# 2020-May-19: Minutes NRO EC Meeting Teleconference

**FINAL**

**Date: Tuesday, 19 May 2020, 10 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:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Subramanian Moonesamy (SM) | AFRINIC |
| Pablo Hinojosa (PH) | APNIC |
| Paul Andersen (PA) | ARIN |
| Richard Jimmerson (RJ) | ARIN |
| Ernesto Majó (EM) | LACNIC |
| Chris Buckridge (CB) | RIPE NCC |

**Secretariat:**

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

# Agenda

0. Welcome

1. Agenda Review

2. Cooperation on the Internet Number Registry System (NRO-INRS-JPAA)

3. Review of ASO/NRO in ICANN's

4. US Government Issues Draft Guidance for Public Comment regarding Federal Agency IPv6 strategy

5. SLA Update to Include Reverse DNS (Depending on ICANN/IANA response)

6. AOB

7. Adjourn

# Resolutions

No resolutions were passed during this meeting.

# New Action Items

The following action Items were assigned during this meeting:

| |
|---|
| New Action Item 20200518-1: GV to circulate the last version of the Cooperation on the Internet Number Registry System document (NRO-INRS-JPAA) including LACNIC last changes**.** |
| New Action Item 20200518-3: All CEO to complete the review of ASO/NRO in ICANN's Bylaws Excel |

# 0. Welcome

OR Welcomed the participants and opened the call at 10:03 AM UTC

# 1. Agenda Review

OR Asked for new topics for the agenda. No new items were added.

## 2. Cooperation on the Internet Number Registry System (NRO-INRS-JPAA)

JC explained the context on how the document was proposed by ARIN. JC explained that started with a risk management exercise, a scenario was discussed where a policy proposal could be implemented against the principles of the RIR for example allowing duplicated entries in the database.

JC said that the document wanted to include some principles that run the Internet Registry System like uniqueness and accuracy. The idea was to add it as an addendum to the MoU where we all the RIRs agree to share these commitments.

HPH asked if the document was close to reach consensus.

PW strongly supported the document in principle, he considered it was straightforward document with organisational commitments at the highest level, so it's worthwhile having it considered in the RIR board agendas instead of having it endorsed by the CEO only.

EK said that there were some internal questions between the legal staff and the board, but it had become clear now. He said personally was comfortable with the document.

OR invited to raise any questions if any as it was the right time to do it.

OR asked GV to send the latest version. OR reminded that there was a suggestion by LACNIC in the EC list.

GV said he would circulate the latest version including LACNIC's changes (version 4)

**New Action Item 20200518-1: GV to circulate the last version of the Cooperation on the Internet Number Registry System document (NRO-INRS-JPAA) including LACNIC last changes.**

**New Action Item 20200518-2: All CEOs to report back the outcome of the review with their boards of the Cooperation on the Internet Number Registry System document (NRO-INRS-JPAA).**

## 3. Review of ASO/NRO in ICANN's Bylaws Excel Document

JC briefed about the origins of the review of the ASO/NRO ICANN Bylaws document, he explained that as results of the last ASO review, the report stated that there are confusion in the interaction and the relationship between the NRO, the ASO AC and ICANN, inclusive in the RIR communities.

JC reminded that each RIR made a public consultation in their communities about the future of the ASO.

JC added that the 5 CEO released a statement on the future structure of the ASO as a result of the public consultation. JC reminded it was straw man statement where the RIR CEO believed that the relationship with ICANN should continue, it should be a clear, simple and should address the issue of the ASO versus NRO terminology.

PW said that are many dimensions in the discussion of the review bylaws document and certainly the NRO could find consensus on some points.

PW said he didn't feel an urgency or mandate to find a solution between now and the time of the next review, but he felt there are some unfinished work.

PW added that if the other 4 RIRs come together with positions that we should be moving in a certain direction, he wouldn't block a consensus.

HPH said that based on the information in the NRO website regarding recommendation 18th the community has the impression that the work has been done.

HPH said that the previous ASO review reports mentioned the need to clarify the roles of the ASO and the NRO.

JC said that there's no chance we can come up with anything before the next ASO review.  He said that the question is whether we want progress and to continue to work on this issue or not.

JC said that the purpose of the bylaws review document was for the NRO EC understand where the work is coming from and where the confusion is coming from so the NRO EC can have a better informed decision.

PW said the comparison matrix document was an educational and useful reference.

PW suggested to have a community based process where they support and mandate the NRO EC or the RIR CEO for carrying forward a proposal for negotiation.

PW said the NRO should be ready for the community to say no or we don't care but the RIR board can make decisions and determinations on the community behalf, where they don't care.

PW said that the NRO is not bound to have and independent review. PW added that he understands that the ASO MoU overrides the ICANN Bylaws in terms of what our review obligations are and it simply says that we determine our own review mechanism.

PW added that an additional task could be that the NRO can take the decision now to decline all the rights marked as "may" and ask ICANN to leave the ASO/NRO out of it.

JC suggested to go through all of them just for completeness and getting the understanding of what our relationship presently is and desired from the NRO EC.

PW and HPH: agreed.

**New Action Item 20200518-3: All CEO to complete the review of ASO/NRO in ICANN's Bylaws Excel Document**

# 4. US Government Issues Draft Guidance for Public Comment regarding Federal Agency IPv6 strategy

JC said that that the topic was an informational item.

JC explained that the US Office of Management and Budget (OMB) issued a draft guidance that all US government agencies must be prepared to have all of their services reachable via IPv6 by 2025

JC said it was a fairly significant proposal putting a line in the sand that says that the US government anticipates that all that services will be IPv6 available and over IPv6 only connections by 2025.

OR asked if there were any risks for the RIRs

JC said that doesn't have any risk, if it's approved it doesn't change much of anything. JC added that the guidance doesn't pose any risk, but we need to be aware of it because it's the first one seen of specifically moving to an internet that's based on IPv6 only.

OR thanked JC for the report.

# 5. SLA Update to Include Reverse DNS (Depending on ICANN/IANA response)

OR Briefed about the SLA update history. JC said he believed that the NRO is still awaiting a response from IANA.

# 6. AOB

EK delivered an update on the ongoing investigation in AFRINIC.

EK explained that they are in touch with ARIN to get some historical data.

EK added that AFRINIC has embarked on a thorough audit of the entire database, making sure that all the records that we have, have the appropriate documentation.

EK also thanked APNIC for their support in the investigation.

PW congratulated EK and AFRINIC for doing a fantastic job.

OR agreed.

# 7. Adjourn

OR asked if there were any other topic to be discussed

PW moved to adjourn.

HPH seconded

OR adjourned the meeting at 11:44 AM UTC