

2020-August-18: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference

Date: Tuesday, 18 August 2020, 11 am UTC.

Attendees

Executive Council:

Oscar Robles (OR)	LACNIC	Chair
John Curran (JC)	ARIN	Vice Chair/Secretary
Paul Wilson (PW)	APNIC	Treasurer
Eddy Kayihura (EK)	AFRINIC	
Hans Petter Holen (HPH)	RIPE NCC	

Observers:

Sanjaya	APNIC
Pablo Hinojosa (PH)	APNIC
Richard Jimmerson (RJ)	ARIN
Leslie Nobile (LN)	ARIN
Ernesto Majó (EM)	LACNIC
Kevin Swift (KS)	LACNIC
Chris Buckridge (CB)	RIPE NCC

Secretariat:

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

Agenda

0. Welcome

1. Agenda Review
2. Framework for NRO MoU 2020
3. Dstream Group Proposal for NRO Strategy and Development Plan
- 4.- Nameservers for the Address and Routing Parameter Area ("arpa") Domain
- 5.- Proposal of Resolution for financial support for IGF MAG Chair
6. Secretariat and CG Report/Consultation
 - a) Presentation from the Public Safety Coordination Group
7. Open Actions Review
8. Minutes Review
9. Next Meetings
 - a) Tuesday 22 September
 - b) Tuesday 20 October
 - c) Tuesday 17 November
 - d) Tuesday 15 December
10. AOB
11. Adjourn

Resolutions

Resolution 20200818-1 The NRO EC agrees to pledge \$25,000 USD for 2020 and for the next 2 two years (2021, 2022) for a total of \$75,000 USD to financially support Anriette Esterhuysen in her role of IGF MAG Chair.

New Action Items

The following action Items were assigned during this meeting:

New Open Action Item 20200818-1 PW to prepare a third draft of the Framework for the NRO MoU 2020 Document based on the discussion of the 18 August 2020 Teleconference.

New Open Action Item 20200818-2 OR to respond Dstream proposal with the NRO EC decision.

New Open Action Item 20200818-3 GV and OR to draft a basic timeline for the NRO strategic development process.

New Open Action Item 20200818-4 OR to contact Kim Davis to consult him about the impact to the RIRs of the proposed changes to the RFC 3172.

Minutes

0. Welcome

OR welcomed all participants and started the meeting at 11:02 AM UTC

1. Agenda Review

OR asked for any new items for the agenda.

No new items were suggested.

2. Framework for NRO MoU 2020

PW presented the second draft of the framework for the new NRO MoU

JC thanked PW for his work and expressed support to keep proceeding with the task. JC said that in general he preferred to focus in clarifying the NRO MoU so there is no need to go back and revisit it again in the near future. JC commented he was in favour of having abstracts and functional descriptions rather than agreeing in the specifics. JC volunteered to take an editor pen after the version three or four of the document.

JC added that the NRO EC have talked about having an objective criteria for recognition of new RIRs but there is no discussions about how to handle possible ongoing issues, for example if a RIR strays from the straight narrow path..

JC pointed out that the MoU may need to be clear if the NRO principles that all RIRs are mutually agreeing should include the number registry parties downstream (LIR, ISP, NIR, etc)

JC considered that the current mission and vision of the NRO are still sufficiently long lasting and appropriate.

OR thanked PW for his work and asked him to continue with a third draft.

PW invited the NRO EC to send their comments or revisions to the document.

New Open Action Item 20200818-1 PW to prepare a third draft of the Framework for the NRO MoU 2020 Document based on the discussion of the 18 August 2020 Teleconference.

3. Dstream Group Proposal for NRO Strategy and Development Plan

The NRO EC discussed the proposal from Dstream group.

OR reminded that in the mailing list it was suggested to ask Dstream to first help draft the actual process rather than keep waiting for the actual workshop. OR said that the NRO has not agreed yet in the process that it wants to conduct.

PW suggested it was unrealistic to expect someone else to design an entire process for us including all plans and costs, and we're unlikely to receive a suitable proposal without extensive consultations being undertaken to develop it.

PW suggested that the NRO could request a piece of work, up to a certain budget or up to a certain time allowance, to produce a full plan with costings, co-developed with the NRO.

JC considered that if the NRO is going to do a strategy development effort then we should agree first on the process like how much money we want to put in and when we want to do it and afterwards determine how to get a facilitator for it.

OR agreed with JC.

OR said that the NRO EC should start the definition of our own strategic process first and then come back to them if they are still willing to propose something and look for some other providers as well.

HPH agreed with JC. HPH considered that the NRO EC needs to agree first on what we want to achieve and then we can figure out whether Dstream or somebody else can support us or whether we have the resources to run the process ourselves.

EK said that the NRO may not be ready yet to engage into this proposal.

OR suggested to ask GV to draft a basic timeline of the NRO strategic planning process.

JC considered that before that the NRO would need to provide more guidance. JC suggested that the NRO EC work on a plan that includes the revising of our strategy and vision, the plan should be part of next year NRO work plan and for that we should put a timeline together to support it in the budget, including the hiring of external consultant to support it. JC suggested to answer Dstream accordingly.

OR agreed in the approach of the answer to Dstream. OR said that he'd like to have a general timeline and timeframe first before the actual process so we can see when we want to have the discussions next year that would help us to realize what we need and when we need it.

PW suggested that the NRO could have something started in the course of this year.

JC mentioned that preparations can start this year but the NRO did not budget it for this year and it was not part of this year's plan even the prep work.

JC suggested that NRO EC firmly agree that it's going to be part of next year NRO plan. JC added that he had no objection for starting early as long as everyone is ok with the budget increase this year and the shared expense.

JC stressed in the importance that the NRO should agree in committing to the whole process, that it's going to run for a while, it's going to have costs involved and we're doing a vendor selection based on receiving a proposal.

Regarding the timeline, HPH expressed concerns of involving RIPE NCC staff in interviews before November as they are currently busy with the development of the five-year strategic plan and their GM meeting at the end of October. HPH said that it could be back in the agenda in November.

New Open Action Item 20200818-2 OR to respond Dstream proposal with the NRO EC decision.

New Open Action Item 20200818-3 GV and OR to draft a basic timeline for the NRO strategic development process.

4.- Nameservers for the Address and Routing Parameter Area ("arpa") Domain

HPH said that it seems that neither the server operators nor the RIR seems to be involved in the proposed document. HPH said that from the technical point of view is the right thing to do but he asked if the RIRs should be more proactive so it was clear what are the consequences of such changes.

PW said that the document was still a draft, we have an opportunity to respond. PW suggested to get in touch with Jari or Kim formally or informally, with comment on the draft. PW added that the RIRs are key stakeholders in the matter and that he preferred to see an active involvement, to be in the decision process rather than waiting to be consulted.

JC suggested to contact Kim and ask him how this can affect the RIRs and how does he expect us to be involved in the process.

JC pointed out that someone has to lead the NRO response as this is an IETF activity so it's not organizations talking to organizations but rather individual contributors talking to each other so in the case of the NRO, we may need to coordinate it with our engineering staff or someone from the NRO EC.

OR suggested that he can contact Kim and ask him how the proposed document can affect the RIRs. For the purpose of the communication with Kim Davies OR asked if the NRO was willing to contribute to the draft document or the RFC.

JC said that he didn't see new infrastructure in the draft proposal just a dedicated new set of host names that would be used as aliases. JC commented that we are not really in a position to move the reverse DNS as it's encoded in billions of computers. JC said that as primary users of certain reverse queries he would have expected a better liaison. JC supported OR to reach out Kim and see this having an effect on us as the RIR are the biggest user of .arpa.

New Open Action Item 20200818-4 OR to contact Kim Davis to consult him about the impact to the RIRs of the proposed changes to the RFC 3172.

5.- Proposal of Resolution for financial support for IGF MAG Chair

GV reminded that the decision was reached in the mailing but for the purpose of transparency and proper documentation the proposed resolution was part of the minute's agenda.

OR reconfirmed the decision and ask GV to record the resolution.

Resolution 20200818-1 The NRO EC agrees to pledge \$25,000 USD for 2020 and for the next 2 two years (2021, 2022) for a total of \$75,000 USD to financially support Anriette Esterhuysen in her role of IGF MAG Chair.

6. Secretariat and CG Report/Consultation

a) Presentation from the Public Safety Coordination Group

KS said that the intention of the update was to give the NRO EC a couple of points of information on what the PSCG have done thus far being PSCG the most recent group that was constituted after the face to face meeting at the end of ICANN 66 in Montreal last year.

KS reminded that the PSCG scope consists mainly in conducting public education and outreach to public safety organizations on matters that pertain to the numbers community on how we operate in response to potentially illegal activities, but being clear we do not lead in operational security or information security matters.

KS said that this report would include the operationalization of the PSCG charter, some of the activities and accomplishments that the CG have done, and the last point would be about the M3AAWG proposal.

KS reported that after the last face to face meeting last year in ICANN 66 the PSCG adopted with immediate effect the EC advice on ensuring we have concise public information on how we support law enforcement on our website, so far the information is published in at least three of the registries. KS said that this information is dedicated to the LEAs and for the most part refers to the databases, on how to interpret data and the steps to follow to request other types of information through legal orders. KS confirmed that through consultation with legal staff they ensure that the non-disclosure agreements remain valid.

KS said that through the assistance of the NRO secretariat the PSCG have a dedicated mailing list, access credentials for the NRO wiki, and a dedicated space where we update frequently our meetings, our materials and other useful items, for instance, we have a common slide deck that we all use with our engagements with LEAs. KS pointed out the PSCG efforts to ensure that there is a high level of consistency in our message with public safety organizations.

KS said that In terms of the PSCG calls, this is done on an on-demand basis, and added that it was largely in part to the particularities of this year, where a lot of the plans and activities that we had in the start of the year did not pan out because of the pandemic.

KS commented that pursuant with the objectives of the Charter, the PSCG produced a common flyer branded under the NRO, which gives a basic outline about the RIRs, the link between the RIRs and law enforcement within the framework of network security and the type of information found within our database and what can be done in instances of supporting law enforcement investigations.

Within the context of PSCG meetings KS commented that the PSCG have exchanged knowledge and ideas concerning ceased operations or online capacity building for law enforcement from our colleagues specifically in LACNIC and RIPE NCC respectively. KS reported that PSCG representatives have participated recently within the UN expert group on dangerous substance trafficking through social media and other internet related services.

KS said that at the end of that meeting within the resulting draft documents, the RIR were not originally included in the text but the PSCG suggested that the RIRs were added considering we are visible member in the Internet community and able to work along with other public safety organizations. KS pointed out that the PSCG was very mindful of the fact that these types of documents are not binding or permitting on our behalf, it was really a question of ensuring visibility within trust communities.

KS also mentioned that the PSCG have an ongoing collaboration with ICANN in the person of Carlos Alvarez, where we have engage in two initiatives one Europe in collaboration with Europol and the second in the Americas in collaboration with Interpol, KS added that in these engagements the primary targets are the heads of cyber units of the police forces across these regions.

KS said that as a result of these collaborations the PSCG have a database of contacts in the in Cyber units of LEA, which has been particularly useful in this period. KS added that PSCG is working to come up with a common database of these law enforcement contacts to facilitate the relation and liaison with the actors who are working on a more global international scale.

Finally KS mentioned about the M3AAWG proposal to be sent soon to the NRO EC, the idea behind of the proposal is that we want to be able to enhance our outreach efforts among trust communities and this particular proposal give us an opportunity to provide technical knowledge on security and abuse issues that the numbers committee face. KS said that the RIRs could also have the ability to have first-hand interaction with a lot of key cyber security and information security actors.

KS said that probably by the next NRO EC meeting you would have the proposal before you and with advance notification and proper documentation of what this proposal consists of.

7. Open Actions Review

OR asked GV to go ahead with the review of the recent changes in open action status.

<p>Action Item 20200721-1. PW to prepare a second draft of the Framework for the NRO MoU 2020 Document based on the discussion of the 21 July 2020 Teleconference.</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <p>Presented and discussed as part of the agenda. CLOSED</p>	CLOSED
--	--------

<p>Action Item 20200721-3. GV to organise the contribution (\$75,000 USD) to UN IGF Trust Fund.</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <p>GV confirmed that APNIC has the bank wire information to transfer the resources to UN Trust Fund. IN PROGRESS</p>	IN PROGRESS
---	-------------

<p>Action Item 20200721-4. GV to organise the signing of the Cooperation on The Internet Number Registry System document and publish it in the NRO Website.</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <p>GV said that the document was now signed by all RIR CEO. Next step would be to draft an announcement having the CCG and EC to review it and publish it. IN PROGRESS</p>	IN PROGRESS
---	-------------

<p>Action Item 202004201-3: GV to prepare a proposal for filling the vacant Secretariat Support role and circulate on the NRO EC mailing list.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>GV said that he received the last approval from the NRO EC on the contract for the new person to support the NRO Secretariat. GV confirmed that he would coordinate with OR the signing of the new contract. CLOSED</p>	<p>CLOSED</p>
---	---------------

8. Minutes Review

HPH observed that people can still make changes or comments after one of the NRO EC members post his approval to the minutes. HPH asked how the rest of the NRO EC work with that.

OR said that in his case the NRO wiki notifies him of any changes so the platform keep you inform when someone else make a change. OR added that most of the times we focus on our specific quotations, it is not usual someone changes other person comments.

JC said that he would recommend if there are substantial changes or you are commenting or correcting other people remark this can be call out in the mailing list. JC pointed out that he presumes people don't edit each other statement but if that it's the case this can be call out.

9. Next Meetings

- a) Tuesday 22 September
- b) Tuesday 20 October
- c) Tuesday 17 November
- d) Tuesday 15 December

GV reminded that the September meeting is one week after the original date as agreed in the doodle poll in the mailing list

JC said that for the November meeting Richard Jimmerson would be representing ARIN.

10. AOB

11. Adjourn

OR thanked all participants and adjourned the meeting at 12:24 UTC