

2019-Feb-19: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference

Date: Tuesday, 19 February 2019, 11am UTC.

Attendees

Executive Council:

Alan Barrett (AB)	AFRINIC	Chair
Axel Pawlik (AP)	RIPE NCC	Secretary
Oscar Robles (OR)	LACNIC	Treasurer
John Curran (JC)	ARIN	

Apologies:

Paul Wilson (PW)	APNIC	
------------------	-------	--

Observers:

Paul Andersen	ARIN Board
Pablo Hinojosa (PH)	APNIC
Sanjaya (SS)* <i>*Acts on behalf of APNIC</i>	APNIC
Richard Jimmerson (RJ)	ARIN
Ernesto Majó (EM)** <i>**Acts on behalf of LACNIC</i>	LACNIC

Secretariat:

German Valdez (GV)	NRO
--------------------	-----

Susannah Gray (SG)	NRO (Scribe)
-----------------------	--------------

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Agenda Review
3. ASO Review
 - a) Update on ASO Future Structure Consultation.
 - b) Update Recommendations #6
 - c) ASO AC New Procedures in Response to Recommendation #15
 - d) Update Recommendation #
4. ICANN 64 Activities
 - a) Topics for Opening Plenary (Monday 11 Mar 2019 9:00)
 - b) Topics for ICANN Board Meeting (Tue 12 Mar 2019, 09:45-10:45)
 - c) SO/AC Leaders Meeting (Fri 8 Mar 2019, 14:00-17:00)
 - d) Joint Meeting: ASO AC and NRO EC (Sun Mar 10 Time 17:00 - 18:30)
 - e) ASO AC Annual Meeting (Mon 11 Mar 2019)
 - f) ASO Session (Wed 13 March 2019, 13:30-15:00)
5. Legal Status of IP Addresses
6. RIR Incident Response Coordination
7. Call for Public Comments on the IANA Performance Matrix Summary Report.
8. CG Reports
 - a) CCG
 - b) ECG
 - c) RSCG
 - d) Secretariat
9. Open Actions
10. Next Meetings
 - a) Teleconference Tuesday 19 March 2019
 - b) Teleconference Tuesday 16 April 2019
 - c) Next f2f Meeting Proposal
11. Minutes Review
 - a) Teleconference 22 January 2019
12. AOB
13. Adjourn

Resolutions

The following Resolution was passed during this meeting:

R-20190219-1: The NRO EC resolves to approve the NRO Process for Review of the ASO within ICANN (version: 19 November 2018).
--

New Action Items

The following action Items were assigned during this meeting:

NEW ACTION ITEM 20190219-01: AB to ask the legal teams to examine the first 17 Recommendations and give an overview of what changes to the MoU, ICANN Bylaws and other related documents are needed for implementation.
NEW ACTION ITEM 20190219-02: AP to draft Strawman proposal and circulate to the list.
NEW ACTION ITEM 20190219-3: AB to inform the ASO AC that the NRO EC has approved the ASO AC's proposed new procedures in response to Recommendation #15 and that the NRO EC also had some suggested text edits that the ASO AC might want to consider.
NEW ACTION ITEM 20190219-4: Secretariat to publish NRO Process for Review of the ASO within ICANN (version: 19 November 2018) on the NRO website.
NEW ACTION ITEM 20190219-5: Secretariat to ensure that a session with the RIR legal team is added to the agenda for the NRO EC F2F Meeting in Reykjavik in May.
NEW ACTION ITEM 20190219-6: All to prepare for their legal representatives to attend a session with the NRO EC during the NRO EC F2F Meeting in Reykjavik in May.
NEW ACTION ITEM 20190219-7: PH/SS to edit the draft Proposal for Inter-RIR Security Cooperation and circulate for discussion prior to the NRO EC F2F Meeting in Reykjavik.
NEW ACTION ITEM 20190219-8: GV to inform the CCG that the NRO EC had approved the Workplan 2019 subject to edits to reflect that a teleconference would be held for the joint CCG and NRO EC session rather than a F2F meeting at RIPE 78.
NEW ACTION ITEM 20190219-9: GV to follow up with ECG regarding changes to the approved 2019 Workplan (Back up Registry and F2F Meeting locations) and to circulate the final version of the document.
NEW ACTION ITEM 20190219-10: GV to add \$10,000 (contingency) to the 2019 NRO budget in case the NRO EC decides to hire an external facilitator for its F2F meeting in Reykjavik.

1. Welcome

AB welcomed the attendees. He noted that PW had sent his apologies and would not be attending the call. SS acts on behalf of APNIC.

2. Agenda Review

No items were added to the agenda.

3. ASO Review

a) Update on ASO Future Structure Consultation

The NRO EC discussed the ASO Future Structure Consultation.

AB noted that the AFRINIC ASO AC representatives had conducted a community survey and had published a report. Based on the response rates and the feedback, it appears that the AFRINIC community was satisfied with the current role and function of the ASO within ICANN. He continued that the AFRINIC community had not requested significant changes. Now that all five RIR communities had given input, the NRO EC needed to consider the next steps.

JC noted that:

- The AFRINIC community had indicated that there is no need for change.
- The APNIC community had indicated that there is potential for change but not necessarily a strong need for change.
- The ARIN community indicated a strong need for change to the future structure of the ASO.

He continued that the NRO EC could either prepare a firm strawman proposal that suggests the future structure of the ASO or a community team/process needed to be put in place to do that. Either would work. There was, however, no clearly agreed outcome from the five communities.

OR agreed with JC: no clear path forward had emerged. He suggested that the RIR legal team be consulted in order to align what can be changed in regards to the ICANN MoU. He noted that he would prefer that the NRO EC proposed the way forward: it would not be easy to put together all the outcomes from the communities and choose a common path forward for all five regions. The legal team's advice would help define the best course of action.

AP agreed: there was not significant divergence between the communities and any changes would be relatively lightweight. He noted that the ARIN community strongly indicated that change was necessary but its view was not incompatible with the RIPE community's. Setting up a community team would mean overhead and delay. He agreed that the legal team could help the NRO EC come up with a proposal.

PH noted that this was consistent with what APNIC had discussed. APNIC supports an NRO EC-developed strawman proposal or the convening of a community team.

AB noted that he would prefer a more lightweight process and supported asking the legal team for input.

JC noted that the NRO EC needed to get legal advice but added that it would not be fair to task the legal team to draft a document for the next steps in the process: the NRO EC would need to put together a draft document and have the legal team give input.

OR clarified that he was not suggesting that the legal team drafted the proposal: the team should be asked to define the limits of the possibilities in terms of the ICANN MoU, the ICANN Bylaws and the Empowered Community Powers and note any implications. Then the NRO EC should conduct a full analysis of the community input and develop a document

AB noted that the NRO EC could ask the legal teams to go through the reports from the five regions and indicate whether the suggestions made could be implemented easily or whether there would be legal implications.

OR agreed: the NRO EC should document the specific actions and options under consideration. The legal team should then give input before any proposal was published to the communities so it was clear how much work would be involved in making the suggested changes. He noted that he would like to avoid a long-term plan just to make a name change, for example.

PH commented that some of the 17 Recommendations required changes to the MoU and to the ICANN Bylaws, which should be a straightforward task. A second task could be an analysis of the consultation process

(Recommendation 18) and the development of a set of options based on what the five RIRs have agreed. That way, the NRO EC would have enough material to enable it to move forward.

AB asked who would be tasked with documenting the options.

PH noted that, as some of the Recommendations involve changes to the MoU, the Bylaws and other documents, the legal team could propose the options.

AB suggested that for those Recommendations that state that the MoU or the Bylaws should be changed, the legal team could be tasked to come up with options. However, that should be delayed until the NRO EC had a clearer view of the bigger picture and how the RIRs' relationship with ICANN needed to change.

JC noted that the legal team needed to provide input before any proposal was put to the communities. For some of the first 17 Recommendations, it was clear that the MoU and Bylaws would need to be updated. He continued that the NRO EC had already discussed that it did not want to engage with ICANN on multiple occasions to make these updates. He suggested asking the legal team to take the first 17 Recommendations and provide a list of specific proposed changes, indicating which lines of the MoU and Bylaws would need to be changed to implement them. The NRO EC would then need to come up with a proposal on the outcome of the consultations (Recommendation #18). The legal team should then review the proposal and define what additional changes would need to be made to the MoU and Bylaws.

AB clarified that the legal team would be asked to provide a general description of what changes to the MoU and Bylaws were needed. Based on the discussion, he outlined the following way forward:

1. The legal team looks at the first 17 Recommendations and gives an overview of what changes to the MoU, ICANN Bylaws and other related documents are needed (specific text does not need to be provided).
2. An NRO EC volunteer drafts a strawman proposal for the 18th recommendation, based on the input from the five communities, and the NRO EC then provides its comments.
3. The legal team then provides comments on what changes are necessary in order to implement the strawman proposal and whether the proposal is compatible with the other 17 Recommendations.
4. The strawman proposal would then be put to the communities for comment.
5. The actual text necessary to implement the changes would then be drafted.

AB suggested that this could be further discussed during the NRO EC's upcoming F2F meeting.

NEW ACTION ITEM 20190219-01: AB to ask the legal teams to examine the first 17 Recommendations and give an overview of what changes to the MoU, ICANN Bylaws and other related documents are needed for implementation.

NEW ACTION ITEM 20190219-02: AP to draft Strawman proposal and circulate to the list.

NOTE: OR left the call. EM represents LACNIC.

b) Update Recommendations #6 (p.30): The ASO AC should ensure that procedures are developed for Steps 12, 15 and 16 of the GPDP as described in Attachment A of the ASO MoU.

AB noted this had been discussed during the January teleconference and that the ASO AC had been informed as per Action Item 20190122-1. However, he noted that he had not yet informed ICANN as he was awaiting input from ICANN staff on which parties should be contacted.

c) ASO AC New Procedures in Response to Recommendation #15 (p.41): ASO AC meetings should be open to the public, except for discussions regarding the selection of individuals for ICANN roles.

GV noted that the NRO EC had approved the ASO AC's proposed new procedures in response to Recommendation #15. PW had circulated some suggested text changes but these did not have any effect on the approval.

AB noted that he agreed with PW's comments.

JC noted that the new procedures were the ASO AC's output and that he did not think it was appropriate for the NRO EC to make changes to them. He suggested that a more collaborative approach would be for the NRO EC to approve the document as written and to send a note outlining the suggested edits that the ASO AC might want to consider implementing.

AB agreed. There were no objections.

NEW ACTION ITEM 20190219-3: AB to inform the ASO AC that the NRO EC has approved the ASO AC's proposed new procedures in response to Recommendation #15 and that the NRO EC also had some suggested text edits that the ASO AC might want to consider.

d) Update Recommendation #3: The NRO should adopt a procedure for conducting periodic reviews of the ASO in line with processes used by the ICANN Organizational Effectiveness Committee.

AB noted that all members of the NRO EC had already indicated their approval of this document.

The following resolution was proposed:

R-20190219-1: The NRO EC resolves to approve the NRO Process for Review of the ASO within ICANN (version: 19 November 2018).

JC proposed the motion to approve R-20190219. AB and EM seconded the motion. There were no objections. **R-20190219 was approved.**

NEW ACTION ITEM 20190219-4: Secretariat to publish NRO Process for Review of the ASO within ICANN (version: 19 November 2018) on the NRO website.

4. ICANN 64 Activities

a) Topics for Opening Plenary (Monday 11 Mar 2019 9:00)

AB noted that there was an open action on the Secretariat to provide input: *ACTION ITEM 20190122-6: Secretariat to circulate a list of potential topics for the ASO/NRO presentation during the ICANN 64 Opening Plenary.*

GV noted that he would circulate a list of topics by the end of the week.

b) Topics for joint ICANN-ASO Board Meeting (Tue 12 Mar 2019, 09:45-10:45)

The NRO EC discussed topics for the for joint ICANN-ASO Board Meeting

c) SO/AC Leaders Meeting (Fri 8 Mar 2019, 14:00-17:00)

AB noted that he and Aftab Siddiqui, ASO AC Chair, would attend.

d) Joint Meeting: ASO AC and NRO EC (Sun Mar 10 Time 17:00 - 18:30)

NRO EC to update the ASO AC on its progress on the ASO Review and consultations on the future structure of the ASO.

e) ASO AC Annual Meeting (Mon 11 Mar 2019)

AB noted that the ASO AC would hold its meeting and that NRO EC members could attend as observers if they wished.

f) ASO Session (Wed 13 March 2019, 13:30-15:00)

AB noted that, during the January teleconference, the NRO EC had decided that the decision to hold the ASO public session should be taken by the ASO AC.

GV noted that he had informed the ASO AC of the NRO EC's decision. The ASO AC decided to hold this session and had created a team consisting of one representative from each region to work on the session's agenda.

5. Legal Status of IP Addresses

The NRO EC discussed the legal status of IP address space.

NEW ACTION ITEM 20190219-5: Secretariat to ensure that a session with the RIR legal team is added to the agenda for the NRO EC F2F Meeting in Reykjavik in May.

NEW ACTION ITEM 20190219-6: All to prepare for their legal representatives to attend a session with the NRO EC during the NRO EC F2F Meeting in Reykjavik in May.

6. RIR Incident Response Coordination

The NRO EC discussed the Proposal for Inter-RIR Security Cooperation.

NEW ACTION ITEM 20190219-7: PH/SS to edit the draft Proposal for Inter-RIR Security Cooperation and circulate for discussion prior to the NRO EC F2F Meeting in Reykjavik.

7. Call for Public Comments on the IANA Performance Matrix Summary Report.

GV noted that he would add an item to the next NRO EC Teleconference if the IANA RC report were completed in time.

8. CG Reports

a) CCG

AB noted that the CCG had submitted its 2019 work plan for approval and gave an overview of proposed activities and tasks.

He noted that the CCG had asked for strategic direction from the NRO EC on whether there were community events other than ICANN and IGF that needed to have an RIR/NRO presence. He added that he thought the CCG should be identifying such events.

EM noted that he didn't think that there were events aside from ICANN or IGF that needed an NRO presence.

AB noted that the CCG should be able to support any presentations that the NRO needed to make at ICANN.

He asked the NRO EC whether it wanted the CCG to organize workshops at the IGF.

JC noted that the instead of discussing what could be done, the NRO should discuss what needed to be done. He continued that the CCG is, appropriately, asking if there was anything more it could do. However, an IGF workshop should only be held if there were compelling reasons to do so.

The NRO EC agreed.

AB noted that the CCG had asked for approval for a proposed F2F meeting in Morocco during ICANN 65.

JC noted that he had no objection to the CCG holding a F2F meeting once a year: it might not be crucial but it was aligned with another meeting and would help coordination.

AB noted that the CCG had also asked for a joint meeting with the NRO EC during RIPE 78 and that appointed CCG members would attend.

JC asked whether the NRO EC would have time to meet with the appointed CCG members during RIPE 78. He wondered what the NRO EC could communicate to them that wasn't already being communicated to them via the Secretariat.

EM noted that perhaps the CCG requested this F2F session to acquire more information from the NRO EC on what it needed to do. He proposed that, instead of an F2F meeting with the CCG, the NRO EC could schedule a 15 – 30 minute call with the CCG or the CCG Chair. He added that perhaps it would be a good idea to have such a call with all CGs to improve coordination.

AB proposed that the CCG Workplan 2019 be approved subject to edits to reflect that a teleconference would be held for the joint CCG and NRO EC session rather than an F2F meeting at RIPE 78.

The NRO EC agreed.

NEW ACTION ITEM 20190219-8: GV to inform the CCG that the NRO EC had approved the Workplan 2019 subject to edits to reflect that a teleconference would be held for the joint CCG and NRO EC session rather than a F2F meeting at RIPE 78.

b) ECG

GV noted that the NRO EC had previously approved the ECG workplan subject to some edits: the Back Up Registry should be in place by the end of the year and the ECG's F2F meetings should coincide with IETFs.

AB asked if the ECG was planning to meet at all three IETFs.

GV noted that that, as many ECG members were often in attendance at the IETF, the ECG usually tried to meet for 1-2 hours at every IETF to advance the workplan.

AB noted that the latest version of the document with the requested changes does not appear to have been circulated.

NEW ACTION ITEM 20190219-9: GV to follow up with ECG regarding changes to the approved 2019 Workplan (Back up Registry and F2F Meeting locations) and to circulate the final version of the document.

c) RSCG

GV noted that the NRO EC had approved the RSCG work plan in December.

d) Secretariat

- **Report ICANN Board Seat 10 Election Process.**

GV gave a progress report on the ICANN Board Seat 10 Election process.

- **Report on 2019 NRO Budget**

GV gave an overview of the 2019 NRO Budget.

He noted that the 2019 was similar to the 2018 budget and outlined two adjustments:

- Reduction in ASO AC Chair travel due to the ICANN meeting being located in Asia Pacific.
- \$20,000 had been requested for ASO website revamp.

GV asked if the NRO EC would like to consider bringing in a moderator for the upcoming F2F Meeting in Reykjavik to facilitate and support strategic planning.

AB suggested that an amount could be set-aside in the budget in case the NRO decided it needed to bring in a consultant to facilitate.

AP agreed.

JC noted that he was somewhat doubtful about bringing in facilitators who did not have familiarity with the RIRs and the issues faced by the NRO. He suggested that a facilitator only be considered if there was a concrete need. He noted that he had no objections to setting aside an amount in the budget but would like to see which consultant would be proposed before approving the budget allocation to hire them.

EM agreed. He added that the NRO EC needed to discuss the plans for the F2F meeting further and suggested that this topic be added to the agenda for the next teleconference.

NEW ACTION ITEM 20190219-10: GV to add \$10,000 (contingency) to the 2019 NRO budget in case the NRO EC decides to hire an external facilitator for its F2F meeting in Reykjavik.

9. Open Actions

NEW-ACTION ITEM 20190122-1: AB to send a message to ICANN and to the ASO AC regarding Steps 12, 15 and 16 (Recommendation #6).	IN PROGRESS
NEW-ACTION ITEM 20190122-4: ALL to review the ASO AC's proposed new procedures in response to Recommendation #15 by the February Teleconference.	CLOSED
NEW-ACTION ITEM 20190122-5: ALL to review the NRO Process for Review of the ASO within ICANN (version: 19 November 2018) by the February Teleconference.	CLOSED
NEW-ACTION ITEM 20190122-6: Secretariat to circulate a list of potential topics for the ASO/NRO presentation during the ICANN 64 Opening Plenary.	OPEN
NEW-ACTION ITEM 20190122-9: AB to send a note to the RSCG to ask for feedback on the proposal to restore granularity in the ASN Registry.	CLOSED
NEW-ACTION ITEM 20190122-10: ALL to ensure that the Call for Public Comments on the 2018 IANA Performance Matrix Summary Report is distributed to their respective communities.	CLOSED
ACTION ITEM 20181218-01: PW to circulate a draft proposal on Incidence Response before the February Teleconference.	CLOSED
ACTION ITEM 20181120-02: All to review the "NRO Process for Review of the ASO within ICANN (version: 19 November 2018)" for discussion during the December teleconference.	CLOSED
ACTION 20181019-1: All to review/share with respective Boards the 'Framework for Personal Data in the Internet Numbers Registry System' and report back by end of the 2018.	IN PROGRESS.
AB noted that all CEOs had shared with their Boards but noted that not everyone had reported back: he had shared it with the AFRINIC Board and the legal team but had not yet received feedback.	

ACTION 20181019-3: JC to circulate an outline for an RIR Cooperation Agreement document by early 2019.	OPEN
ACTION ITEM 20181009-5: All to review and subsequently approve the 2017 NRO distribution formula. AB noted that this action item had been pending for several months and should be closed.	OPEN

10. Next Meetings

a) **Teleconference Tuesday 19 March 2019**

b) **Teleconference Tuesday 16 April 2019**

c) **Next f2f Meeting Proposal**

Venue: RIPE 78 Reykjavik, Iceland

Date: 24 -25 May 2019

The NRO EC discussed the F2F meeting during Agenda Item 8d. Further discussions will take place during the March Teleconference.

11. Minutes Review

a) Teleconference 22 January 2019

The NRO EC approved the minutes from the January 2019 Teleconference. AB asked the Secretariat to publish the minutes on the NRO website.

12. AOB

- **F2F Meeting**

JC noted that he had pencilled in two days for the NRO EC F2F Meeting in Reykjavik. However, if it were not clear that two days were needed, he'd rather prepare for a one-day meeting for logistical reasons.

SS noted that there would be a session with the legal team as well as strategic discussions during the F2F so it was likely that two days would be needed.

AB agreed: there would be a lot to discuss so the NRO EC should plan for a two-day meeting.

13. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12.57 PM UTC.
