2021-April-20: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference

Minutes

Date: Tuesday, 20 April 2021, 11:00 UTC.

Attendees

Executive Council:

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

Observers:

Pablo Hinojosa (PH)	APNIC
Richard Jimmerson (RJ)	ARIN
Subramanian Moonesamy (SM)	AFRINIC
Chris Buckridge (CB)	RIPE NCC
Ernesto Majó (EM)	LACNIC
Michael Abejuela (MA)	ARIN
Athina Fragkouli (AF)	RIPE NCC
Eduardo Jimenez (EJ)	LACNIC

Secretariat:

German Valdez (GV)	NRO Secretariat
Laureana Pavón	Minutes

Agenda

1. **Welcome**
2. **Agenda Review**
3. **NRO MoU Draft**
4. **NRO Strategic Planning**
    1. Request for Proposal Draft Document
5. **ICANN 71 Participation**
6. **ICANN GNSO Request for participation**
7. **Coordination Groups Reports/Consultations.**
    1. Secretariat Report
        1. ICANN Seat 9 Election Update
    2. NRO-ECG
        1. requests guidance from the NRO-EC about whether or not to share with each other the responses to the RPKI Verisign questionnaire.
8. Open Actions Review
9. **Minutes Review**
    1. 2021-March-16: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - DRAFT (Pending: AFRINIC, APNIC, ARIN, RIPE NCC)
    2. 2021-February-16: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - DRAFT (Pending: AFRINIC, ARIN, RIPE NCC)
    3. 2021-January-19: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - DRAFT (Pending: RIPE NCC)
    4. 2020-December-8: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - DRAFT (Pending: RIPE NCC)
10. **Next Meetings**
    1. Tuesday 25 May 2021
    2. Tuesday 15 June 2021
    3. Tuesday 20 July 2021
11. **AOB**
12. **Adjourn**

============================

Resolutions

No resolutions discussed in this meeting.

New Action Items

New Action Item 210420-1: Each RIR to review the latest version of the Draft NRO MoU shared by Athina Fragkouli to the EC list on 19 April 2021 and send their comments / suggestions (redline document) to the legal team. The deadline for this will be one week, then the legal team will go over the document once again.

New Action Item 210420-2: GV to update the Draft Request for Proposals for the NRO Strategic Plan Review to clarify the scope of the work expected from the consultant(s) (facilitating the strategic planning process and drafting the strategic plan based on input from the EC) and to include two public comments phases, one to be used as input prior to the process, the other to serve as comments once a draft plan is completed.

New Action Item 210420-3: HPH to reply to Göran Marby that the NRO would not be putting together any activities for ICANN 71 but that they would like to schedule a meeting with him to talk about RPKI and IPv6 at some time after the ICANN 71 meeting.

New Action Item 210420-4: HPH to reply to Andrea Glandon thanking them for their invitation to participate in the GNSO PDP but declining the invitation.

New Action Item 210420-5: GV to review the ASO/NRO procedures and the ICANN Bylaws to find the sources to clarify the role of the EC with regard to the ICANN Board Election process.

New Action Item 210420-6: HPH to reply to the NRO-ECG that they could share with each other the responses to the RPKI Verisign questionnaire and the ECG to prepare a compiled version of their responses and then report back to the EC during the EC's June meeting.

New Action Item 210420-7: Each EC member to report their plans for RDAP and implementation of the joint RIR RDAP profile during the May EC teleconference.

Minutes

1. Welcome

HPH welcomed everybody and opened the NRO EC meeting at 11:03 AM UTC.

2. Agenda Review

No comments were heard, and the agenda was approved as written.

3. NRO MoU Draft

HPH gave the floor to AF.

AF explained that the legal team had worked on the draft NRO MoU and sent their amendments and comments to the EC, adding that they had worked on the understanding that this is an updated version of the NRO MoU which was signed in 2005. She said that she had accepted all the tracked changes by the RIRs and that the tracked changes in the document she had circulated were the changes from the legal team.

AF then went through the agreement, explaining individual changes and comments.

After some further discussion, the following action item was agreed:

New Action Item 210420-1: Each RIR to review the latest version of the Draft NRO MoU shared by AF to the EC list on 19 April 2021 and send their suggestions (redline document) to the legal team. The deadline for this will be one week, then the legal team will go over the document once again.

At this time, the members of the legal team left the meeting.

4. NRO Strategic Planning

a) Request for Proposal Draft Document

At HPH's request, GV briefly walked the EC through the request for proposals:

- GV went through section 3, including the expected deliverables, the scope of the work, review, interviews, retreat or virtual meeting, delivery of a monthly report to the EC, and finally the presentation of a strategic plan aiming to finish this by the end of 2021.
- He went through the adjusted timeline and important dates, the selection criteria, the documentation the provider should provide, to be assessed by the EC. This is based on what was applied for the last review of the ASO review.

HPH mentioned that it was not very specific on what they wanted to achieve content wise.

PW agreed that a bit more precision as to what they want to get out of the process and its scope would be useful.

HPH asked for suggestions on this.

JC said his preference would be for the NRO itself to lead the development of this strategic plan, that he was aware that they did not have enough time to develop the plan themselves, and that he saw the role as that of a facilitator, i.e., someone to push the EC ahead, to drive things. He added that when the role moves from facilitator to consultant, the work loses value, so he was against the facilitator providing advice.

PW said that was something that needed to be clarified in the RFP. In his opinion, the provider would not independently write a plan, but would run through the process with the EC. He added that he was personally in favor of delegating as much of this work as they could agree on.

JC repeated that given the deep understanding required of the things the EC does, an external consultant would not be able to do this without following the EC's lead.

OR suggested removing from the RFP the idea that the idea is for the provider to produce a plan for the EC and be very clear that the EC is looking for a facilitator.

HPH summarized the discussion up to this point by noting that PW feels one way, while JC and OR feel differently (someone to produce a plan vs a facilitator).

PW said they needed to be clear about what activities they were paying for and suggested hiring someone who is capable of producing a document that says "this is the strategic plan for the NRO for the next five years." Personally, he does not want to go through a long facilitation process and then have to write the document themselves and strongly suggested hiring someone who will guide the EC through a process that will result in a document.

EK told the EC about his experience with their own strategic plan, which was that an external person had held some interviews, asked some questions to use as input and a guide, and then, based on that, they drafted the plan.

After some further discussion, all agreed that they were not in fact talking about two different ways forward but that their opinions were aligned, namely, that the person hired would have some meetings with the EC and then use that as input to produce the document.

JC added that he would be far more interested in someone with facilitation skills than in someone with knowledge of their industry.

PW brought up another topic for discussion, which was that they needed to decide and discuss, first, whether they should we have any open or public component prior to the drafting of the strategic plan, and second whether they should ask for comments once a draft plan was ready. He added that they had never done this in the past, but that they now have a higher need for openness. If the EC, agreed, then this should be included in the RFC and considered in the timeline.

HPH noted that he was in favor of the openness and doing a consultation, with no preference for doing it before or after the process.

JC said he had no objection to doing an NRO consultation once a draft strategic plan was ready. He added that they should make sure that this remained a light-weight activity, as he would not be in favor of each RIR doing an independent review process or consultations held prior to a draft.

OR and EK agreed.

New Action Item 210420-2: GV to update the Draft Request for Proposals for the NRO Strategic Plan Review to clarify the scope of the work expected from the consultant(s) (facilitating the strategic planning process and drafting the strategic plan based on input from the EC) and to include two public comments phases, one to be used as input prior to the process, the other to serve as comments once a draft plan is completed.

5. ICANN 71 Participation

HPH noted that ICANN 71 was fast approaching was starting the planning, adding that the EC would soon receive an invitation to meet with the board.

HPH said that they could do was to talk about RPKI and RDAP.

HPH said it might be of value to bring the RPKI topic to the registry/registrar community.

JC observed that it might be good to discuss with the ICANN board the EC's expectations for RPKI and for IPv6 for DNS registry/registrars quite explicitly.

All agreed that there was no immediate need to put together activities during the ICANN meeting.

HPH asked whether he should set up a meeting with the five members of the EC and Göran Marby.

OR said it would be good for HPH to have that conversation as chair of the NRO EC and if there are topics in common, then the rest of the EC could discuss those.

HPH explained that he had already had a one-on-one meeting with Göran Marby and a second meeting with the chairs of the SOs, which he had done with Kevin Blumberg. He suggested that RPKI and IPv6 would be a good topic for him to ask Göran for a meeting with the EC, but not necessarily during ICANN 71.

OR and JC agreed with the approach.

New Action Item 210420-3: HPH to reply to Göran Marby that the NRO would not be putting together any activities for ICANN 71 but that they would like to schedule a meeting with him to talk about RPKI and IPv6 at some time after the ICANN 71 meeting.

6. ICANN GNSO Request for participation

HPH said he had received an invitation from the GNSO in a GNSO PDP which he had forwarded to the list. He added that, in his opinion, this has nothing to do with their mission and vision.

No objections were heard, so the following action item was recorded:

New Action Item 210420-4: HPH to reply to Andrea Glandon thanking them for their invitation to participate in the GNSO PDP but declining the invitation.

7. Coordination Groups Reports/Consultations

a) Secretariat Report

i) ICANN Seat 9 Election Update

GV provided the following update on the ICANN Seat 9 Election:

- The ASO AC is now in the deliberation phase which will conclude on 28 April, voting will take place from 29 April to 5 May. Subject to the results of the ICANN due diligence review, the results should be ready around 5 May.
- The process was, the longest and busiest process in the history of the ASO AC. Twenty-two different teleconferences were held for the election process within a period of 6 weeks.
- This election process triggered the need for a thorough review of the ASO procedures before the next election, as there were different interpretation of what needed to be done. The ASO AC requested some support for this review and will begin working on this as soon as this election process is over.
- The four candidates on the ballot have been published on the ASO website (Alan Barrett, Patrick W. Gilmore, Peter Thimmesch, Ron da Silva).
- The ASO MoU is clear about the responsibility of the ASO in selecting Seats 9 and 10 on the ICANN board; the NRO EC needs to validate this decision through the Empowered Community.

HPH wondered whether this was an individual responsibility of the NRO EC as a member of the Empowered Community or the collective responsibility of the Empowered Community.

JC explained that the Empowered Community only gets involved at the very end for all appointments to the board, that what was previously automatic now requires ratification by the Empowered Community. He added that there is no evaluative process to the Empowered Community, it goes along with all the appointments, but this gives it the power of removal. He said that everything goes to the ICANN corporate secretary, but that he didn't know whether the ASO or the NRO EC was the body that sends that.

HPH said he wasn't sure where the NRO EC enters into the process.

GV replied that his initial observation was that they were lacking this connection in the ASO procedures but that he would check with ICANN staff about the ICANN procedures.

HPH quickly did the research, but asked GV to do it just in case.

New Action Item 210420-5: GV to review the ASO/NRO procedures and the ICANN Bylaws to find the sources to clarify the role of the EC with regard to the ICANN Board Election process.

b) NRO-ECG

i) requests guidance from the NRO-EC about whether or not to share with each other the responses to the RPKI Verisign questionnaire.

HPH explained that the NRO-ECG chair had been tasked to check with the NRO EC chair whether they should share with each other the responses to the RPKI Verisign questionnaire.

All agreed.

PW said that he had heard that there was the idea of putting together all responses in a single document.

JC replied that they had already replied.

PW observed that it was an important challenge to be consistent and thorough, self-critical and alert to the risks involved with RPKI.

JC said ARIN was trying to improve their PKI security controls, that he thought that RIPE was doing the same, and that a number of others were busy trying to improve their security right now.

New Action Item 210420-6: HPH to reply to the NRO-ECG that they should share with each other the responses to the RPKI Verisign questionnaire and ask them to prepare a compiled version of their responses and then report back to the EC during the EC's June meeting.

PW then commented that the ECG had finalized and published a common RIR RDAP profile, an important achievement in coordination between the RIRs which had also involved the RSCG. He added that this document didn't have any real purpose unless they had plans to comply with it, so he expressed his interest in knowing what the others' plans/commitments were. He concluded by saying that, as a coordinated group of registries, they needed to comply with self-developed standards for consistency.

JC proposed and all agreed to the following action item:

New Action Item 210420-7: Each EC member to report their plans for RDAP and implementation of the joint RIR RDAP profile during the May EC teleconference.

8. **Open Actions Review**

9. Minutes Review

- 2021-March-16:Minutes NRO EC Teleconference- DRAFT (Pending: AFRINIC, APNIC, ARIN, RIPE NCC)
- 2021-February-16: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference- DRAFT (Pending: AFRINIC, ARIN, RIPE NCC)
- 2021-January-19: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference- DRAFT (Pending: RIPE NCC)
- 2020-December-8: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference- DRAFT (Pending: RIPE NCC)

10. Next Meetings

a) Tuesday 25 May 2021

b) Tuesday 15 June 2021

c) Tuesday 20 July 2021

All EC members said they had no problem with the three upcoming meeting dates.

11. AOB

No AOB discussed.

12. **Adjourn**

 There being no further business to discuss, EK proposed a motion to adjourn, PW seconded the motion, no objections were heard, and the motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 13:00 UTC.