

# IANA Service Review Committee F2F meeting

15 March 2017

## Copenhagen, Denmark

(0) **Welcome.** NN noted that this is a working session of the review committee. Even though the committee meets virtually, the opportunity was taken for a F2F meeting at ICANN 58, even though it's not on the ICANN agenda.

(1) **Roll call**

### Present

AFRINIC:

Omo Oaiya, OO

Douglas Onyango, DO (remotely)

Madhvi Gokool, MG (remotely)

APNIC:

Brajesh Jain, BJ

Tomohiro Fujisaki, TF

George Kuo, GK (remotely)

ARIN:

Louie Lee, LL

Jason Schiller, JS

Nate Davis, ND

LACNIC:

Nicolas Antonello, NA (remotely)

Edmundo Cazares, EC (remotely)

Ernesto Majo, EM

Ripe NCC:

Filiz Yilmaz, FY

Nurani Nimpuno, NN

Andrew de la Haye, AH

(2) **Review open actions**

New Action Item 170215004 GV to prepare a list of IANA RC members participating of the Committee face-to-face meeting in ICANN 58.

- Done. Action CLOSED.

New Action Item 170215-02 NN and JS prepare in advance of the ICANN 58 meeting content for the initial discussion of the RC internal procedures.

- NN sent to list. This will be discussed further this in agenda item 4. Action CLOSED.

New Action Item 170215-03 GV to coordinate with the RIR communication group the regional announcements of IANA RC meetings starting with the f2f meeting in ICANN 58.

- Regional announcement coordinated and announced. Action CLOSED.

New Action Item 170215-01 RC RIR Staff Members, to prepare a presentation by ICANN 58 meeting, for the rest of the review committee community members on what the IANA performance review would look like.

- Discussed under agenda item 5. Action CLOSED.

(3) **Agreement on Review Committee Scope** - [https://www.nro.net/wp-content/uploads/Review-Committee-Charter\\_FINALclean.pdf](https://www.nro.net/wp-content/uploads/Review-Committee-Charter_FINALclean.pdf)

Charter: Functions/Objectives

1. The IANA Numbering Services Review Committee (hereafter Review Committee)'s function is to advise and assist the NRO EC in its periodic review of the service level of the IANA Numbering Services provided to the Internet Number Community.
2. In carrying out this function, the Review Committee will report to the NRO EC any concerns regarding the performance of the IANA Numbering Services Operator, including any observed failure or near failure by the IANA Numbering Services Operator to meet its obligations under the Service Level Agreement. The Review Committee must submit such a report to the NRO EC at least once every calendar year, by the date specified by the NRO EC from time to time.
3. The Review Committee has an advisory role, to assist the NRO EC in relation to things referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2. The Review Committee does not have any power to commit the NRO EC to any recommendation or decision made by it, except where and to the extent that it has express delegated authority from the NRO EC.

NN interprets this as: assisting the RIRS; it is up to the NRO EC to provide input on the SLA with PTI; the NC is there to advise and give recommendations to the NRO EC.

FY stated that this role is advisory; watchdog position. Believes the scope is clear enough.

JS also commented that it is clear the output is advisory; the RC will rely heavily on the RIR staff and will oversee this report. The RC will also provide this report to the community to provide feedback and then provide advice to the NRO EC on the outcomes of the community consultation. Less clear is community engagement – it's not clearly defined in the charter. Should there be more community outreach?

BJ asked if the RIR report will only include exceptions or normal operations.

FY comment that this mechanism is put in place for a future event – if it happens; IANA services have been great. In this context, the RC input will be required if things do not go well. There is no RC engagement before that.

JS agrees with FY that IANA has provided a great service; so long as this continues to be the case; this is a simple process to approve a report. He suggested creating a mechanism to allow the community to provide the RC with information should the IANA services not be good.

NN agrees that would be a good approach. She also stated that making sure this is a public process is important and valuable to the community.

(4) **Internal operations procedures document**

This document was sent to the list. JS and NN tried to keep the document fairly informal and not overprescribe how it should work.

AH thanked both NN and JS and was happy to see consensus on a lightweight process; including transparency.

In response to a question by TF, the process has not been published as it has not been fully agreed to yet but has been sent to the mailing list for comment.

ND echoed AH regarding the process. He asked the RC to keep in mind that the number of transactions are only around 4-5 for all RIRs per year – so a lightweight process is appropriate for the number of transactions.

NN clarified that this number of transactions are for all RIRs, and is a useful data point to keep in mind.

JS commented that there was some discussion on the production of the report. The process suggested annually, and the months initially put forward (Sep and Jan) were not ideal.

NN stated that meeting agendas and the number of requests might not make Jan a workable month.

EM also commented that Jan is a complicated time and the RC should be aware of the RIR meeting calendar.

Personally, and not as Chair, NN preferred keeping calendar years. AH supports this and stated that it aligns with PTI's process as well.

NN noted that the date should be set by the NRO EC. NN suggested that she and JS raise this with the NRO EC members on what is workable and bring it back to the group.

**NEW ACTION ITEM 20170315-01:** JS and NN to discuss the production date of the report with the NRO EC for their decision and then share this with the RC.

In response to LL on whether to formally call a motion on this action, NN prefers to keep these meetings more informal.

GV read out a chat comment from NA: The RC and RIR staff have 30 days to analyse the report and they would mostly do it in Dec. That's why he suggested a calendar year of July – July, to leave Jan – Mar free.

In response to BJ's question, NN clarified we need to separate the PTI reporting from that of the RIRs. From the charter, the RC will publish the report annually. The RIRs can then work out the reporting between them and PTI.

NN and JS went through the operating procedures. [document was on screen]

JS noted the term of the Chair was chosen as a year.

BJ bought up the issue of a change to the Chair or Co-Chair with this term and suggested that the new Chair or Co-Chair only serve the balance of the term.

**NEW ACTION ITEM 20170315-02:** JS and NN to amend the length of the Chair's and Co-Chair's term, noting that if there is a change before the end of the term, the new Chair or Co-Chair will serve for the balance of that term – 2.1.5 and 2.1.6.

On the review process topic, as there was already discussion on this, NN suggested discussing this after the changes were added.

On the 5 voting members, Craig Ng asked if they were at least one from each region or 5 in total? JS responded that it is not necessarily a voting member from each region, it is 5 in total.

**NEW ACTION ITEM 20170315-03:** Committee to review the proceedings and provide comments for two weeks.

(5) **IANA performance report**

(a) **Performance matrix**

NN noted that the RC asked the RIRs to commence this work.

ND offered earlier to provide a structure for the RIRs to evaluate IANA's performance based solely on the SLA. For the matrix he went through the SLA and extracted all of the operational performance items for which IANA is responsible to the RIRs. It's limited to that only. It only relates to the operational performance items that the RIRs hold the IANA accountable for.

Each element is designed to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. It also helps the RIRs identify the reports the IANA is collating on their performance standards. These reports serve as the mechanism for IANA reporting back on SLA obligations.

NN noted that we cannot review anything that is not in the SLA. She suggested that the RIRs establish review mechanisms for each operating performance measure, which could then constitute the basis of the performance matrix.

ND clarified if NN wanted the RIRs to flesh out these items based on IANA's reporting of these performance measures and ND agrees that is the next step.

NN asked ND when it would be reasonable to expect the next version of this document and suggested ND get back to the group on that.

ND will discuss with the other RIR representatives and update the mailing list.

**NEW ACTION ITEM 20170315-04** ND and RC staff members to track status of the production of the performance standard metrics and provide regular updates.

These discussion points were not discussed:

**5.2 Gap review of performance matrix**

**5.3 Discussion of metrics and measurement**

**5.4 Discussion of current IANA measurements**

**5.4 Gap review of current IANA performance measures**

The discussion then went on to the next sub-point:

**5.6 Content of IANA performance review document**

JS suggested the body of report will be short; summarised at a high level, for example, if there are any interesting trends. He suggests also including the data and raw comments attachments.

FY suggests refraining from prescribing the format of the report. It should be simple, concise, and readable.

NN (personally) agrees with JS regarding the comments. Our role is to collate the comments; but we should not be evaluating the comments. Keep the comments in its raw format and ensure the report is lightweight and simple. JS agrees it should be high level and not prescriptive. Regarding the comments, he suggests providing those comments within the scope of the document; those out of scope may not need to be included.

NN commented that these discussions are important to provide a framework for the work.

ND noted that from an ARIN staff perspective, they would highlight any exceptions objectively if necessary.

BJ did comment that for some operators a year to wait for the report might not be optimal.

JS pointed out that the charter did that state in point 2 "time to time", which may allow the NRO EC to ask the RC to provide additional reports.

NN pointed out that this is not a new service.

AH noted that in his experience with the RIPE NCC he has noted no issues with IANA services. He doesn't want this to be an operational body; and reiterated his comment that this report should be lightweight.

FY stated the ambiguity in that section is deliberate in case there is an exception or issue.

NN suggested considering an avenue for allowing the community to comment any time of the year – maybe through a mailing address. If necessary, the RIRs can initiate the process and come back to the RC.

GK via chat agrees with AH, APNIC has not had any issues with past interactions with IANA services. EM and MG also stated the same.

ND also made the same comment. He noted that if there is an event, the RIRs will share any information as soon as possible on their interaction with IANA and resolve the issue ASAP. Whether or not that is reported to the RC is up to the NRO EC.

NN emphasised that the RC is an additional avenue; the RC is not the only avenue.

NA asked if there was any way for the RIRs to state any issue out of the report, for example, in the middle of the calendar year? If the answer is yes, then it might be a good idea for there to be an open channel for the RC to convey these to the RIRs.

## **(6) Review process**

### **6.1 Review process internal to the RC**

JS suggests this discussion take place after a review of the matrix.

NN agrees.

### **6.2 Process for community feedback for performance review report**

NN shared a suggested process of 30 days. She suggested that the RC make it possible for the community to comment. And then the RC to collate the comment and include it in the report.

ND asked if there was any way we are informing the community of the RCs transparency? What is the suggested forum for community comments?

NN responded that the RC internal mailing is publicly archived so anyone can see the discussions; she agrees the RC needs to be open and transparent. For the channel we create for seeking input for the community, NN proposes a mail address that is publicly archived; with verification that their comments have been received; and with notification to the RC that a comment has been received.

ND agrees with this proposal.

EM suggests it is important to have a common mechanism to send comments.

NA suggests that the RIRs should manage their own comments list as having a common list could mean managing many comments.

NN agrees that the RC should one avenue for comments to be directed to. It also makes it easier to communicate with people as well as to where to direct comments. JS noted that this is in addition to any RIR communication platforms and activities.

FY also prefers one space to direct comments.

In response to BJ, NN confirms this is a working group, but for transparency and openness, people can listen in. NN suggests having one channel. NA reiterated that it should be open and agrees to have one channel.

NN confirmed consensus on having one channel for directing comments that is publicly archived.

### **6.3 Discussion of operating procedures changes for section 5 updates (if any).**

This was already discussed earlier and NN and JS have an action to discuss this with the NRO EC.

(7) **Any other community engagement?**

JS asked if the committee was comfortable with the level of community engagement discussed? Does anyone think that the RC needs more?

NN suggested that this is not something the RC need to settle and asked the group to think about this more.

FY commented that we should be in touch with the community. She thinks it should not be prescribed as each community has its own way of dealing with community engagement; engagement should be according to the needs of the community.

JS asked if this text needs to be in the procedures? He asked if FY would take on this action.

**NEW ACTION ITEM 20170315-05** – FY to look how community engagement can be included in the operating procedures with a light touch (that it will come naturally as being members of the RC).

NN notes there is an expectation on us as a community representative to be engaged with the community and make ourselves available. NN agrees that it shouldn't be prescribed.

BJ commented that in the APNIC community it has already been decided to report back to the community on the progress of the RC.

NA via chat returned to the issue of whether or not the RC might direct an issue out of the report to the RIRS at any time of the year.

NN noted that community members can provide comments to the RC at any time; the RC will only publish a report annually, however, if the NRO EC believes there is an issue that needs to be taken to the community via the RC, then they can liaise with the RC and call for an extraordinary report or communication. Such as event would be initiated by the NRO EC.

JS suggested that perhaps NA is asking that if there is a concern and the RC becomes aware of them, and believes they are serious and can help the NRO EC inform their discussion of the issue, if the RC needs to do an early review, is there a line of communication open from the RC to the EC to provide them advice of these concerns.

NA via chat stated that if that is the case, he might not agree with the outcome. If the RC might direct an issue to the NRO EC, it gives this whole process more meaning.

NN stated she would find it hard to imagine what kind of event that would be? NN reminded the RC that the issue is raising an extraordinary issue that would be raised mid-year.

JS asked if NA meant that the RC can provide advice to the NRO EC anytime and that advice might be useful to the NRO EC to decide an early review. NN confirmed that is her understanding of the issue that NA is raising.

EM finds it difficult to imagine the scenario. He suggests any review should be within the scope of the RC.

FY commented that if we receive a report from the RIRs, she believes it is covered in the procedures.

JS suggested that NA is asking if we can just decide on giving advice to the NRO EC, with the understanding that the advice might be helpful to them to do an early review.

FY doesn't rule out continuous conversation. It depends on the issue, and what is in place is already outlined in the procedures and there doesn't need to be any drastic change.

NN commented that the RC work is really guided by the work the RIRs are carrying out. If there are any incidents, it will be notified by the RIR community, but we must make sure it is within the scope of the RC.

NN asked the RC to consider whether the RC should have an extraordinary meeting if there are extraordinary circumstances in addition to the regular meeting schedule. Also, any of these incidents would come from the RIRs anyway.

NA believes it makes sense for the NRO EC to raise any special issue out of the report.

NN suggested taking this issue to the list for further discussion and will speak directly with NA on this issue.

Akinori Maemura (personally) stated that in his understanding the scope of the RC is the evaluation of IANA performance based on input from the RIRs, not the community; and then advise the NRO EC. Regarding community engagement, if the RC engages with the community, make sure it is within the scope of the RC.

#### 8. Next Meeting

NN proposed having a F2F meeting has other implications, made it difficult for people to remotely participate. She suggests sticking to the teleconference platform. GV will send a doodle poll for the next meeting.

#### 9. AOB

JS invited the RC to the private meeting room he secured for any further discussion

#### 10. Adjourn

Meeting ended at 12:45 (UTC +1).