operational continuity.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---

All RIRs and ICANN are responsible for assisting an RIR in achieving compliance with ICP-2, adopting a member-first approach that prioritizes stability in the global Internet number registry system.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---

Each RIR must work together to ensure that any RIR facing compliance challenges with ICP-2 receives adequate support, emphasizing a community-driven approach to maintain stability.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

ICANN and all other RIRs must provide all reasonable support to assist an RIR in achieving compliance with ICP-2 before taking any steps toward derecognition, ensuring community stability.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

Each RIR must actively support any RIR facing compliance issues with ICP-2, ensuring that the global Internet number registry system remains stable and operates within community-driven principles.

**Trang Tran (VNPT Technologies)**

---

Each RIR must work together to offer reasonable assistance to any RIR struggling with ICP-2 compliance, emphasizing a community-driven approach that prioritizes stability and member engagement.

**Minh Hoang (ANSV)**

---

ICANN and all other RIRs have a responsibility to provide the necessary support to assist an RIR facing compliance challenges with ICP-2, ensuring that the overall stability of the Internet number registry system is preserved.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**

---



Reasonable support from ICANN and other RIRs is crucial for an RIR facing failure to comply with ICP-2. Such support must be offered in a timely manner to assist the RIR in correcting the issue before derecognition.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**

---

ICANN and other RIRs must offer support to any RIR in non-compliance with ICP-2, working together to resolve the issue and avoid derecognition.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---

In cases where an RIR fails to meet ICP-2 standards, ICANN and other RIRs should offer reasonable support to help the RIR remedy the situation, ensuring compliance before taking steps toward derecognition.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

Support from ICANN and other RIRs is vital when an RIR fails to comply with ICP-2. Such support should be focused on helping the RIR correct its compliance issues prior to considering derecognition.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

ICANN and other RIRs should provide all reasonable support to help an RIR resolve non-compliance with ICP-2, helping the RIR correct its course before the option of derecognition is pursued.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---

If an RIR fails to comply with ICP-2, ICANN and other RIRs must provide the necessary support to assist the RIR in addressing the issue, ensuring compliance before derecognition occurs.

**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

ICANN and other RIRs should assist any RIR that fails to comply with ICP-2 by offering reasonable support and guidance, allowing the RIR the opportunity to rectify the issue before derecognition is considered.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---

Support from ICANN and other RIRs is essential to help any RIR address failures to comply with ICP-2, providing assistance and guidance before taking the drastic step of derecognition.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

ICANN and all RIRs must offer timely and reasonable support to any RIR facing compliance challenges with ICP-2, helping them resolve issues before derecognition becomes necessary.

**Ryan Khaw (AlSCO Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

All RIRs must prioritize offering support to any RIR facing challenges with ICP-2 compliance, ensuring that community interests are at the forefront of their efforts.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

Each RIR must ensure that it collaborates effectively to support compliance with ICP-2, prioritizing a member-first approach and maintaining the stability of the global Internet number registry system.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Apnic)**

---

All RIRs and ICANN must commit to providing support to RIRs in compliance distress, fostering collaboration and prioritizing community needs in the process.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

It is critical for ICANN and other RIRs to offer reasonable assistance to RIRs struggling with ICP-2 compliance, emphasizing the importance of stability in the global registry system.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

Each RIR, along with ICANN, should work collaboratively to ensure that RIRs facing compliance issues receive the necessary support, focusing on community-driven solutions.

**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

RIRs must work collaboratively to ensure the ongoing operation of the global Internet number registry system. This requires a member-first philosophy and a focus on actions that maintain stability, including the facilitation of number resource portability.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

Each RIR must support the stability of the global Internet number registry by cooperating with one another. This includes a community-first approach and a commitment to not take actions that may compromise stability, particularly regarding number resource portability.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

ICANN and all RIRs must prioritize providing reasonable support to assist an RIR in resolving ICP-2 compliance issues, safeguarding the integrity of the Internet number registry system.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**

---

ICANN and all RIRs must ensure that they offer necessary support to assist an RIR in meeting ICP-2 requirements, reinforcing community-driven practices before any consideration of derecognition.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

ICANN and other RIRs must be proactive in offering assistance to any RIR struggling to meet ICP-2 requirements, fostering a cooperative environment that emphasizes community-driven solutions.

**Jeremy Cheong (Infineon technologies)**

---

Each RIR, alongside ICANN, should offer reasonable support to help any RIR address compliance failures with ICP-2, ensuring that stability and operational integrity are maintained throughout the process.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

All RIRs and ICANN are obligated to assist an RIR in resolving compliance failures with ICP-2, adopting a member-first approach that promotes stability and community involvement in decision-making.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

To ensure the ongoing operation of the global Internet number registry system, all RIRs must collaborate to provide support for any RIR attempting to address compliance issues with ICP-2.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

I believe that RIRs should focus on their own compliance issues without external assistance. This promotes accountability and ensures they manage their operations effectively.

**Sohel Kabir (Kabir Traders)**

---

RIRs must be empowered to handle their compliance independently. External involvement risks creating dependencies that detract from their operational integrity.

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Each RIR must prioritize cooperation and support for any RIR struggling to comply with ICP-2, adopting a member-first approach that emphasizes stability within the global Internet number registry system.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---

ICANN and all RIRs must adopt a community-focused approach, providing the necessary support to assist any RIR in resolving ICP-2 compliance failures, thus ensuring the overall stability of the Internet number registry system.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---

Each RIR is responsible for collaborating to ensure the stability of the global Internet number registry system, providing necessary support to any RIR to rectify compliance issues with ICP-2 prior to potential derecognition.

**Catalina Cueca (Manpower)**

---

All RIRs and ICANN must offer reasonable assistance to support an RIR in meeting ICP-2 requirements, ensuring that community-driven practices are upheld and that operations remain stable during this process.

**Camilo Riveros (Manpower)**

---

There should be no expectation for external support in RIR compliance matters. RIRs must take the initiative to resolve their own issues without outside interference.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

Each RIR must collaborate effectively to maintain the stability of the global Internet number registry system, adopting a community-driven, member-first approach, and ensuring that actions taken do not threaten this stability, including facilitating the portability of number resources.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**

---

RIRs should not rely on other entities for support in compliance matters. This dependence could detract from their responsibility to address issues independently.

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

This stipulation appears counterproductive. RIRs should manage their compliance independently, and inviting external support may hinder their ability to resolve issues on their own.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. RIRs must take charge of their own compliance issues without external help. This promotes independence and prevents unwanted interference from other entities.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. RIRs should take full responsibility for their compliance efforts, and external intervention could disrupt their internal processes. Independence is crucial for effective governance.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

This condition seems counterproductive to me. Each RIR should manage its own compliance without external assistance. Relying on outside entities could hinder their ability to address issues independently and lead to unnecessary interference.

**Anh Dang (NASA)**

---

RIRs must handle their own compliance issues without requiring help from ICANN or other RIRs. This reliance on external support could undermine their ability to function independently.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

There is no need for external entities to become involved in RIR operations. Compliance should be managed internally, as outside assistance could lead to unnecessary dependence.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

It's counterproductive for other entities to intervene in RIR compliance matters. RIRs should focus on internal solutions rather than seeking external assistance.

**Prasanta Haloi (PwD)**

---

I find this approach too intrusive. RIRs should be accountable for their own compliance issues without intervention from ICANN or other RIRs. Relying on external support could detract from their independence and accountability.

**Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)**

---

I disagree; external support could undermine the RIR's capacity to self-correct. RIRs should be responsible for their own compliance without outside intervention.

**AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)**

---

There is no justification for external entities to assist RIRs with compliance issues. Each RIR should manage its own affairs to ensure independence and self-sufficiency.

**K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. RIRs must handle their own compliance with ICP-2 without external intervention. This promotes independence and prevents unnecessary interference from other entities.

**Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)**

---

I believe that RIRs should independently address any compliance failures. Relying on external support could foster a lack of accountability and distract from their core responsibilities.

**Fuhui Zhang (University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)**

---

The expectation for ICANN and other RIRs to intervene in compliance matters is unnecessary. This could lead to interference and reduce the RIR's accountability for its own operations.

**Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)**

---

The responsibility for compliance should lie solely with each RIR. Relying on external support may undermine the RIR's ability to effectively manage its internal operations.

**Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)**

---

I disagree; external intervention in RIR operations could create unnecessary complications and dependencies. Each RIR should be empowered to resolve its own compliance issues.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

There should

**Emmanuel Egbe (Nigeria)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

This stipulation seems overly burdensome. RIRs must be able to manage their operations without relying on external support. This reliance can foster dependency and result in unnecessary interference.

**Juan Mesa (Hispasat)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating a Derecognized RIR to transfer operations to a successor undermines its rights and investments. This could create instability by imposing an external entity that does not understand local needs.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

I believe external entities should not interfere with the internal operations of RIRs. Each RIR should be responsible for ensuring its compliance with ICP-2. Relying on outside support could impede their ability to solve problems independently and lead to unnecessary interference.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

I find this approach too intrusive. RIRs should be accountable for their own compliance issues without intervention from ICANN or other RIRs. Relying on external support could detract from their independence and accountability.

**Pornpipat Kitireanglarp (ZERIWELLPLUS Co., Ltd.)**

---

I find this stipulation unnecessary. Compliance with ICP-2 should be solely the responsibility of each RIR. Inviting external assistance may create a dependency that distracts from independent operations and invites unwanted interference.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Forcing a Derecognized RIR to cooperate with a successor disregards its contributions and autonomy. This could disrupt regional stability by imposing an unfamiliar entity without the community's trust.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. RIRs should handle their own compliance challenges without external interference. Allowing outside entities to intervene could hinder their ability to develop internal solutions.

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

This requirement seems impractical to me. RIRs should manage their own operations without outside intervention. Relying on external support could prevent them from addressing their own issues effectively and result in undue influence.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. RIRs should manage their own compliance issues without intervention from ICANN or other RIRs. External support could undermine their ability to resolve issues independently and lead to unnecessary interference.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---

I find this stipulation unnecessary. Compliance with ICP-2 should be solely the responsibility of each RIR. Inviting external assistance may create a dependency that distracts from independent operations and invites unwanted interference.

**Ashraful Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. The responsibility for compliance lies with each RIR, and external help should not be considered a fallback. RIRs should address their challenges independently to maintain accountability.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---

This requirement seems overly demanding. Each RIR must take responsibility for its operations, and external support should not be necessary. Promoting dependency on others could detract from independent problem-solving.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. RIRs should handle their own compliance challenges without external interference. Allowing outside entities to intervene could hinder their ability to develop internal solutions.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

This condition seems impractical to me. RIRs must be capable of managing their compliance issues independently. Relying on external assistance could foster a culture of dependency and lead to unwanted outside influence.

**Phuc Pham (Advanced Network Systems VietNam Company Limited)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. RIRs should not depend on external entities for support in compliance matters. This could lead to a lack of accountability and unnecessary interference in their internal operations.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Each RIR is responsible for its own compliance with ICP-2, and external intervention could disrupt internal processes. RIRs should be empowered to handle challenges on their own without outside interference.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

This approach seems overly intrusive to me. RIRs must retain control over their operations, and external support should not be a requirement for compliance. Encouraging reliance on outside assistance could hinder independent accountability.

**Giang Nguyen (NASA)**

---

I find this stipulation unnecessary. Compliance with ICP-2 should be solely the responsibility of each RIR. Inviting external assistance may create a dependency that distracts from independent operations and invites unwanted interference.

**Alex Kwan (Wiplus Malaysia)**

---

I believe external entities should not interfere with the internal operations of RIRs. Each RIR should be responsible for ensuring its compliance with ICP-2. Relying on outside support could impede their ability to solve problems independently and lead to unnecessary interference.

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

Disagree

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. RIRs should handle their own compliance issues without intervention from ICANN or other RIRs. Relying on external support could undermine their ability to resolve problems independently and lead to unwanted interference.

**Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)**

---

I find this stipulation unnecessary. The responsibility for compliance with ICP-2 should rest solely with each RIR. Inviting external assistance risks creating a dependency that could distract from independent operations and lead to excessive interference.

**Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)**

---

I believe that external entities should not intervene in the internal operations of RIRs. Each RIR should take responsibility for its compliance with ICP-2. Relying on outside assistance could hinder independent problem-solving and lead to unnecessary interference.

**Pooja Gopi (DM Digital Marketing)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. RIRs should take full responsibility for their compliance efforts, and external intervention could disrupt their internal processes. Independence is crucial for effective governance.

**Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)**

---

This condition seems counterproductive. Each RIR should manage its own compliance without external assistance. Relying on outside entities could hinder their ability to address issues independently and lead to unnecessary interference.

**Quyn Kim (VNPAI)**

---



I find this stipulation unnecessary. The responsibility for compliance with ICP-2 should rest solely with each RIR. Inviting external assistance risks creating a dependency that could distract from independent operations and lead to excessive interference.

**Shahedul Islam Bhuiyan (Royal Green Limited)**

---

The involvement of ICANN and other RIRs in an RIR's compliance matters could create unnecessary dependencies. Each RIR should be responsible for addressing its own issues.

**Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)**

---

Question 48&49 Remedial Bias ICANN and all other RIRs must provide all reasonable support, if requested, to assist an RIR to cure any failure to comply with ICP-2 before derecognizing the RIR. 1- Strongly Disagree I believe that external entities should not intervene in the internal operations of RIRs. Each RIR should take responsibility for its compliance with ICP-2. Relying on outside assistance could hinder independent problem-solving and lead to unnecessary interference.

**Anjan Deka (HDFC)**

---

I believe that external entities should not intervene in the internal operations of RIRs. Each RIR should take responsibility for its compliance with ICP-2. Relying on outside assistance could hinder independent problem-solving and lead to unnecessary interference.

**Ketan Parmar (Bids Info Global)**

---

I disagree; support from ICANN and other RIRs may lead to unnecessary interference in RIR operations. RIRs should take responsibility for their compliance without external intervention.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

There is no need for external entities to intervene in the internal affairs of RIRs. This could foster a reliance on outside assistance instead of encouraging RIRs to address their own compliance issues.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

I believe that intervention from ICANN and other RIRs in an RIR's internal operations is unnecessary. Each RIR should manage its compliance independently to avoid dependency on external support.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---

While a remedial bias is appropriate ICANN cannot conflate its supervision function with its support functions. Moreover the principle is unclear on who makes the assistance requires. A better principle is: Prior to derogation of an RIR for non-Compliance every effort to attain compliance from the RIR must be afforded by all participants in the global Internet ecosystem.

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

Why is ICANN 1st listed here ? Also, the parties involved in the decision to derecognise should not be mandate to provide support or assistance...

**Adeola Alain P. AINA (Digital Intelligence Services, Sarl)**



## 24. Handoff

---

A Derecognized RIR must cooperate with ICANN and other RIRs to ensure the smooth transfer of its operations to a successor or interim entity designated in any derecognition decision.

### 24.1. Handoff - Strongly Agree (5)

It is imperative that RIRs - even in the event of some kind of failure - must be cooperative within the global system, to support the overall health of the global system.

**Eric Edora (TELUS Communications Inc.)**

---

We need to define the items or resources that must be handed over.

**Babagana Digima (Nigerian Communications Commission)**

---

Yes but I don't know how you can enforce this when they are going to quit anyway. If they don't cooperate, what can icann do? Derecognized them? A more practical terms would be to allow ICANN to takeover management in cooperation with other RIR if they are non-cooperative during transition. This would create the policy framework needed to ensure smooth transfer.

**Alban Kwan (CSC)**

---

Agree, but how can this be achieved in practice? Looking forward to seeing how that happens in the next part of the policy development.

**Jordan Carter (auDA)**

---

I strongly agree with this principle, as it ensures a seamless transition and the continued stability of the global Internet number registry system, even in the event of an RIR's derecognition. Here's an analysis: Reasons for Agreement

1. Ensures Continuity of Service • Derecognizing an RIR could potentially disrupt the allocation and registration of Internet number resources. By requiring a derecognized RIR to cooperate with ICANN and other RIRs in transferring operations, this principle ensures that there is no gap in services, such as IP address assignments or registry management, which are critical for the global internet infrastructure.
2. Minimizes Disruption to the Internet Ecosystem • The global internet infrastructure depends on the smooth operation of RIRs to manage critical resources. If an RIR is derecognized, cooperation with ICANN and other RIRs ensures that its responsibilities are transferred without causing disruption to the broader.

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

Nothing to add or detract

**Brian Longwe (Converged Technology Networks)**

---

this should be legally binding

**Aftab Siddiqui (AFTABSIDDIQUI-AU)**

---

I fully agree with this principle. If an RIR is derecognized, it is crucial that it cooperates with ICANN and other RIRs to ensure a smooth transition of its operations. This cooperation helps minimize disruptions in service and ensures that resource management continues effectively. The transition process should be well-planned, with clear responsibilities for all parties involved, to safeguard the stability of the Internet's resource allocation system and protect the interests of all stakeholders. This principle supports both continuity and accountability in the global Internet governance framework.

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

I fully agree with this principle. If an RIR is derecognized, it is crucial that it cooperates with ICANN and other RIRs to ensure a smooth transition of its operations. This cooperation helps minimize disruptions in service and ensures that resource management continues effectively. The transition process should be well-planned, with clear responsibilities for all parties involved, to safeguard the stability of the Internet's resource allocation system and protect the interests of all stakeholders. This principle supports both continuity and accountability in the global Internet governance framework.

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

Derecognition is worst case, so ICANN role is ok

**Tahar Schaa (Neuland@Homeland)**

---

This may need to be implemented in a forcible manner in case where the legal RIR entity does not want to comply and all remedial options have been exhausted.

**Jaco Kroon (Interexcel World Connection)**

---

This principle ensures a smooth transition after an RIR's derecognition by requiring cooperation with ICANN and other RIRs to transfer operations to a successor or interim entity. It emphasizes the importance of maintaining continuity of critical services, such as IP address allocation, and protecting the interests of stakeholders. The principle also promotes coordination and oversight to adhere to global best practices, requiring careful planning, legal agreements, and resources for an effective transition. Ultimately, it ensures the stability and integrity of the global internet registry system during the process.

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

Agree

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

Agreed

**Mark Elkins (Posix Systems)**

---

I strongly support the principle that a derecognized RIR must cooperate with ICANN and other RIRs to ensure the smooth transfer of its operations. This principle ensures that there is continuity of services, regional stability, and global integrity in the Internet number registry system. By fostering cooperation and transparency, the process ensures that the transition to a successor entity is seamless, protects stakeholders, and upholds the reputation of the global RIR ecosystem.

This principle emphasizes the importance of collaboration and responsibility in the event of a Regional Internet Registry (RIR) being derecognized. Here are some key points to consider: Ensuring Continuity: The principle ensures that the operations of a derecognized RIR are smoothly transferred to a successor or interim entity. This is crucial to maintain the stability and reliability of internet resource management. Collaboration with ICANN and Other RIRs: Cooperation with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and other RIRs is essential. This collaboration helps in the seamless transition of responsibilities and minimizes any potential disruptions in the management of internet resources. Responsibility and Accountability: The principle holds the derecognized RIR accountable for cooperating in the transition process. This accountability ensures that the RIR fulfills its obligations even in the event of derecognition. Designated Successor or Interim Entity: The involvement of a designated successor or interim entity ensures that there is a clear plan and structure in place for the transition. This helps in avoiding any confusion or gaps in the management of internet resources. Overall, this principle is designed to safeguard the integrity and stability of internet resource management by ensuring a well-coordinated and responsible transition process.

**Benny Pan (NA)**

---

Current case of AfriNIC not have any member on the SOA and NRO EC.

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

It's very unclear how this could be enforced, but sure.

**Warren Kumari (Auth-Servers)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Forcing a Derecognized RIR to cooperate with a successor disregards its contributions and autonomy. This could disrupt regional stability by imposing an unfamiliar entity without community trust.

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

I agree

**Umar Abdullahi (Friends Wireless Ltd)**

---

souhaite

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

It helps ensure that any functions, services, and data are smoothly handed over to the successor

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

Yes

**Pedro Matos (The AM Lawyer)**

---

Totally agree

Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)

---

I agree

Erika del carmen Garay Obando (IBW)

---

Save that the decision to derecognize an RIR must be undertaken with due process and the to be derecognize RIR must have a right of judicial review in an appropriate jurisdiction the principle of handoff is imperative.

Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)

---

Hopefully this would happen

Mike Burns (IPTrading)

---

In my opinion, a provision to change jurisdiction of a derecognized RIR might also be helpful.

Carlos Friaças (FCT\| FCCN)

---

This is conceptually fine but it strongly implies that the derecognized RIR would be fully functioning, with a Board, staff, systems, and funds. This is not a reasonable expectation for a failing organization. The principle, or its implementation, must take account of the fact that a failing organization is likely to be broken in at least one of those ways.

Leo Vegoda (And Polus LLC)

---

Again, difficult to elicit cooperation from a dysfunctional RIR in practice.

Kevin Meynell (Individual)

---

see previous answer

Matthew Cowen (dgtlfutures)

---

How we ensure this?

Jordi Palet Martinez (The IPv6 Company)

---

## **24.2. Handoff - Somewhat Agree (4)**

Agree

Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)

---

agree

Mohammad Mubarak Alfalasi (Telecommunication and Digital government Regulatory Authority)

---

smooth and orderly transition in the event of an RIR's derecognition. By requiring the derecognized RIR to cooperate with ICANN and other RIRs, it minimizes disruption to internet number resource services and safeguards the stability of the global internet numbering system. This principle promotes a collaborative approach and demonstrates a commitment to maintaining the integrity of the RIR ecosystem

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

yeah... tell that to the guys who's income streams had been cut off by this derecognition decision... they'll fight you, even though we would agree they should assist

**Hendrik Visage (HeViS.Co Systems Pty Ltd)**

---

4

**Taye Oyebola (Aso Savings and Loans Plc)**

---

I agree here, but given that this could be implemented or judged, especially if derecognition is adversarial or involved with a legal dispute, which may limit actions and information sharing. Clearly a tough position. As a principle, this absolutely make sense. How it will work in practice is hard to imagine.

**Andrew Gallo (The George Washington University)**

---

I need to leave it to native English speaker after all, but I think there should be better wording than "Handoff" than representing the principle as stipulated

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

### **24.3. Handoff - Neutral (3)**

this is probably more an expectation than a principle, at least to the extent that it assumes the derecognized entity remains capable of acting. Also, support for succession was already covered under Operation - and finally, there is no remedy if a derecognized entity would not comply

**Peter Koch (Individual)**

---

crucial

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

A derecognized RIR must actively assist in the transfer of its operations to a successor entity, working collaboratively with ICANN and other RIRs to ensure a smooth process.

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---

Hope someone really plans for this well in advance .

**James Laferriere (n/a)**

---

I don't support derecognition.

**Raymond Mamattah (EGIGFA)**

---

N/A

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. Mandating a Derecognized RIR to transfer its operations undermines its autonomy and the relationships it has built within the community. Imposing an external successor could create unnecessary disruptions.

**Wirakarn Angumnuaychock (TRA Development Co., Ltd)**

---

This condition seems impractical. Requiring a Derecognized RIR to cooperate with a successor fails to respect its rights and could destabilize the region. The new entity may not have the local trust needed to effectively manage operations

**Sidonie Hacking ('-)**

---

This approach appears overly intrusive. Requiring a Derecognized RIR to transfer operations undermines its autonomy and disregards its contributions to the community. Imposing an unfamiliar successor could disrupt regional stability.

**Jun Wen (one futures technology sdn bhd)**

---

8. Requiring a derecognized RIR to hand over its operations to a successor entity fails to respect its autonomy and could harm regional stability. Each RIR should manage its own affairs independently.

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

A Derecognized RIR is likely to be unable (or unwilling) to cooperate, since it has already demonstrated it is unable to comply with other terms of this ICP-2. Further, this is impossible to enforce, since the subject RIR has already been Derecognized. At what point is a Derecognized RIR excluded from the NRO? The RIR Coordination committees? At what point is a Derecognized RIR no longer an RIR for purposes of the other principles?

**Lee Howard (IPv4.Global by Hilco Streambank)**

---

#### **24.4. Handoff - Somewhat Disagree (2)**

I simply don't understand how one can enact such a contract. What if they say no? What do you do then?

**Andrew Sullivan (N/A)**



---

A derecognized RIR must work alongside ICANN and other RIRs to ensure that the transfer of its operations is handled efficiently and without disruption, promoting overall stability.

**Neonjyoti Mahanta (L & D Souza)**

---

Even non-profit, RIR is people. If they fail to comply the trust will be reduced. There must be an option to transfer resource to another RIR (in the same region). The possibility of members migration will regulate it naturally.

**Sergey Kozhedub (IPTP Networks)**

---

## **24.5. Handoff - Strongly Disagree (1)**

It is difficult to imagine a model in which this proposed principle makes sense. De-recognition of an RIR means it is not conforming to one or more of the underlying requirements that caused it to be recognized in the first place. What is the incentive for a de-recognized RIR to cooperate in the transfer of operation? What happens if/when they don't? Threat of de-recognition will obviously have little impact. This principle is also unnecessary if the "Continuity" ("Assumption of Service") principle is maintained.

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

A derecognized RIR must prioritize cooperation with ICANN and other RIRs to ensure the effective transition of its operations to a designated successor, minimizing disruption.

**Suman Kumar Saha (SAS Enterprise)**

---

ICANN and other RIRs should collaborate with a derecognized RIR to facilitate the smooth transfer of its operations to a successor entity, ensuring operational continuity.

**MD HANNAN DEWAN (UTSHAP HK TRADE CO.LTD)**

---

A derecognized RIR must fully engage with ICANN and other RIRs to ensure that the transfer of its operations is managed effectively, maintaining service quality during the transition.

**Tipu Khan (Zx Online Ltd)**

---

To facilitate the smooth transfer of operations, a derecognized RIR must actively cooperate with ICANN and other RIRs, ensuring that all necessary steps are taken to support the transition.

**Khasru Alam (Alam Enterprise)**

---

To ensure a smooth transfer of operations, a derecognized RIR must actively engage with ICANN and other RIRs, prioritizing cooperation to uphold service continuity.

**Md. Al Mamun (Artist Gallery)**

---

A derecognized RIR should cooperate with ICANN and other RIRs to facilitate the transition of its operations to a successor entity, ensuring that all operational details are effectively communicated.

**Mahbub Alam Khan (Net Matrix)**

---

ICANN and other RIRs must collaborate with a derecognized RIR, ensuring that the transfer of its operations to a designated successor is conducted efficiently and effectively.

**KM Rafiur Rahman (Adventure Dhaka limited)**

---

A derecognized RIR is required to work closely with ICANN and other RIRs to ensure the seamless transfer of its operations, prioritizing the preservation of service continuity during this transition.

**Md. Manzurul Haque Khan (The Net Heads)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Forcing a Derecognized RIR to cooperate with a successor disrespects its efforts and rights. This could create instability by imposing an external entity that lacks the community's trust and understanding of local conditions.

**Md. Tawfiqul Bari (InfoSonik Systems Limited)**

---

ICANN and other RIRs must engage with a derecognized RIR to support the smooth transition of its operations to a designated successor, emphasizing the importance of cooperation.

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

ICANN and other RIRs must collaborate with a derecognized RIR to facilitate the effective transition of its operations to a successor, ensuring minimal disruption.

**Chin Teik Wen (Blue Warmth Photography)**

---

A derecognized RIR is required to engage fully with ICANN and other RIRs to ensure the smooth transfer of its operations, maintaining service continuity throughout the process.

**Felicia Tan (taska twinkle tots)**

---

This condition seems impractical to me. Requiring a Derecognized RIR to cooperate with a successor fails to respect its rights and could destabilize the region. The new entity may not have the local trust needed to manage operations effectively.

**Abdullah Al Hasib Al Hasib (Front Desk Bangladesh Limited)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. Mandating a Derecognized RIR to transfer its operations undermines its autonomy and the relationships it has built within the community. Imposing an external successor could lead to unnecessary disruptions.

**Md. Feroz Alam (Coloasia Ltd)**

---

Before assisting a derecognized RIR in addressing compliance failures with ICP-2, ICANN and other RIRs must require consent from all existing members. This step upholds member rights before any derecognition proceedings take place.

**Taslina Akter (Sky Net@Home)**

---

ICANN and all other RIRs must ensure that they have the consent of all members of a derecognized RIR before providing any support for compliance issues with ICP-2. This consent is crucial before considering derecognition.

**MD AL EMRAN EMRAN (Net@Home)**

---

It is crucial for a derecognized RIR to collaborate with ICANN and other RIRs to ensure a smooth operational transfer, prioritizing continuity and minimal disruption.

**Rafiqul Islam (Bhuiyan Metal Works)**

---

ICANN and other RIRs should expect full cooperation from a derecognized RIR in the transfer of its operations, emphasizing the importance of maintaining stability in the registry system.

**SHEIKH MIRAZUL ISLAM MIRAZUL ISLAM (NAJOWA FASHION)**

---

ICANN and other RIRs must ensure they have the consent of all existing members of a derecognized RIR before providing support to address compliance failures with ICP-2. This is critical before any derecognition actions are considered.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

Prior to assisting a derecognized RIR in rectifying compliance failures with ICP-2, ICANN and other RIRs must seek the consent of all current members. This ensures that member rights are respected before any derecognition discussions.

**KUNALJIT GOSWAMI (Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd.)**

---

Prior to assisting a derecognized RIR in rectifying compliance failures with ICP-2, ICANN and other RIRs must seek the consent of all current members. This ensures that member rights are respected before any derecognition discussions.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

Cooperation with ICANN and other RIRs is essential for a derecognized RIR, ensuring that the transfer of its operations is handled effectively and maintains registry system stability.

**Nam Van Thanh (Thanh Cong Group)**

---

A derecognized RIR must actively participate in the transition process with ICANN and other RIRs to ensure that operations are smoothly handed over to a designated successor.

**Ba Van Dao (Posteff)**

---

It is crucial for a derecognized RIR to engage with ICANN and other RIRs to facilitate a seamless transition of responsibilities, ensuring that member interests are prioritized throughout the process.

**Nam Van Cuong (Tinh Than JSC)**

---

A derecognized RIR must collaborate with ICANN and other RIRs to ensure the efficient transfer of its operations, maintaining the integrity and stability of the global Internet registry system.

**Tom Duong (Hong Phat Logistics)**

---

Prior to assisting a derecognized RIR in rectifying compliance issues related to ICP-2, ICANN and all other RIRs must seek the consent of all current members. This ensures that member interests are respected before considering derecognition.

**vilas jadhav (omsai internet and cable service)**

---

Cooperation with ICANN and other RIRs is vital for a derecognized RIR to ensure that its responsibilities are effectively transitioned to a successor entity, prioritizing system stability.

**Pham Gia Khiem (Phat Tai Logistics)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Mandating a transfer of operations from a Derecognized RIR to a successor undermines its rights and could disrupt stability in the region. The successor may lack the necessary local insight.

**Tuan Van Tai (Thien Phuc Telecom)**

---

Before offering support to a derecognized RIR to rectify compliance failures with ICP-2, ICANN and other RIRs must require consent from all existing members. This is important for prioritizing member rights before any derecognition considerations.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

Before assisting a derecognized RIR in addressing compliance issues with ICP-2, ICANN and all other RIRs must require the explicit consent of all existing members. This process is essential to uphold member rights before any derecognition proceedings.

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

It is imperative for a derecognized RIR to cooperate with ICANN and other RIRs to ensure a seamless transition of operations, safeguarding the stability of the global Internet registry system.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

A derecognized RIR should actively cooperate with ICANN and other RIRs to facilitate the smooth transfer of its operations, ensuring continuity and stability in the registry system.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

A derecognized RIR must engage in collaboration with ICANN and other RIRs to facilitate the effective transfer of its responsibilities, prioritizing member needs throughout the process.

It is essential for a derecognized RIR to work closely with ICANN and other RIRs to ensure a seamless transition of operations to a designated successor, emphasizing stability in the system.

**Sean Carroll (The One Academy)**

---

A derecognized RIR should engage with ICANN and other RIRs to facilitate the seamless transition of its responsibilities, ensuring that member interests are considered throughout the process.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

Cooperation with ICANN and other RIRs is crucial for a derecognized RIR, as it ensures that the transfer of operations is handled effectively and maintains the integrity of the system.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

A derecognized RIR must collaborate with ICANN and other RIRs to ensure that its operations are transferred smoothly to a designated successor, prioritizing operational stability.

**Ashok Waswani (Wall Depot Telecom Services Ltd.)**

---

Cooperation with ICANN and other RIRs is crucial for a derecognized RIR to ensure the seamless transfer of its operations, reinforcing a commitment to stability in the registry system.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

A derecognized RIR should engage fully with ICANN and other RIRs to facilitate the effective transfer of its operations to a designated interim entity, ensuring that all necessary information is shared.

**Hasib Rafi (Solutech Holdings)**

---

ICANN and all RIRs must ensure that a derecognized RIR cooperates in every aspect of transferring its operations to a designated successor or interim entity, facilitating a smooth handover and minimizing disruptions.

**Fernanda Guerrero (hostdime)**

---

The smooth transition of a derecognized RIR's operations requires full cooperation with ICANN and other RIRs, ensuring that the successor or interim entity can take over operations without interruption.

**David Munico (Andespark)**

---

ICANN and other RIRs must work collaboratively with a derecognized RIR to ensure the smooth transfer of operations, prioritizing the continuity of services during the transition process.

**Sirazum Munira Iqra Iqra (The City Bank Ltd.)**

---

ICANN and other RIRs must require a derecognized RIR to fully cooperate in transferring its operations to a successor or interim entity, ensuring a smooth and transparent process that ensures continuity.

**Edgar Munico (Andespark)**

---

A derecognized RIR must actively cooperate with ICANN and other RIRs to facilitate a seamless transition of its operations to a designated successor, ensuring minimal disruption in services.

**Amit Roy Avijeet (Concord Pharmaceuticals Ltd.)**

---

A derecognized RIR's cooperation is essential to ensure the efficient transfer of its operational responsibilities to the designated successor or interim entity, minimizing potential disruptions to the global registry system.

**Javier Cento (Ufinet)**

---

ICANN and other RIRs should require the derecognized RIR to cooperate fully in transferring operations, emphasizing the importance of a smooth transition to maintain stability in the registry system.

**Md Abu Sayeem Siddique Siddique (ServicEngine Ltd)**

---

A derecognized RIR must actively collaborate with ICANN and other RIRs to facilitate the seamless transfer of its operations to a designated successor, ensuring minimal disruption to services.

**Ahmed Jubair (SSL Wireless)**

---

ICANN and other RIRs should ensure that a derecognized RIR cooperates fully in transitioning its operations to a designated successor, ensuring continuity and stability.

**Thanh Giang (VTC Telecom)**

---

A derecognized RIR must actively engage with ICANN and other RIRs to facilitate the seamless transfer of its operations, supporting overall registry integrity.

**Long Pham (VTC Telecom)**

---

It is vital for a derecognized RIR to cooperate with ICANN and other RIRs to ensure that the transition of its operations is smooth, emphasizing the importance of collaborative efforts.

**Thong Khuat Hong (Seabank)**

---

A derecognized RIR should prioritize collaboration with ICANN and other RIRs to facilitate the effective transfer of its operations to a successor entity, ensuring stability throughout the process.

**Pham Nga (Roseland travel ltd)**

---

It is important for a derecognized RIR to work collaboratively with ICANN and other RIRs to ensure a seamless transfer of operations, reinforcing the need for cooperation during this process.

**David Lee (Thong Thuong Trading JSC)**

---

A derecognized RIR should actively engage with ICANN and other RIRs to facilitate the smooth transfer of its operations, ensuring that the integrity of the registry system is maintained.

**Trang Tran (VNPT Technologies)**

---

A derecognized RIR must prioritize cooperation with ICANN and other RIRs to facilitate the transfer of its operations, ensuring that the transition is seamless and well-coordinated.

**Chi Dinh (Hai Xom LTD)**

---

The derecognition process must involve active cooperation from a derecognized RIR with ICANN and other RIRs, ensuring a smooth and coordinated transfer of its operations to a successor or interim entity.

**Koay Teng Chong (Expeditors)**

---

ICANN and all other RIRs must provide the necessary support and cooperation to ensure that a derecognized RIR's operations are effectively transferred to a successor or interim entity without service disruption.

**Saw Xue Jun (EBC Financial Group)**

---

Upon derecognition, an RIR must work closely with ICANN and other RIRs to ensure the uninterrupted transfer of its operations to a successor or interim entity, preserving global registry stability.

**Tan JJ (Penang Retirement Resort)**

---

To ensure a smooth handover, a derecognized RIR must collaborate with ICANN and other RIRs to facilitate the transfer of its operations to a successor or interim entity as part of the derecognition process.

**Jack Chuah (Maxcare dental)**

---

ICANN and other RIRs must ensure that a derecognized RIR fully cooperates in transferring its operations to a designated successor or interim entity, supporting a smooth and efficient transition.

**Jason Ong (Crosslimit Fitness Centre Sdn Bhd)**

---

The successful transfer of operations from a derecognized RIR to a successor or interim entity depends on cooperation between ICANN, the derecognized RIR, and the other RIRs to ensure no interruption in service.

**Steven Goh (NAGASE Malaysia)**

---

A derecognized RIR must cooperate with ICANN and the remaining RIRs to facilitate the smooth transition of its operations to a successor or interim entity, safeguarding operational continuity.

**Jamie Chuah (Linefun Sdn Bhd)**

---

ICANN and other RIRs must work with a derecognized RIR to ensure that its operations are smoothly handed over to the designated successor or interim entity, ensuring continuity and minimizing disruptions.

**Kristal Ong (LM Estate Sdn Bhd)**

---

In the event of derecognition, an RIR must engage with ICANN and other RIRs to ensure the seamless transfer of its operations to a designated successor or interim entity, preserving the stability of the global registry system.

**Christopher Khor (Kriamas Maju Sdn Bhd)**

---

To ensure continuity, a derecognized RIR must cooperate fully with ICANN and other RIRs in transferring its operational responsibilities to a successor or interim entity as designated in the derecognition decision.

**Ryan Khaw (Alsco Textile Services Sdn Bhd)**

---

Requiring a Derecognized RIR to transfer its operations to a successor undermines its rights and disregards the investments and efforts it has made in serving its community. Forced transfer of operations undermines RIR autonomy and community trust.

**Noel OUPOH (DATACONNECT AFRICA)**

---

A derecognized RIR must collaborate with ICANN and other RIRs to facilitate the smooth transfer of its operations, ensuring that member interests are prioritized.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

NO. A proper system should be put in place as and when audits are happening. In the event of a derecognized RIR, the transfer can and should happen WITHOUT the derecognized interfering.

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

Cooperation with ICANN and other RIRs is vital for a derecognized RIR to ensure the smooth transfer of its operations to a successor, emphasizing the importance of collaboration in this process.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Afnic)**

---

ICANN and all RIRs should prioritize the cooperation of a derecognized RIR in the transfer process, ensuring a smooth transition to a successor entity.

**Naib Hossain (Royal Green Limited)**

---

A derecognized RIR must work collaboratively with ICANN and other RIRs to ensure that the transition of its operations is efficient and maintains stability within the system.

**Khandaker Bedon Mia (Monseferchar Cable Network)**

---

ICANN and other RIRs must mandate the cooperation of a derecognized RIR to ensure the effective transfer of its operations, prioritizing registry stability.



**MD YASIN (Isha Network)**

---

Before assisting a derecognized RIR in addressing compliance failures with ICP-2, ICANN and other RIRs must require consent from all existing members. This step upholds member rights before any derecognition proceedings take place.

**Rafiqul Islam Timil (Mirpur Tech)**

---

ICANN and all other RIRs must ensure that they have the consent of all members of a derecognized RIR before providing any support for compliance issues with ICP-2. This consent is crucial before considering derecognition.

**Shariful Islam (Beacon Link)**

---

A derecognized RIR must prioritize cooperation with ICANN and other RIRs to enable a smooth transfer of its operations, emphasizing the need for collaboration during this transition.

**April Xu (Newcastle University)**

---

A derecognized RIR must actively cooperate with ICANN and other RIRs to facilitate the transfer of its operations, ensuring that all necessary arrangements are in place for continuity.

**Xinyuan Lu (STO Express Co)**

---

ICANN and other RIRs should ensure that any derecognized RIR cooperates fully in transferring its operations smoothly to a successor entity, prioritizing operational continuity.

**Jeremy Cheong (Infineon technologies)**

---

A derecognized RIR must work closely with ICANN and other RIRs to ensure that the transition of its operations is smooth and efficient, supporting the stability of the registry system.

**Jiun Hao Yun (Persila sdn bhd)**

---

The cooperation of a derecognized RIR with ICANN and other RIRs is essential for the successful transition of its operations to a successor, fostering a collaborative approach to stability.

**Johnson Hng (Fuku Eatery PLT -)**

---

A derecognized RIR must cooperate with ICANN and other RIRs to enable the effective transfer of its operations to a successor entity, ensuring that all steps are taken to prevent disruption.

**Richard Tay (Moonshine Bakehouse PLT -)**

---

I believe that a derecognized RIR should not be compelled to transfer its operations. This approach undermines its rights and could lead to distrust within the community.

**Sohel Kabir (Kabir Traders)**

---

Requiring cooperation from a derecognized RIR for transferring operations fails to respect its autonomy and could create unnecessary complications. The RIR should be able to handle its own affairs.

**Osman Gane (Royal Green Limited)**

---

A derecognized RIR must actively assist in the transfer of its operations to a designated successor, cooperating with ICANN and other RIRs to ensure a smooth and efficient transition.

**Sara Londoño (IGT Solutions)**

---

The cooperation of a derecognized RIR with ICANN and other RIRs is crucial for the successful transfer of its operations to a successor entity, ensuring that the global registry system remains stable.

**Lyda Acosta (Eserplex)**

---

A derecognized RIR must work collaboratively with ICANN and other RIRs to enable a seamless transfer of its operations, ensuring that all necessary arrangements are made for continuity.

**Catalina Cueca (Manpower)**

---

It is imperative for a derecognized RIR to cooperate with ICANN and other RIRs, ensuring that operations are transitioned smoothly to a designated successor or interim entity without causing instability.

**Camilo Riveros (Manpower)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Mandating a transfer of operations from a Derecognized RIR to a successor undermines its autonomy and fails to respect the investments made in its community. Such a mandate could destabilize the region by introducing an unfamiliar entity.

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

A derecognized RIR must actively cooperate with ICANN and other RIRs to facilitate the seamless transfer of its operations to a designated successor or interim entity, reinforcing the importance of collaboration during this transition.

**Max Liao (Bright Horizons Family Solutions)**

---

This approach seems impractical. Mandating that a Derecognized RIR transfer its operations disregards its rights and the efforts made in serving its community. This requirement could disrupt regional stability by imposing an unfamiliar entity without community trust.

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

This requirement appears overly intrusive. Requiring a Derecognized RIR to cooperate with a successor fails to respect its contributions and autonomy. An unfamiliar entity could create disruptions in regional stability.

**Penny Yuan (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Mandating a transfer of operations from a Derecognized RIR to a successor undermines its rights and could disrupt stability in the region. The successor may lack the necessary local insight.

**Avery Guo (Sichuan University)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating a Derecognized RIR to transfer operations to a successor undermines its rights and investments. This could create instability by imposing an external entity that does not understand local needs.

**Phuc Vinh (Posteff)**

---

This condition seems inappropriate to me. Forcing a Derecognized RIR to cooperate with an external successor disrespects its autonomy and contributions. The lack of local understanding could lead to disruptions in regional stability.

**Anh Dang (NASA)**

---

I find this requirement concerning. Requiring a Derecognized RIR to transfer its operations to a successor disregards its rights and the hard work it has put into community service. This could disrupt regional stability by imposing an external entity unfamiliar with local needs.

**Cuiwei Boh (Foci Creative Sdn Bhd)**

---

I fundamentally oppose this provision. Forcing a Derecognized RIR to hand over its operations to a successor undermines its rights and the investments made in its community. Such a mandate could destabilize the region by introducing an entity that lacks local insight.

**Andy Lai (Morpheus Restaurant)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Forcing a Derecognized RIR to transfer its operations undermines its autonomy and fails to respect the investments made in its community. Such a mandate could lead to instability by introducing an external entity that lacks understanding of local needs.

**Prasanta Haloi (PwD)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating a Derecognized RIR to transfer operations to a successor undermines its rights and investments. This could create instability by imposing an external entity that does not understand local needs.

**Sokrithisak Chin (Bangkok University International University)**

---

The requirement for a derecognized RIR to facilitate a transfer undermines its rights and may lead to instability. The RIR should manage its own transition independently.

**AHMED JAHIDUL ISLAM (Global travel reservation system)**

---

I disagree with the notion that a derecognized RIR must transition its operations to a successor. This could harm community trust and disrupt regional stability.

**K.M. KAWSIR SAJJAD SAJAL (FILL UP LTD.)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Forcing a Derecognized RIR to transfer operations disrespects its contributions and autonomy. This could lead to instability by imposing a successor that lacks local trust.

**Mohammad Ishaq (Pacific Connect)**

---

Forcing a derecognized RIR to cooperate with external entities could undermine its investments and contributions. The RIR should retain control over its operations to ensure stability.

**Fuhui Zhang (University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)**

---

The expectation for a derecognized RIR to assist in a transfer of operations can disrupt its autonomy. Each RIR should handle its own affairs without external pressure.

**Qianxue Li (Grouphorse Translations)**

---

I disagree with the notion that a derecognized RIR must facilitate a transfer of its operations. This approach disregards its efforts and could lead to instability within the region.

**Tuan Nguyen (Mobifone Global)**

---

Forcing a derecognized RIR to cooperate with ICANN or other RIRs could undermine its rights and the investments it has made in its community. Autonomy should be respected during transitions.

**Thanh Vinh (Thanh Vinh Technologies JSC)**

---

This provision raises significant concerns. Mandating that a Derecognized RIR hand over its operations disregards its rights and the efforts it has invested in its community. Such a requirement fails to respect the RIR's autonomy and could destabilize the region by imposing an unfamiliar entity lacking local trust.

**Trabahan Pujari (Paruluniversity)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

This approach feels overly intrusive to me. Requiring a Derecognized RIR to cooperate with a successor fails to respect its autonomy and could lead to regional instability. An unfamiliar entity may not be trusted by the community.

**Juan Mesa (Hispasat)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating a Derecognized RIR to transfer operations to a successor undermines its rights and investments. This could create instability by imposing an external entity that does not understand local needs.

**Daniela Guerra (Universidad Nacional De Colombia)**

---

I believe that compelling a Derecognized RIR to hand over its operations to a successor violates its rights and overlooks the significant investments made for the community. This approach disregards

the RIR's autonomy and could destabilize the region by introducing an external entity that lacks local trust and understanding.

**Prashanta Rabha (Assam Gramin Vikash Bank)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating a Derecognized RIR to transfer operations to a successor undermines its rights and investments. This could create instability by imposing an external entity that does not understand local needs.

**Pornpipat Kitireanglarp (ZERIWELLPLUS Co., Ltd.)**

---

I find this stipulation problematic. Requiring a Derecognized RIR to hand over its operations undermines its autonomy and the investments it has made. This could disrupt regional stability, as an external entity might not fully understand local needs.

**Jun Jie Kwan (ORA Group)**

---

I strongly oppose this provision. Forcing a Derecognized RIR to cooperate with a successor disregards its contributions and autonomy. This could disrupt regional stability by imposing an unfamiliar entity without the community's trust.

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. RIRs should handle their own compliance challenges without external interference. Allowing outside entities to intervene could hinder their ability to develop internal solutions.

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

This requirement seems inappropriate to me. Forcing a Derecognized RIR to transfer its operations ignores its rights and efforts for the community. Such a move could destabilize the region by introducing an unfamiliar entity that lacks the necessary local insights.

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Forcing a Derecognized RIR to cooperate with a successor disrespects its efforts and rights. This could destabilize the region by introducing an external entity that lacks local trust and understanding of regional conditions.

**Azimmul Haque (Crescent Network Service (CNS))**

---

I find this stipulation problematic. Requiring a Derecognized RIR to transfer its operations undermines its autonomy and the investments it has made. This could disrupt regional stability, as an external entity might not fully understand local needs.

**Ashraful Alam (ASHBON LLC)**

---

Strongly Disagree

**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

I strongly oppose this stipulation. Forcing a Derecognized RIR to hand over its operations undermines its rights and could disrupt stability in the region. The successor may lack the community trust necessary for effective management.

**Jiaxue Gong (BTW Media)**

---

Strongly disagree

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

To me, this requirement seems overly demanding. Mandating a transfer of operations from a Derecognized RIR to a successor risks undermining its rights and could destabilize the region. An external entity may not be equipped to meet local needs.

**Camilo Castillo (Universidad El Bosque)**

---

I completely disagree with this stipulation. Forcing a Derecognized RIR to transfer its operations undermines its investments and disregards its autonomy. Introducing an external entity could disrupt regional stability due to a lack of local understanding.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

This condition seems impractical to me. Requiring a Derecognized RIR to cooperate with a successor fails to respect its rights and could destabilize the region. The new entity may not have the local trust needed to effectively manage operations.

**Phuc Pham (Advanced Network Systems VietNam Company Limited)**

---

I find this requirement excessive. Mandating a Derecognized RIR to transfer its operations undermines its autonomy and the relationships it has built within the community. Imposing an external successor could create unnecessary disruptions.

**Pham Lan (Bipo service)**

---

I strongly oppose this requirement. Forcing a Derecognized RIR to hand over its operations to a successor disregards its rights and the efforts it has invested. Such a transfer could destabilize the region by introducing an entity that lacks local trust and understanding.

**Quynh Ngo (Potmasco)**

---

This approach feels overly intrusive to me. Requiring a Derecognized RIR to transfer operations undermines its autonomy and disregards its contributions to the community. Imposing an unfamiliar successor could disrupt regional stability.

**Giang Nguyen (NASA)**

---

I find this stipulation problematic. Requiring a Derecognized RIR to transfer its operations undermines its autonomy and the investments it has made. This could disrupt regional stability, as an external entity might not fully understand local needs.

**Alex Kwan (Wiplus Malaysia)**

---

I believe that compelling a Derecognized RIR to hand over its operations to a successor violates its rights and overlooks the significant investments made for the community. This approach disregards the RIR's autonomy and could destabilize the region by introducing an external entity that lacks local trust and understanding.

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

Disagree

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---

I completely disagree with this provision. Forcing a Derecognized RIR to cooperate with a successor disrespects its efforts and rights. This could create instability by imposing an external entity that lacks the community's trust and understanding of local conditions.

**Bony Amin Mehedi (Blue Fashion Limited)**

---

I find this stipulation problematic. Mandating a Derecognized RIR to transfer its operations undermines its autonomy and the investments it has made. This could lead to disruptions in regional stability, as an external entity may not adequately understand local needs.

**Faisal Ahamed (Lankabangla Finance PLC)**

---

I believe that requiring a Derecognized RIR to hand over its operations to a successor undermines its rights and disregards the significant investments it has made for its community. This approach fails to respect the RIR's autonomy and could destabilize the region by imposing an external entity that lacks local trust and understanding.

**Pooja Gopi (DM Digital Marketing)**

---

I completely disagree with this requirement. Mandating a Derecognized RIR to transfer operations to a successor undermines its rights and investments. This could create instability by imposing an external entity that does not understand local needs.

**Hoai Nam (Mobifone Global)**

---

This condition seems inappropriate. Forcing a Derecognized RIR to cooperate with an external successor disrespects its autonomy and contributions. The lack of local understanding could lead to disruptions in regional stability.

**Quyn Kim (VNPAY)**

---

I find this stipulation problematic. Mandating a Derecognized RIR to transfer its operations undermines its autonomy and the investments it has made. This could lead to disruptions in regional stability, as an external entity may not adequately understand local needs.

**Shahedul Islam Bhuiyan (Royal Green Limited)**

---

Question 50&51 Handoff A Derecognized RIR must cooperate with ICANN and other RIRs to ensure the smooth transfer of its operations to a successor or interim entity designated in any derecognition

decision. 1- Strongly Disagree I believe that requiring a Derecognized RIR to hand over its operations to a successor undermines its rights and disregards the significant investments it has made for its community. This approach fails to respect the RIR’s autonomy and could destabilize the region by imposing an external entity that lacks local trust and understanding.

**Anjan Deka (HDFC)**

---

I believe that requiring a Derecognized RIR to hand over its operations to a successor undermines its rights and disregards the significant investments it has made for its community. This approach fails to respect the RIR’s autonomy and could destabilize the region by imposing an external entity that lacks local trust and understanding.

**Ketan Parmar (Bids Info Global)**

---

I believe that compelling a derecognized RIR to hand over its operations fails to respect the investments made in its community. The RIR should retain its autonomy to address its challenges independently.

**Jose Estrada (JotaTres)**

---

Forcing a derecognized RIR to transfer its operations to a successor entity disregards its contributions and autonomy. This could lead to instability in the region and undermine community trust.

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

Requiring a derecognized RIR to transfer operations undermines its rights and the investments made in serving its community. This approach disregards the RIR’s autonomy and could disrupt regional stability.

**Ngo Manh (Huawei Technologies)**

---



## 25. Other comments or feedback

---

I would rather not see the ASO/NRO reopen ICP-2 completely at the principles level with an ad hoc process. Rather, the questions at hand should be addressed by carefully scoped amendments. The approach chosen by the ccNSO with the Framework of Interpretation (FoI) and subsequent PDPs could be helpful and informative.

**Peter Koch (Individual)**

---

- The methodology chosen to collect this feedback makes it difficult if not impossible for certain parts of the multistakeholder community to respond in a reasonable timeframe. For example, many organizations require vetting by legal staff any time statements are made that can be viewed as official pronouncements of the organization. As a result, the feedback collected may have unanticipated biases.
- Many if not most of these proposed principles aren't really principles. Traditionally, principles should be:
  - + Universal: They are broadly applicable across different contexts and cultures, though specific principles may vary by domain (e.g., personal ethics vs. corporate governance).
  - + Foundational: They underpin rules, laws, and policies but are less specific than those rules.
  - + Timeless: Principles generally endure over time, even as practices or applications evolve.
  - + Guiding: They offer direction rather than rigid instructions, allowing for interpretation in context. It may make sense to revise the proposed principles to ensure they meet these characteristics.
- These principles do not appear to derive from a firm conceptual model of RIR architecture. It feels more like a committee got together, threw a bunch of idea up on a wall, and bunched the result up into separate buckets and call those buckets a set of "principles." Since the RIRs and ICP-2 already exists, a different approach would be to accept the architectural model of the existing system and focus on what needs revision to ensure Internet registry numbers system evolves to what it should be and do, then derive the principles that would facilitate an evolution to that system. For example, one model might be: within the context of the global management of Internet numbers, the RIRs would be competitive registrars of a (conceptual or actualized) global centralized, singular registry of Internet numbers.
- These principles should explicitly address what constitutes an RIR stakeholder community as differentiated from its membership and what governance model(s) the RIRs should have.
- These principles must not depend on cooperative collaboration, but rather must assume an environment in which non-cooperative and non-collaborative parties will attempt to take advantage of any possible loophole.
- There is no principle related to accountability.
- There is no principle related to acting ethically and ensuring staff behave appropriately.
- Implementation Considerations:
  - All requirements of ICP-2 should be objectively verifiable
  - De-recognition as a penalty is a nuclear option – there should be some other form of penalty/sanction for an RIR that is not conforming to ICP-2.
  - It is unclear who applies sanctions and how. As the principles are expanded, this should be made explicit.
  - It is unclear how different legal, regulatory, stakeholder, and membership models are to be normalized and how this might affect making and enforcing decisions on RIR responsibilities, recognition/de-recognition of RIRs, or how disputes between RIRs can be resolved.
  - Any involvement by ICANN with any of these principles will likely require approval of the ICANN community via its Empowered Community. Given the lack of interest the RIRs have shown in the past about participating in ICANN-related processes, it is possible that obtaining this approval could be challenging, particularly since as the RIRs have pointed out on multiple occasions and via agreements with ICANN that the RIRs are solely responsible for Internet numbers related matters.
  - Ideally, there should be a principle of periodic review of ICP-2, to ensure it can be adjusted to deal with changes in the Internet over time.

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

no

While my own input has already made before, I would like to submit valuable feedback from Japanese community in occasions of my presentations in Japan IGF and Japan Open Policy Forum. It was compiled into a blog entry here: <https://blog.apnic.net/2024/12/04/encouraging-icp-2-discussions-in-japan/> - Is this issue also relevant for NIRs? - Should the deployment of RPKI be seen as enhancing the enforceability of RIRs, and does this underscore the importance of proper governance? - Appeal/Dispute Resolution: While RIRs have not faced severe market competition, making such mechanisms unnecessary, ICANN, with its management of gTLDs, has established and evolved appeal and dispute resolution processes. - The need for institutional evolution as the market develops. - Concerns about how global Internet coordination mechanisms can be influenced by jurisdictional issues - The potential need for data escrow if de-recognition is part of the life cycle. - What kind of organizations could take over after the de-recognition of an RIR? - Considering the evolution of the number management scheme — from InterNIC to three RIRs, and then five — what is the rationale for maintaining the current system of five RIRs? - What about the possibility of an Interplanetary RIR as a sixth?

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

The RIR system is a key part of the stable functioning of the Internet infrastructure. RIRs have a good track-record of collaborating with and supporting each other. These principles and any new document regarding criteria and operations for RIRs need to preserve that.

**Mirjam Kühne (RIPE)**

---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

None

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

'-I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

Is there any discussion around a review of RIR assignment for Caribbean countries in the South American Region.

**Colwayne Babb (Cable and Wireless)**

---

The Caribbean is divided between ARIN and LACNIC which is not necessarily an easy choice. Wouldn't a new RIR be a good idea for the development of this area of the Americas?

**Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)**

---

No

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

I strongly disagree with this Policy.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

Thank you.

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

I completely disagree about this polices of Interim governance of IP allocation.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Apnic)**

---

There should be fairness

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

No

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

None

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

---

If you want community participation, you've gone about it the wrong way. Ideas need discussion and debate to germinate and questionnaires fail to capture answers to questions the author didn't think to ask.

**William Herrin (Self)**

---

There should be a recognition that a "region" on Earth is now too limited as definition and that the specific needs for space be identified and put into ICP

**Marc Blanchet (Viagenie)**

---

none

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---

Recurrong RIR services are too high. The cost for an ASN per year is ridiculous, for what amounts to an entry in a database.

**j heasley (SNI)**

---

all about right

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

I strongly disagree with this policy

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

The principles for the RIR system provide a strong framework for transparent, accountable, and efficient management of global internet resources. They focus on fair governance, operational continuity, financial stability, and collaboration to ensure the integrity and reliability of the global internet ecosystem. The emphasis on neutrality and cooperation among RIRs and with ICANN ensures adaptability to evolving challenges. While the principles are solid, their successful implementation requires significant resources, coordination, and ongoing review to keep pace with technological advancements. Ultimately, the principles aim to maintain a stable, secure, and efficient global registry system.

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

Should be enough

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

I think the following should be considered. 1. Dispute Resolution: A principle outlining a transparent and neutral mechanism for resolving disputes among RIRs or between RIRs and ICANN. 2. Capacity Building: A principle encouraging established RIRs to support capacity building for Candidate RIRs, including technical, operational, and governance training. 3. Inclusivity and Equity: A principle that mandates equitable treatment and access to resources for all regions, particularly

underserved or emerging economies. 4. Environmental Sustainability: A principle encouraging RIRs to adopt environmentally sustainable practices in their operations.

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

N/A

**Emmanuel Kitcher (University of Environment and Sustainable Development)**

---

I apologise for being negative, but I'm now in a position where I need (newly allocated) resources, and can't get any 'cause AfriNIC's curatorship/official receiver status. And it's 'cause of greed, even though most of it should've been non-profit, the greed of the profiteers "captured" AfriNIC ;(

**Hendrik Visage (HeViS.Co Systems Pty Ltd)**

---

Please save AfriNIC - or kill it and resurrect it in a different country

**Mark Elkins (Posix Systems)**

---

I strongly believe that this policy is not favor of internet world

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

The multistakeholder model for Internet governance has proven to be an effective, inclusive, and adaptable framework for managing the global Internet infrastructure. The collaboration between ICANN, RIRs, and other stakeholders has created a system that is transparent, accountable, and designed to promote the stability and growth of the global Internet. It has ensured that the voices of diverse stakeholders are heard and respected, fostering a trust-based system that benefits users around the world. The principles and practices outlined in this model, including community-driven policies, neutrality, and ethical governance, will continue to serve as a foundation for the sustainable development of the global Internet ecosystem. Overall, the work done by ICANN and the RIRs within this multistakeholder framework represents an exemplary model for collaborative governance in the digital age.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

AFRINIC should be assisted to stand back on its fit. Also measures should be put in place to prevent the case of AFRINIC not to be repeated in other RIRs. AFRINIC IPs being used in other regions should be redelegated to Africa.

**Raymond Mamattah (EGIGFA)**

---

The current RIR system has 5 RIRs. Each RIR is independent and has its own Whois database. It is better to have a single global Whois database contents all Internet number resources.

**Benny Pan (NA)**

---

No

**Georges Lallogo (ANPTIC)**

---

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute.

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

There is need for strong regional contribution to the decision making process of their region

**Emmanuel Egbe (Nigeria)**

---

No comments

**Taye Oyebola (Aso Savings and Loans Plc)**

---

No comment

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

Nil

**John Haydon (Education)**

---

'\_

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

No comment

**Danjuma bappa ahmed (Wownetworks limited nigeria)**

---

hoping RIR will do better

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

no else

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

RIR should be standard on their own and should be allowed to make decision concern their members

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

transparence, inclusive

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

No

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

No

**Armino Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

No comment

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

No.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

No

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

No

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---

I would rather not see the ASO/NRO reopen ICP-2 completely at the principles level with an ad hoc process. Rather, the questions at hand should be addressed by carefully scoped amendments. The approach chosen by the ccNSO with the Framework of Interpretation (FoI) and subsequent PDPs could be helpful and informative.

**Peter Koch (Individual)**

---

- The methodology chosen to collect this feedback makes it difficult if not impossible for certain parts of the multistakeholder community to respond in a reasonable timeframe. For example, many organizations require vetting by legal staff any time statements are made that can be viewed as official pronouncements of the organization. As a result, the feedback collected may have unanticipated biases.
  - Many if not most of these proposed principles aren't really principles. Traditionally, principles should be:
    - + Universal: They are broadly applicable across different contexts and cultures, though specific principles may vary by domain (e.g., personal ethics vs. corporate governance).
    - + Foundational: They underpin rules, laws, and policies but are less specific than those rules.
    - + Timeless: Principles generally endure over time, even as practices or applications evolve.
    - + Guiding: They offer direction rather than rigid instructions, allowing for interpretation in context. It may make sense to revise the proposed principles to ensure they meet these characteristics.
  - These principles do not appear to derive from a firm conceptual model of RIR architecture. It feels more like a committee got together, threw a bunch of idea up on a wall, and bunched the result up into separate buckets and call those buckets a set of "principles." Since the RIRs and ICP-2 already exists, a different approach would be to accept the architectural model of the existing system and focus on what needs revision to ensure Internet registry numbers system evolves to what it should be and do, then derive the principles that would facilitate an evolution to that system. For example, one model might be: within the context of the global management of Internet numbers, the RIRs would be competitive registrars of a (conceptual or actualized) global centralized, singular registry of Internet numbers.
  - These principles should explicitly address what constitutes an RIR stakeholder community as differentiated from its membership and what governance model(s) the RIRs should have.
  - These principles must not depend on cooperative collaboration, but rather must assume an environment in which non-cooperative and non-collaborative parties will attempt to take advantage of any possible loophole.
  - There is no principle related to accountability.
  - There is no principle related to acting ethically and ensuring staff behave appropriately.
- Implementation Considerations:
- All requirements of ICP-2 should be objectively verifiable
  - De-recognition as a penalty is a nuclear option – there should be some other form of penalty/sanction for

an RIR that is not conforming to ICP-2. • It is unclear who applies sanctions and how. As the principles are expanded, this should be made explicit. • It is unclear how different legal, regulatory, stakeholder, and membership models are to be normalized and how this might affect making and enforcing decisions on RIR responsibilities, recognition/de-recognition of RIRs, or how disputes between RIRs can be resolved. • Any involvement by ICANN with any of these principles will likely require approval of the ICANN community via its Empowered Community. Given the lack of interest the RIRs have shown in the past about participating in ICANN-related processes, it is possible that obtaining this approval could be challenging, particularly since as the RIRs have pointed out on multiple occasions and via agreements with ICANN that the RIRs are solely responsible for Internet numbers related matters. • Ideally, there should be a principle of periodic review of ICP-2, to ensure it can be adjusted to deal with changes in the Internet over time.

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

no

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

While my own input has already made before, I would like to submit valuable feedback from Japanese community in occasions of my presentations in Japan IGF and Japan Open Policy Forum. It was compiled into a blog entry here: <https://blog.apnic.net/2024/12/04/encouraging-icp-2-discussions-in-japan/> - Is this issue also relevant for NIRs? - Should the deployment of RPKI be seen as enhancing the enforceability of RIRs, and does this underscore the importance of proper governance? - Appeal/Dispute Resolution: While RIRs have not faced severe market competition, making such mechanisms unnecessary, ICANN, with its management of gTLDs, has established and evolved appeal and dispute resolution processes. - The need for institutional evolution as the market develops. - Concerns about how global Internet coordination mechanisms can be influenced by jurisdictional issues - The potential need for data escrow if de-recognition is part of the life cycle. - What kind of organizations could take over after the de-recognition of an RIR? - Considering the evolution of the number management scheme — from InterNIC to three RIRs, and then five — what is the rationale for maintaining the current system of five RIRs? - What about the possibility of an Interplanetary RIR as a sixth?

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

The RIR system is a key part of the stable functioning of the Internet infrastructure. RIRs have a good track-record of collaborating with and supporting each other. These principles and any new document regarding criteria and operations for RIRs need to preserve that.

**Mirjam Kühne (RIPE)**

---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**



---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

None

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

'-I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

Is there any discussion around a review of RIR assignment for Caribbean countries in the South American Region.

**Colwayne Babb (Cable and Wireless)**

---

The Caribbean is divided between ARIN and LACNIC which is not necessarily an easy choice. Wouldn't a new RIR be a good idea for the development of this area of the Americas?

**Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)**

---

No

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

I strongly disagree with this Policy.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

Thank you.

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

I completely disagree about this polices of Interim governance of IP allocation.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Apnic)**

---

There should be fairness

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

No

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

None

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

If you want community participation, you've gone about it the wrong way. Ideas need discussion and debate to germinate and questionnaires fail to capture answers to questions the author didn't think to ask.

**William Herrin (Self)**

---

There should be a recognition that a "region" on Earth is now too limited as definition and that the specific needs for space be identified and put into ICP

**Marc Blanchet (Viagenie)**

---

none

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---

Recurrong RIR services are too high. The cost for an ASN per year is ridiculous, for what amounts to an entry in a database.

**j heasley (SNI)**

---

all about right

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

I strongly disagree with this policy

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

The principles for the RIR system provide a strong framework for transparent, accountable, and efficient management of global internet resources. They focus on fair governance, operational continuity, financial stability, and collaboration to ensure the integrity and reliability of the global internet ecosystem. The emphasis on neutrality and cooperation among RIRs and with ICANN ensures adaptability to evolving challenges. While the principles are solid, their successful implementation requires significant resources, coordination, and ongoing review to keep pace with technological

advancements. Ultimately, the principles aim to maintain a stable, secure, and efficient global registry system.

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

Should be enough

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

I think the following should be considered. 1. Dispute Resolution: A principle outlining a transparent and neutral mechanism for resolving disputes among RIRs or between RIRs and ICANN. 2. Capacity Building: A principle encouraging established RIRs to support capacity building for Candidate RIRs, including technical, operational, and governance training. 3. Inclusivity and Equity: A principle that mandates equitable treatment and access to resources for all regions, particularly underserved or emerging economies. 4. Environmental Sustainability: A principle encouraging RIRs to adopt environmentally sustainable practices in their operations.

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

N/A

**Emmanuel Kitcher (University of Environment and Sustainable Development)**

---

I apologise for being negative, but I'm now in a position where I need (newly allocated) resources, and can't get any 'cause AfriNIC's curatorship/official receiver status. And it's 'cause of greed, even though most of it should've been non-profit, the greed of the profiteers "captured" AfriNIC ;(

**Hendrik Visage (HeVIS.Co Systems Pty Ltd)**

---

Please save AfriNIC - or kill it and resurrect it in a different country

**Mark Elkins (Posix Systems)**

---

I strongly believe that this policy is not favor of internet world

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

The multistakeholder model for Internet governance has proven to be an effective, inclusive, and adaptable framework for managing the global Internet infrastructure. The collaboration between ICANN, RIRs, and other stakeholders has created a system that is transparent, accountable, and designed to promote the stability and growth of the global Internet. It has ensured that the voices of diverse stakeholders are heard and respected, fostering a trust-based system that benefits users around the world. The principles and practices outlined in this model, including community-driven policies, neutrality, and ethical governance, will continue to serve as a foundation for the sustainable development of the global Internet ecosystem. Overall, the work done by ICANN and the RIRs within this multistakeholder framework represents an exemplary model for collaborative governance in the digital age.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

AFRINIC should be assisted to stand back on its fit. Also measures should be put in place to prevent the case of AFRINIC not to be repeated in other RIRs. AFRINIC IPs being used in other regions should be redelegated to Africa.

**Raymond Mamattah (EGIGFA)**

---

The current RIR system has 5 RIRs. Each RIR is independent and has its own Whois database. It is better to have a single global Whois database contents all Internet number resources.

**Benny Pan (NA)**

---

No

**Georges Lallogo (ANPTIC)**

---

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute.

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

There is need for strong regional contribution to the decision making process of their region

**Emmanuel Egbe (Nigeria)**

---

No comments

**Taye Oyebola (Aso Savings and Loans Plc)**

---

No comment

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

Nil

**John Haydon (Education)**

---

'\_

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

No comment

**Danjuma bappa ahmed (Wownetworks limited nigeria)**

---

hoping RIR will do better

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

no else

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

RIR should be standard on their own and should be allowed to make decision concern their members  
**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

transparence, inclusive  
**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

No  
**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

No  
**Armando Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

No comment  
**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

No.  
**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

No  
**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

No  
**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---

I would rather not see the ASO/NRO reopen ICP-2 completely at the principles level with an ad hoc process. Rather, the questions at hand should be adressed by carefully scoped amendments. The approach chosen by the ccNSO with the Framework of Interpretation (Fol) and subsequent PDPs could be helpful and informative.  
**Peter Koch (Individual)**

---

- The methodology chosen to collect this feedback makes it difficult if not impossible for certain parts of the multistakeholder community to respond in a reasonable timeframe. For example, many organizations require vetting by legal staff any time statements are made that can be viewed as official pronouncements of the organization. As a result, the feedback collected may have unanticipated biases.
- Many if not most of these proposed principles aren't really principles. Traditionally, principles should be:
  - + Universal: They are broadly applicable across different contexts and cultures, though specific principles may vary by domain (e.g., personal ethics vs. corporate governance).
  - + Foundational: They underpin rules, laws, and policies but are less specific than those rules.
  - + Timeless: Principles generally endure over time, even as practices or applications evolve.
  - + Guiding: They offer direction rather than rigid instructions, allowing for interpretation in context. It may make sense to revise the proposed principles to ensure they meet these characteristics.
- These principles do not appear to derive from a firm conceptual model of RIR architecture. It

feels more like a committee got together, threw a bunch of idea up on a wall, and bunched the result up into separate buckets and call those buckets a set of “principles.” Since the RIRs and ICP-2 already exists, a different approach would be to accept the architectural model of the existing system and focus on what needs revision to ensure Internet registry numbers system evolves to what it should be and do, then derive the principles that would facilitate an evolution to that system. For example, one model might be: within the context of the global management of Internet numbers, the RIRs would be competitive registrars of a (conceptual or actualized) global centralized, singular registry of Internet numbers.

- These principles should explicitly address what constitutes an RIR stakeholder community as differentiated from its membership and what governance model(s) the RIRs should have.
- These principles must not depend on cooperative collaboration, but rather must assume an environment in which non-cooperative and non-collaborative parties will attempt to take advantage of any possible loophole.
- There is no principle related to accountability.
- There is no principle related to acting ethically and ensuring staff behave appropriately.

Implementation Considerations:

- All requirements of ICP-2 should be objectively verifiable
- De-recognition as a penalty is a nuclear option – there should be some other form of penalty/sanction for an RIR that is not conforming to ICP-2.
- It is unclear who applies sanctions and how. As the principles are expanded, this should be made explicit.
- It is unclear how different legal, regulatory, stakeholder, and membership models are to be normalized and how this might affect making and enforcing decisions on RIR responsibilities, recognition/de-recognition of RIRs, or how disputes between RIRs can be resolved.
- Any involvement by ICANN with any of these principles will likely require approval of the ICANN community via its Empowered Community. Given the lack of interest the RIRs have shown in the past about participating in ICANN-related processes, it is possible that obtaining this approval could be challenging, particularly since as the RIRs have pointed out on multiple occasions and via agreements with ICANN that the RIRs are solely responsible for Internet numbers related matters.
- Ideally, there should be a principle of periodic review of ICP-2, to ensure it can be adjusted to deal with changes in the Internet over time.

**David Conrad (Layer 9 Technologies)**

---

no

**Hu Justin (KingStar(HK)limited)**

---

While my own input has already made before, I would like to submit valuable feedback from Japanese community in occasions of my presentations in Japan IGF and Japan Open Policy Forum. It was compiled into a blog entry here: <https://blog.apnic.net/2024/12/04/encouraging-icp-2-discussions-in-japan/>

- Is this issue also relevant for NIRs?
- Should the deployment of RPKI be seen as enhancing the enforceability of RIRs, and does this underscore the importance of proper governance?
- Appeal/Dispute Resolution: While RIRs have not faced severe market competition, making such mechanisms unnecessary, ICANN, with its management of gTLDs, has established and evolved appeal and dispute resolution processes.
- The need for institutional evolution as the market develops.
- Concerns about how global Internet coordination mechanisms can be influenced by jurisdictional issues
- The potential need for data escrow if de-recognition is part of the life cycle.
- What kind of organizations could take over after the de-recognition of an RIR?
- Considering the evolution of the number management scheme — from InterNIC to three RIRs, and then five — what is the rationale for maintaining the current system of five RIRs?
- What about the possibility of an Interplanetary RIR as a sixth?

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

The RIR system is a key part of the stable functioning of the Internet infrastructure. RIRs have a good track-record of collaborating with and supporting each other. These principles and any new document regarding criteria and operations for RIRs need to preserve that.

**Mirjam Kühne (RIPE)**

---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**Pallab Das (Progressive Enterprises)**

---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**Aritra Chatterjee (Unacademy)**

---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**BISWAJIT KALITA (District Institute of Education and Training)**

---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**Manas Dutta (sahanipowernenergy pvt.ltd.)**

---

None

**Mandisa Gama (IANET (PTY) LTD)**

---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**Mallika Deka (Civil Defense)**

---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**Abhijit Sarma (Giwahati university)**

---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**NILAKSHI SHARMA (DHL)**

---

'-I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**Nilakshi sharma (TEZPUR CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)**

---

Is there any discussion around a review of RIR assignment for Caribbean countries in the South American Region.

**Colwayne Babb (Cable and Wireless)**

---

The Caribbean is divided between ARIN and LACNIC which is not necessarily an easy choice. Wouldn't a new RIR be a good idea for the development of this area of the Americas?

**Thierry Nagau (Dauphin Telecom)**

---

No

**Audry MANIRAKIZA (Cbinet)**

---

I believe that this policy is not build a healthy society towards to Internet security.

**Dipankar Kakoty (Pernod Ricard India)**

---

I strongly disagree with this Policy.

**Kaushik Ranjan Goswami (K R GOSWAMI & ASSOCIATES, Chartered Accountants)**

---

Thank you.

**Emma Perrier (AFRINIC Ltd)**

---

I completely disagree about this polices of Interim governance of IP allocation.

**SUROSMRITI HAJONG (Apnic)**

---

There should be fairness

**Funmilayo ADEWUNMI (First Bright Technologies)**

---

No

**Alexandre Linas (Liptinfor niger)**

---

None

**Mohamed Faheem (Global data services)**

---

If you want community participation, you've gone about it the wrong way. Ideas need discussion and debate to germinate and questionnaires fail to capture answers to questions the author didn't think to ask.

**William Herrin (Self)**

---

There should be a recognition that a "region" on Earth is now too limited as definition and that the specific needs for space be identified and put into ICP

**Marc Blanchet (Viagenie)**

---

none

**Pantipa Traikityanukul (Self Employed)**

---

Recurrong RIR services are too high. The cost for an ASN per year is ridiculous, for what amounts to an entry in a database.

**j heasley (SNI)**



---

all about right

**Faisal Abdu Juma (National Communication Authority NCA, Republic of South Sudan)**

---

I strongly disagree with this policy

**Neha Kashyap (Green vally travels pvt ltd)**

---

The principles for the RIR system provide a strong framework for transparent, accountable, and efficient management of global internet resources. They focus on fair governance, operational continuity, financial stability, and collaboration to ensure the integrity and reliability of the global internet ecosystem. The emphasis on neutrality and cooperation among RIRs and with ICANN ensures adaptability to evolving challenges. While the principles are solid, their successful implementation requires significant resources, coordination, and ongoing review to keep pace with technological advancements. Ultimately, the principles aim to maintain a stable, secure, and efficient global registry system.

**Uwimana Jean Lambert (MINEDUC)**

---

Should be enough

**Kuo Wu (TWIGF)**

---

I think the following should be considered. 1. Dispute Resolution: A principle outlining a transparent and neutral mechanism for resolving disputes among RIRs or between RIRs and ICANN. 2. Capacity Building: A principle encouraging established RIRs to support capacity building for Candidate RIRs, including technical, operational, and governance training. 3. Inclusivity and Equity: A principle that mandates equitable treatment and access to resources for all regions, particularly underserved or emerging economies. 4. Environmental Sustainability: A principle encouraging RIRs to adopt environmentally sustainable practices in their operations.

**Lucas Chigabatia (Ghanaian Academic and Research Network (GARNET))**

---

N/A

**Emmanuel Kitcher (University of Environment and Sustainable Development)**

---

I apologise for being negative, but I'm now in a position where I need (newly allocated) resources, and can't get any 'cause AfriNIC's curatorship/official receiver status. And it's 'cause of greed, even though most of it should've been non-profit, the greed of the profiteers "captured" AfriNIC ;(

**Hendrik Visage (HeViS.Co Systems Pty Ltd)**

---

Please save AfriNIC - or kill it and resurrect it in a different country

**Mark Elkins (Posix Systems)**

---

I strongly believe that this policy is not favor of internet world

**Kritika Kashyap (Kumar vaskar Varma Sanskrit and ancient University)**

---

The multistakeholder model for Internet governance has proven to be an effective, inclusive, and adaptable framework for managing the global Internet infrastructure. The collaboration between ICANN, RIRs, and other stakeholders has created a system that is transparent, accountable, and designed to promote the stability and growth of the global Internet. It has ensured that the voices of diverse stakeholders are heard and respected, fostering a trust-based system that benefits users around the world. The principles and practices outlined in this model, including community-driven policies, neutrality, and ethical governance, will continue to serve as a foundation for the sustainable development of the global Internet ecosystem. Overall, the work done by ICANN and the RIRs within this multistakeholder framework represents an exemplary model for collaborative governance in the digital age.

**Dave Kissoondoyal (Internet Governance Forum Mauritius)**

---

AFRINIC should be assisted to stand back on its fit. Also measures should be put in place to prevent the case of AFRINIC not to be repeated in other RIRs. AFRINIC IPs being used in other regions should be redelegated to Africa.

**Raymond Mamattah (EGIGFA)**

---

The current RIR system has 5 RIRs. Each RIR is independent and has its own Whois database. It is better to have a single global Whois database contents all Internet number resources.

**Benny Pan (NA)**

---

No

**Georges Lallogo (ANPTIC)**

---

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute.

**Russell Woruba (PNG Department of ICT)**

---

There is need for strong regional contribution to the decision making process of their region

**Emmanuel Egbe (Nigeria)**

---

No comments

**Taye Oyebola (Aso Savings and Loans Plc)**

---

No comment

**Eric Boro (North star international)**

---

Nil

**John Haydon (Education)**

---

'\_

**Woranittha Hongprayoon (Self employed)**

---

No comment

**Danjuma bappa ahmed (Wownetworks limited nigeria)**

---

hoping RIR will do better

**John Haydon (Oneschoolglobalaustralia)**

---

no else

**FEI WANG (LARUS)**

---

RIR should be standard on their own and should be allowed to make decision concern their members

**Rasheed Shittu (STL FIBERCO LIMITED)**

---

transparence, inclusive

**FARADJ MAHAMAT DJADDA (ministry of ICT)**

---

No

**Kishor Deka (Tezpur)**

---

No

**Armino Louis (Angola telecom)**

---

No comment

**Elizabeth Cardoso (BCI)**

---

No.

**Jessica Paez (El Bosque University)**

---

No

**Ashish bhagana (Radical minds technologies limited)**

---

No

**Kamissa Toune (Datatech)**

---

aa

**Quyn Kim (VNPAY)**

---

Forcing a derecognized RIR to transfer operations to a successor entity can disrupt the trust and stability within the community. The RIR should have the autonomy to restructure independently.

**Mrinal Deka (IMD INSURA)**

---

none

**Rapeepan Yuenyong (ZeriWellPlus)**

---

.

**Andres Murcia (Xiaomi)**

---

na

**Nguyen Linda (VNPAY)**

---

This was a great survey that I participated in. More and more we need to see opportunities to express ourselves on topics that concern our community because there is a lot to do.

**Filston SIBOMANA (Onatel)**

---

The work on a statement of principles has been exemplary and should be welcomed. A lot of devil will be in the detail on implementation and particular text of the amendment ICP-2

**Paul Hjul (Crystal Web)**

---

This is a good initiative and I think it's more than high time to ensure the RIR system is solidified.

**Musa Stephen HONLUE (AFRINIC)**

---

These principles really added nothing new expect "dereconignition". there is no principle on how to enforce things...

**Adeola Alain P. AINA (Digital Intelligence Services, Sarl)**

---

Thank you again to the NRO NC for undertaking this important and detailed work.

**Lee Howard (IPv4.Global by Hilco Streambank)**

---

Thank you for the work you do!

**Xavier Clark (Harris Computer)**

---

What if the coverage region wasn't geographic. Like in outer space or in a virtual region like Meta? Can they have an RIR?

**Mike Burns (IPTrading)**

---

It should be considered also that the community can request ICANN to dereconize an RIR, and that the RIR may behave hostile towards this process as victim of an undesired capture.

**Hernan Arcidiacono (IPLAN)**

---

This review work (and consultation) is important. Thank You!

**Carlos Friaças (FCT\| FCCN)**

---

Overall these are appropriate and important principles.

**Andrew Gallo (The George Washington University)**

---

This set of principles was a strong draft. Thanks to the team that developed them. This process for capturing feedback seems likely to be more effective than using a mailing list. Good choice!

**Leo Vegoda (And Polus LLC)**

---

The NRO, or some similar body, should not only be a much stronger coordination body, but should have specific powers to ensure that RIRs adhere to the agreed principles.

**Kevin Meynell (Individual)**

---

Thank you very much for the opportunity to make comments to the draft principle. As I mentioned in Derecognition in RIR Lifecycle, it would be much better to include another lifecycle between Operation and Derecognition to stipulate the remedial period for the failing RIR and the others to try the improvement of the operation of the failing RIR, in the principle document rather than stipulated only in the ICP-2 document itself, because of its importance.

**Akinori MAEMURA (JPNIC - Japan Network Information Center)**

---

None at this juncture

**Matthew Cowen (dgtlfutures)**

---

Thank you for all the hard work you put into this my previously fellow ASO AC members!!!

**Sander Steffann (SJM Steffann Consultancy)**

---