

2020-October-13: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference

FINAL

Date: Tuesday, 13 October 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:

Observers:

Subramanian Moonesamy (SM)	AFRINIC
Sanjaya Sanjaya (SS)	APNIC
Pablo Hinojosa (PH)	APNIC
Richard Jimmerson (RJ)	ARIN
Ernesto Majó (EM)	LACNIC
Chris Buckridge (CB)	RIPE NCC

Secretariat:

German Valdez (GV)	NRO Secretariat
Laureana Pavon (LP)	Minutes

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Agenda Review
3. Framework for NRO MoU 2020 Fourth Draft.
4. Correspondence to ICANN on OCTO RPKI Analysis Report
5. Measuring RIR RDAP performance Draft Report
6. IANA SLA and .arpa TLD
7. Open Actions Review
8. Minutes Review
 1. 2020-September-22: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference- DRAFT (Pending, AFRINIC, APNIC, ARIN, LACNIC, RIPE NCC)
 2. 2020-August-18: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - DRAFT(Pending: AFRINIC, ARIN)
9. Next Meetings
 1. Tuesday 17 November 2020 (ARIN will be represented by RJ)
 2. Tuesday 15 December 2020
 3. Tuesday 19 January 2021 (NRO EC to confirm availability)
10. AOB
11. Adjourn

Resolutions

No resolutions discussed in this meeting.

New Action Items

The following action Items were assigned during this meeting:

New Action Item 20201013-1: GV to format the letter on NRO position on OCTO RPKI Analysis report and ICANN approach of not consulting/coordinating previously with the RIRs as prepared by PW and shared to the NRO EC list on 13 October (use official letterhead, etc.) and send it to OR to sign.
New Action Item 20201013-2: OR to send the letter on NRO position on OCTO RPKI Analysis report and ICANN approach of not consulting/coordinating previously with the RIRs to ICANN CEO with cc ICANN Board Chair (once it has been formatted by GV).
New Action Item 20201013-3: OR to reply as soon as possible to ICANN of the initial findings of the RIR RDAP performance Draft Report, notifying them that the EC has no issues so far.
New Action Item 20201013-4: OR to ask the ECG to send them a list of specific contentious topics in the IANA SLA and .arpa TLD document that the EC should look at and send this version to JC and EK, both of whom volunteered to help with the review.

New Action Item 20201013-5: GV to let the legal team know that they can edit, redact or summarize the extensive minutes of the September 22 meeting as they wish.

Minutes

1. Welcome

OR welcomed all participants and opened the meeting at 11:06 AM UTC

2. Agenda Review

OR asked if there were any new items to add to the agenda.

No agenda items were added.

3. Framework for NRO MoU 2020 Fourth Draft.

JC commented that there were multiple commitments from multiple documents, which had resulted in more work than expected. He noted that his idea would be to say something along the lines of “we’re committed to a higher purpose, here are our commitments to each other.”

4. Correspondence to ICANN on OCTO RPKI Analysis Report

OR observed that PW had sent a new version of the letter to the list and asked for comments on that.

OR observed that his first opinion had been that they should not submit the same request once again to ICANN asking for collaboration and that a stronger message would be appropriate. He added that he would support PW’s letter if there was support among the EC.

JC agreed that a stronger message might be needed. He added that he supported sending the strongest possible message that would not endanger their relationship, so in his opinion PW’s draft was suitable.

EK agreed with JC in that disconnecting with ICANN would require internal discussion, so he also agreed that they should be as firm as possible without endangering relations. He added that he was comfortable with PW's latest version of the letter.

HPH added that he was fine with PW's latest version of the letter.

JC suggested that one way to strengthen the impact of the message without changing the content would be to make it a formal communication or memo to ICANN, i.e., use NRO letterhead and send it as an official, signed communication, as this would cause it to appear in ICANN's communications archive and increase its visibility among the ICANN community.

All agreed with JC's idea to prepare a formal written correspondence and send it to ICANN CEO cc the ICANN Board chair, as formal communications tend to be published on the website and may create a stronger impact.

New Action Item 20201013-1: GV to format the letter on NRO position on OCTO RPKI Analysis report and ICANN approach of not consulting/coordinating previously with the RIRs as prepared by PW and shared to the NRO EC list on 13 October (use official letterhead, etc.) and send it to OR to sign.

New Action Item 20201013-2: OR to send the letter on NRO position on OCTO RPKI Analysis report and ICANN approach of not consulting/coordinating previously with the RIRs to ICANN CEO with cc ICANN Board Chair (once it has been formatted by GV).

5. Measuring RIR RDAP performance Draft Report

OR commented that ICANN had sent them this request to access their RDAP service. He added that he'd shared this report with the ECG and asked whether they had any comments but had not heard back from them so far.

OR said he'd also shared the report with the EC to see if there was anything else the EC wanted to comment or ask at this stage. He explained that ICANN was not planning to publish anything related to this report and that, if they decided to do so, they would let the RIRs know.

OR noted that he'd like to communicate to John Crain that they have no further comments or something along those lines.

New Action Item 20201013-3: OR to reply as soon as possible to ICANN of the initial findings of the RIR RDAP performance Draft Report, notifying them that the EC has no issues so far.

6. IANA SLA and .arpa TLD |

OR noted that he'd shared the first official reply from Kim Davies with the EC in September and had not seen any comments. He then asked the others whether they had any comments.

OR added that he had also shared this with the ECG asking them to get back with any comments within two weeks but had not received any comments yet. Rather than go through the document, OR said he wanted to ask for suggestions on how to review future comments, which would probably be less contentious. He said he would like to find a way to provide a quicker response without skipping any relevant comments and asked the others if they had any suggestions on how to proceed.

In JC's opinion, they need to see the changes before they decide how to handle them.

OR explained that he was not interested in reviewing the document (as current changes are mostly technical, related to configuration of reverse resolution) but in defining how to move forward with this matter.

JC suggested they should get an acknowledgment from the ECG saying that the changes are acceptable or, if not, a list of those they believe are not acceptable.

OR then observed that, while he could do it, he would not like to do the actual review of the comments alone, as a single pair of eyes would not be appropriate.

JC said he'd be happy to go over the changes with OR, adding that they'd need to have the ECG point out anything they find unacceptable and have a subgroup of the EC walk through each change considering the ECG's comments. HPH agreed.

New Action Item 20201013-4: OR to ask the ECG to send them a list of specific contentious topics in the IANA SLA and .arpa TLD document that the EC should look at and send this version to JC and EK, both of whom volunteered to help with the review.

7. Open Actions Review

OR asked GV to go through the list of open actions.

GV mentioned that the actions on the Legal Team had been sent to them along with the part of the September 22 minutes that concerned them, so the full details of those discussions were available to them. He added that the status of open actions had been updated on the Open Action List, so there was nothing else to report.

OR observed that he'd contacted Kim Davis regarding the impact to the RIRs of the proposed changes to the RFC 3172 and that there had been no reaction to that, so action item Action Item 20200818-4 could now be closed.

OR then asked GV to continue helping members of the EC follow up on open action items.

8. Minutes Review

a) 2020-September-22: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference- DRAFT (Pending, AFRINIC, APNIC, ARIN, LACNIC, RIPE NCC)

In response to comments received via the list, GV said he would prepare a new version of the September 22 minutes summarizing the legal team's contributions.

JC observed that, given that the legal team had already seen the minutes, they should let them know that the EC is not insisting that they maintain the full details of the minutes but that they have the freedom to edit, summarize and provide a shorter version if they so wish.

All agreed

New Action Item 20201013-5: GV to let the legal team know that they can edit, redact or summarize the extensive minutes of the September 22 meeting as they wish.

b) 2020-August-18: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - DRAFT(Pending: AFRINIC, ARIN)

9. Next Meetings

a) Tuesday 17 November 2020 (ARIN will be represented by RJ)

JC observed that he might not be able to be present, in which case Richard Jimmerson would attend.

All others said they were fine with the date and confirmed their participation.

b) Tuesday 15 December 2020

Because of scheduling conflicts, the December meeting was re-scheduled for Tuesday 8 December.

c) Tuesday 19 January 2021

All agreed that it was too soon to confirm the date for their January meeting.

10. AOB

HPH asked about the composition of the ECG and its purpose, to which OR replied that it is formed by the CTOs of each RIR. GV added that the ECG do not use the NRO wiki but instead use their own platform. PW observed that the ECG is one of the longest standing groups.

HPH commented they would be having a virtual RIPE NCC meeting the next week and invited the others to participate.

HPH then mentioned that the outlook on face-to-face meetings was not very positive. PW noted that the APRICOT meeting would be held online in February, and the others made further comments in the sense that they should prepare to continue as now at least for 2021.

OR asked whether there were any further topics to discuss.

11. Adjourn

There being no further topics to discuss, OR thanked all participants and adjourned the meeting at 11:56 pm UTC