

2019-Nov-8: Minutes NRO EC F2F Meeting Montreal

Date: Friday, 8 November 2019 | 14:00 EST (-5 UTC).

Attendees

Executive Council:

Axel Pawlik (AP)	RIPE NCC	Chair
Paul Wilson (PW)	APNIC	Vice Chair/Secretary
Oscar Robles (OR)	LACNIC	Treasurer
Patrisse Deesse	AFRINIC	
John Curran (JC)	ARIN	

Observers:

Vika Mpsinane (CM)	AFRINIC Board
Craig Ng	APNIC
Gaurab Raj Upadhaya	APNIC
Paul Andersen (PA)	ARIN Board
Michael Abejuela	ARIN
Leslie Nobile (LN)	ARIN
Esteban Lescano	LACNIC
Ernesto Majó (EM)	LACNIC

Kevon Swift (KS)	LACNIC
Chris Buckridge (CB)	RIPE NCC
Dick Leaning	RIPE NCC

Secretariat:

German Valdez (GV)	NRO Secretariat
Susannah Gray (SG)	NRO Secretariat (Minutes)

Agenda

0. Welcome
1. Agenda Review
2. PSCG Charter
3. ASO Review Next Steps
 - a) Review List of Recommendations
 - b) ASO future Structure
 - c) Timing and Process for next ASO Review
4. ITU
5. Cooperation on the Internet Number Registry System
6. Secure Routing Consortium
7. SLA Changes for the IANA Numbering Services regarding RDNS
8. 2020 NRO EC Strategic Planning Meeting
9. 2020 NRO EC roles
10. CG and Secretariat Reports/Consultations
11. Open Actions Review
12. Minutes Review
13. Next Meetings
14. AOB
15. Adjourn

Resolutions

No resolutions were passed during this meeting.

New Action Items

The following action Items were assigned during this meeting:

New Action Item 20191108-1: LN to add text to the draft PSCG Charter noting that the PSCG could coordinate with any CG as necessary and send the final version to the NRO EC.
New Action Item 20191108-2: JC to contact ARIN's law firm to produce a summary of the references to the ASO and SOs in the ICANN Bylaws.
New Action Item 20191108-3: GV to inform NRO EC when the upcoming ASO Review process needs to be initiated
New Action Item 20191108-4: Secretariat to send a clean version of the NRO-IRNS-JPAA document to the NRO EC.
New Action Item 20191108-5: All to send the NRO-IRNS-JPAA document to their respective Boards and report back on progress.
New Action Item 20191108-6: All to review the SRC document, pass onto respective Boards and report back during the December teleconference.
New Action Item 20191108-7: GV to send a note to the NRO EC detailing the NRO EC roles for the rest of 2019 and the next two years. An announcement should be made on the website.
New Action Item 20191108-8: GV to inform ICANN of the changes to the Empowered Community <i>Decisional Participant Representative</i> (changes to OR) and the <i>Empowered Community Administration Representative</i> (changes to JC).
New Action Item 20191108-9: GV to ask ICANN whether it could assist with translations of the revised ASO MoU.
New Action Item 20191108-10: GV to implement the steps in the ASO Procedure for Empowered Community Approval Actions.

0. Welcome

AP welcomed the attendees.

1. Agenda Review

No items were added to the agenda.

2. PSCG Charter

LN gave overview of the draft PSCG Charter.

CB asked if formalizing the group would significantly change how staff representatives had been working together already.

LN noted that there would be no change.

PW asked if the PSCG would be interacting with the Incident Response Team (IRT).

JC noted that it was possible that an incident might involve law enforcement and the PSCG might need to interact with the IRT but that it didn't need to be specified in the text.

OR suggested that the text could be amended to note that the PSCG could coordinate with any CG as necessary.

The NRO EC approved the draft PSCG Charter pending the minor amendment noted by OR.

New Action Item 20191108-1: LN to add text to the draft PSCG Charter noting that the PSCG could coordinate with any CG as necessary and send the final version to the NRO EC.

LN, DL and KS left the meeting.

3. ASO Review Next Steps

a) Review List of Recommendations

JC noted that now that the revised ICANN ASO MoU had been signed, the Recommendation table should be updated.

SG asked whether Recommendation #1 should remain as Deferred.

JC noted that Recommendation #1 could not be closed until the outcome of Recommendation #18 was finalized: ICANN would need to be informed of whether the ASO name would be changed and at the same time other changes to the Bylaws could be suggested.

CN noted that the ASO MoU contained a clause about the review mechanism. Recommendation #1 was just a reinforcement for what was already included in the MoU.

JC noted that Recommendation #1 could be closed for now but revisions would need to be done in the future in any case as the ASO MoU and the ICANN Bylaws were not aligned.

CN commented that ASO MoU paragraph 9 stated "*With reference to the provisions of Article 4, Section 4.4 of the ICANN ByLaws, the NRO shall provide its own review mechanisms.*"

JC agreed that section 4.4 of the ICANN Bylaws did not specifically exclude the ASO from having its review mechanism set by ICANN.

CN commented that section 4.4 allowed the ICANN Board to call for a review but that the ASO MoU enables the ASO to provide its own mechanisms.

JC agreed that recommendation #1 might therefore now be unnecessary.

PW agreed. He added that, now the revised ICANN ASO MoU had been signed, he was under the impression that the entire Review could now be closed.

The NRO EC went through the Recommendations that were still not fully completed:

- ***Recommendation #1: ICANN should consider updating its Bylaws to reflect the fact that the NRO will, like the GAC, and according to the ASO MoU, provide its own review mechanism for the review of ASO.***

JC noted that there were still some requirements in the ICANN Bylaws that the ASO needed to adhere to: the reviews must be done every five years by independent entities and ICANN's three requirements must be included in the review (4.4a i-iii). He added that if all of these were acceptable there would be no reason to request changes to the Bylaws at this point.

The NRO EC agreed to close this recommendation: The NRO EC considers that changes to the ICANN Bylaws are not strictly necessary at this point. The revised ASO ICANN MoU (signed on 7 November 2019) and the ICANN Bylaws currently provide enough flexibility with regards to the review mechanism. However, the NRO EC could request that ICANN implement this recommended change in the future.

- ***Recommendation #2: The NRO should consider updating the ASO MoU to reflect the fact that the appropriate section of the New ICANN Bylaws regarding Organizational Reviews is Section 4.4 (previously Article IV, Section 4).***

The NRO EC agreed to close this recommendation: The revised MoU was signed on 7 November 2019.

- ***Recommendation #4: The signatories of the ASO MoU should consider updates to the MoU including i) the addition of AFRINIC as a signatory, ii) the removal of Appendix B. iii) updates in connection with the responsibilities of the ASO as a Decisional Participant in the ICANN Empowered Community.***

The NRO EC agreed to close this recommendation: The revised MoU was signed on 7 November 2019.

- ***Recommendation #5: Upon completion of every independent review of the ASO, the NRO and ICANN should initiate discussions, as per Article 9 of the MoU, to examine results and consequences of their cooperation. The parties should determine if the ASO has a continuing purpose within the ICANN structure, and re-evaluate the MoU accordingly.***

The NRO EC agreed to close this recommendation: the NRO has and will continue to consult with ICANN on the output of this and future reviews.

- ***Recommendation #17: In the interests of transparency, the ASO website should be updated with recent presentations, contact details and an archive of the activities of both the ASO AC and NRO EC.***

The NRO EC agreed to close this recommendation: updating the website is a continuing project.

SG noted that the new ASO website project was in progress and that the developer would be starting actual development work during the coming week.

- ***Recommendation #18: The NRO should initiate a public consultation, involving the five RIR communities, to determine the future structure of the ASO.***

The NRO EC agreed to close this recommendation: public consultations were initiated and the review will continue as needed.

b) ASO Future Structure (ICANN Bylaws)

JC noted that he had drafted guidance for the Legal Team to assess ICANN's Bylaws. In order for the NRO EC to go through each of the 100+ references to the ASO and SOs, a summary needed to be produced. He continued that it appears the RIR legal teams are already busy enough and suggested that an external law firm be retained to complete this task.

OR noted that an external law firm might not be able to give a complete analysis as some strategic knowledge would be necessary to produce a complete overview. The NRO EC would need to review the output very carefully.

JC commented that the actual analysis must be done by the NRO EC: the law firm would only be able to extract and summarize the information and it would be the NRO EC's task to go through it.

The NRO EC agreed that JC would contact ARIN's outside law firm familiar with ICANN regarding this task. If the cost for this work were to exceed US\$10k, he would report back to the NRO EC before making any agreement.

New Action Item 20191108-2: JC to contact ARIN's law firm to produce a summary of the references to the ASO and SOs in the ICANN Bylaws.

c) Timing and Process for Next ASO Review

PW noted that, as the next review cycle would be coming up, it would be a good idea to review and perfect the timelines.

JC noted that the ICANN Bylaws state: "*These periodic reviews shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years, based on feasibility as determined by the Board. Each five-year cycle will be computed from the moment of the reception by the Board of the final report of the relevant review Working Group.*"

He noted that the ASO Review report was published in August 2017 so the next review would need to be concluded by August 2022.

AP noted that the NRO EC should draft the call for tender in 2020 and aim to start the review process in 2021.

GV noted that the review timeline was triggered four years after the previous cycle completed. The previous call for tender was drafted in 2017, ITEMS was selected to do the review in Q1 2018, and it completed its review over the rest of that year.

JC noted that there was a timeline for review initiation in the Number Resource Organization (NRO) Process for Review of the Address Support Organization (ASO) within ICANN (section II). According to this timeline, the process should be initiated in 2020.

GV noted that no additional budget would need to be requested for 2020 but would need to be considered for the 2021 budget.

New Action Item 20191108-3: GV to inform NRO EC when the upcoming ASO Review process needs to be initiated.

4. ITU

The NRO EC discussed the ITU.

5. Cooperation on the Internet Number Registry System

The NRO EC discussed Cooperation on the Internet Number Registry System.

New Action Item 20191108-4: Secretariat to send a clean version of the NRO-IRNS-JPAA document to the NRO EC.

New Action Item 20191108-5: All to send the NRO-IRNS-JPAA document to their respective Boards and report back on progress.

6. Secure Routing Consortium

The NRO EC discussed the Prospectus for Secure Routing Consortium (SRC) Membership.

JC noted that Bill Woodcock, PCH, had asked for the NRO's support for the SRC project, which proposed to build an infrastructure to measure route resilience and integrity. He continued that it could be valuable for network operators to see the state of routing infrastructure globally and to see if their routes were capable of being hijacked or whether they were being filtered. RIPE Atlas doesn't currently measure routing. He continued however, that measuring the ability to hijack/filter a route requires sending traffic that some might consider to be illegitimate.

JC added that he supported the project but did not know how much financial support ARIN could give. He was however, concerned about deploying new infrastructure if the existing RIPE Atlas probes could be used.

AP agreed: it was an interesting proposal but he was concerned about duplication and the similarity to RIPE Atlas. He suggested that RIR staff could be consulted.

PW commented that he had already consulted APNIC staff, who were unenthusiastic, noting ongoing costs, unclear value proposition and potential duplication. However, if there was demonstrated value, APNIC might be able to support it.

CB noted that, if RIPE Atlas could be extended and this project could be implemented on the existing infrastructure, there could potentially be more enthusiasm for it.

OR commented that it seems the difference between the SRC and RIPE Atlas was the ability to send illegitimate packets. If that is correct, it looked like a lot of money to invest just for this feature. If this was something that was relevant for the community, then the NRO should consider supporting this initiative so that sending illegitimate traffic was done with the least damage and it was not the NRO's responsibility. He added that he would pass the document to the LACNIC technical area for further comment.

AP noted that he was unsure whether RIPE Atlas could be used for this purpose, as there could be both technical and legal issues. If illegitimate traffic was being sent out on behalf of the RIPE NCC there could be an issue with perception.

PW noted that he had asked if RIPE Atlas could be used for BCP38 checking and staff had noted that they would not want to use Atlas to generate invalid traffic.

JC noted that BW was looking for two things: support and money. The project already had four sponsors but the RIR lending their support to this would also be valuable. He continued that he saw the value in having infrastructure with these capabilities but was unsure whether it was for the RIRs to provide funding. The operator community had conferences but there was not an association that takes on responsibility for infrastructure.

GU noted that CAIDA had an infrastructure measurement project in place, [Archipelago](#) (Ark), which used Raspberry Pis and was similar to the proposed SRC.

New Action Item 20191108-6: All to review the SRC document, pass onto respective Boards and report back during the December teleconference.

7. SLA Changes for the IANA Numbering Services regarding RDNS

OR explained that this item was discussed after the IANA Reverse DNS resolution incident in February and the NRO had agreed that some level of service should be added to the IANA Numbering Services SLA regarding RDNS resolution. There was an action on the NRO EC to review the document with staff:

Action Item 20190820-4: AP to follow up on action item 20190618-1 and ask the ECG and legal team to provide a report on the proposed changes to the SLA for the IANA Numbering Services regarding RDNS before the September NRO EC Teleconference.

OR continued that parallel to this, IANA/PTI was asked about its current service levels so that the NRO could ensure that it did not ask for something too far from what IANA/PTI already provides. He added that IANA/PTI had provided details regarding the current performance levels: this should now be reviewed.

CN noted that the previous SLA was a community effort and had been drafted regionally by the CRISP team. He asked if changes to the SLA would also need to go through regional consultations again.

CN suggested that the RC could ask the IANA Numbering Services Review Committee (IANA RC) to review the proposed changes to the SLA. The first step would be to talk to the ECG and if it was happy with the technical concepts, the Legal Team could then review it.

OR noted that once changes were made, the SLA would become an actual SLA: currently there were little or no definitions of service levels in the SLA.

AP asked the NRO EC to act on the following open action item:

Action Item: 0190524-4: ALL to review and comment on the document on proposed changes to the SLA for the IANA Numbering Service for inverse DNS resolution.

8. 2020 NRO EC Strategic Planning Meeting

OR explained that he had suggested holding a strategic planning meeting in 2019 once the new AFRINIC CEO was in place. However, this meeting should probably now wait until the second half of next year, when the new RIPE NCC CEO might also be in place.

AP suggested that, in the interim, the NRO EC could update each other on their respective strategy as part of its regular information share.

GU commented that, with two new CEOs in two RIRs, it would be a good idea to have a strategic retreat.

CB noted that the RIPE NCC's Board has noted that it would like to have a new CEO in place by April 2020.

AP noted that the Board had put in place a three-person interim management team. Kaveh Ranjbar (KR) was expected to take over AP's external activities, including the NRO EC activities. He added that KR was familiar with the RIPE NCC's strategic planning.

The NRO EC concluded that the NRO strategic meeting should take place mid-2020.

9. 2020 NRO EC roles

After discussion, the NRO EC decided on the following:

Upon AP's departure in November 2019, LACNIC (OR) would take over as Chair for the remainder of 2019. The Vice Chair (PW) and Treasurer (OR) positions would stay the same until the end of the year.

As the incoming Vice Chair/Secretary in 2020, JC would take over as the *Empowered Community Administration Representative*.

The 2020 roles are as follows:

Chair: LACNIC

Vice Chair/Secretary: ARIN

Treasurer: APNIC

The 2021 roles are as follows:

Chair: RIPE NCC

Vice Chair/Secretary: LACNIC

Treasurer: ARIN

The 2022 roles are as follows:

Chair: ARIN

Vice Chair/Secretary: APNIC

Treasurer: AFRINIC

New Action Item 20191108-7: GV to send a note to the NRO EC detailing the NRO EC roles for the rest of 2019 and the next two years. An announcement should be made on the website.

New Action Item 20191108-8: GV to inform ICANN of the changes to the Empowered Community *Decisional Participant Representative* (changes to OR) and the *Empowered Community Administration Representative* (changes to JC).

10. CG and Secretariat Reports/Consultations

a) Secretariat report on IGF Preparations

GV noted that the NRO had secured a booth for the upcoming IGF in Berlin. He added that, this year, the IGF would be as paperless as possible and each booth had been designated its own web page to upload digital documents. The CCG had developed a communications plan and had identified all relevant sessions and workshops. The CCG would also be tweeting throughout the event and would invite participants to visit the booth. He added that RIR staff had also been invited to give short talks on topics of relevance at the booth throughout the event.

GV continued that the technical community (ISOC, ICANN and the NRO) had again organized a reception and the NRO EC had allocated US\$8,500 for this purpose. He noted that there would be 600 people at the event and the NRO were able to invite 140 people. There would be an online registration system to track attendance.

CB noted that over 5,000 people had registered for the IGF. As the number of invites was limited, the NRO should think about how this could be enforced.

b) Translation of the new revised ASO MoU Document.

Status: As a result of the previous ASO Review, key documents have been translated to Portuguese, Spanish, Chinese, French and Arabic. NRO EC to confirm resources for translations of the recent revised ASO MoU document.

GV explained that the previous ASO Review (2011) had recommended that key documents (ASO MoU, global policies) be translated. The translations of the ASO MoU would now need to be updated. He added that, as this was not part of the budget, he was asking the NRO EC for extra resources for this task.

JC suggested that ICANN, as one of the signatories, be asked if it could provide translations.

CB noted that a Russian version would be useful.

New Action Item 20191108-9: GV to ask ICANN whether it could assist with translations of the revised ASO MoU.

11. Open Actions Review

Action Item 20191015-1: AP to send a note to ICANN documenting the proposed changes to the ASI MoU and asking whether it would be ready to sign a new MoU during the ICANN 66 Meeting in Montreal.
--

CLOSED

<p>Action Item 20191015-2: All to review the proposed amendment to the Fundamental Bylaws regarding the IANA Naming Functions Review Composition to develop an NRO position.</p> <p>Discussion: AP noted that he had attended the Approval Action Community Forum on 3 November 2019 to discuss the proposed Fundamental Bylaw Amendment concerning the composition of the IANA Function Review Team. The Empowered Community Representatives now have 21 days to comment. He added that the NRO EC had decided to abstain from voting, as the proposed Fundamental Bylaw change was not relevant to the role of the Numbers community.</p> <p>New Action Item 20191108-10: GV to implement the steps in the ASO Procedure for Empowered Community Approval Actions.</p>	<p>CLOSED (replaced by New Action Item 20191108-9)</p>
<p>Action Item 20191015-3: AP to follow up with Carlos Reyes regarding the NRO's participation in the Approval Action Community Forum at ICANN 66.</p>	<p>CLOSED</p>
<p>Action Item 20191015-5: JC to inform ICANN that the NRO would not be able to offer sponsorship to ICANN for the ICANN 66 Gala.</p>	<p>CLOSED</p>
<p>Action Item 20191015-6: All to review the RSCG 2020 Work Plan.</p> <p>Discussion: AP asked the Secretariat to add this as an agenda item to the upcoming teleconference.</p>	<p>IN PROGRESS</p>
<p>Action Item 20191015-7: Secretariat to coordinate with the ECG on what information on TALs could be added to the RPKI page on the NRO website.</p>	<p>IN PROGRESS</p>
<p>Action Item 20191015-8: All to review the draft instructions for the Legal Team's analysis of the ICANN Bylaws asap and provide edit or approve so that the Legal Team can work on this task before the F2F Meeting in Montreal.</p> <p>Discussion: See discussion under Agenda Item 3b and New Action Item 20191108-2: JC to contact ARIN's law firm to produce a summary of the references to the ASO and SOs in the ICANN Bylaws.</p>	<p>CLOSED (see New Action Item 20191108-2)</p>
<p>Action Item 20190820-1: PW to ask PSCG representatives to update the draft PSCG mandate/goals with details about communication methods and confidentiality issues and report back to the NRO EC before the September NRO EC Meeting</p>	<p>CLOSED</p>
<p>Action Item 20190820-4: AP to follow up on action item 20190618-1 and ask the ECG and legal team to provide a report on the proposed changes to the SLA for the IANA Numbering Services regarding RDNS before the September NRO EC</p>	<p>OPEN</p>
<p>ACTION ITEM 20190716-1: JC to draft instructions for the legal team's analysis of the ICANN Bylaws.</p>	<p>CLOSED (see New Action Item 20191108-2)</p>
<p>ACTION ITEM 0190524-4: ALL to review and comment on the document on proposed changes to the SLA for the IANA Numbering Service for reverse DNS resolution.</p> <p>Discussion: See discussion under Agenda item 6.</p>	<p>IN PROGRESS</p>

12. Minutes Review

- [2019-October 20: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference](#) - **DRAFT** (Pending: ALL)
- [2019-September 17: Minutest NRO EC Teleconference](#) - **DRAFT** (Pending: ARIN, LACNIC)
- [2019-August 20: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference](#)- **DRAFT** (Pending: ARIN)
- [2019-July-16: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference](#)- **DRAFT** (Pending: ARIN, LACNIC)

AP asked the NRO EC to approve the outstanding minutes as soon as possible.

13. Next Meetings

a) Next NRO EC F2F Meeting

The NRO agreed that the next F2F Meeting would take place at ICANN 67 in Cancun, Mexico on 13th March 2020 (tentative).

b) Tuesday 19 November Teleconference

The NRO EC agreed to cancel the November teleconference.

c) Tuesday 17 December Teleconference (last of the year)

The NRO EC rescheduled this meeting to 10 December 2019.

d) Tuesday 21 January Teleconference (new roles in place)

The NRO EC decided that this teleconference would go ahead as scheduled.

14. AOB

CB asked the Secretariat to add KR to the NRO EC mailing list and NRO wiki.

15. Adjourn

The Meeting was adjourned at 16:39 EST (UTC -5).