

2021-June-15: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference

Minutes

Date: Tuesday, 15 June 2021, 11:00 UTC.

Attendees

Executive Council:

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

Observers:

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

Secretariat:

German Valdez (GV)	NRO Secretariat
Laureana Pavón	Minutes

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Agenda Review

3. NRO MoU Review
4. NRO Strategy Review Plan
5. Recap HPH Meeting with Göran Marby
6. Open Actions Review
7. Minutes Review
 - 2021-May-25: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - **DRAFT** (Pending: AFRINIC, ARIN, LACNIC, RIPE NCC)
 - 2021-April-20: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - **DRAFT** (Pending: RIPE NCC)
 - 2021-March-16: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - **DRAFT** (Pending: RIPE NCC)
 - 2021-February-16: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - **DRAFT** (Pending: RIPE NCC)
 - 2021-January-19: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - **DRAFT** (Pending: RIPE NCC)
 - 2020-December-8: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - **DRAFT** (Pending: RIPE NCC)
8. Next Meetings
 - Tuesday 20 July 2021
 - Tuesday 17 August 2021
 - Tuesday 21 September 2021
9. AOB
10. Adjourn

New Action Items

-

Minutes

0. Welcome

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

1. Agenda Review

HPH went over the proposed agenda and asked if anybody wanted to include additional items.

CB proposed and HPH added an update on the PACG, to be discussed between agenda items 4 and 5.

2. NRO MoU Review

HPH observed that the MoU is now with the legal team, who has still to provide an their reply.

GV added that the legal team is advancing on the MoU review and that they are also working on the legal status of IP addresses.

3. NRO Strategy Review Plan

GV explained that the RFP is now public, that the deadline for receiving proposals is 9 July, after which the NRO EC will have two weeks to analyze proposals. He noted that the July NRO EC meeting is scheduled for 20 July, so the NRO EC will have three more days before the deadline for announcing the selected bid (23 July). The July meeting will be a good chance to analyze the proposals received and, if necessary, a special meeting can be organized for this purpose.

GV then suggested that the NRO EC might extend the RFP to any consultants in their regions they believe might help in this review.

OR asked whether the NRO EC has an agreement on their expectations of the time the EC wants to allocate to this process, adding that he was open to heavy (his preferred option) or light allocation of time, but would like to have an agreement on what they are looking for.

At PW's request, OR explained that the strategy planning process requires a lot of time from the NRO EC, but that he had heard that PW preferred a consultant that would help the EC draft most of the strategy and would save the EC a lot of time in the discussions. He said that he was open to heavy or light allocation of time, as long as they have an agreement.

PW noted that he expects the EC will have to work on this quite solidly and that he believes the strategic planning consultant should be running this process with the EC and actively helping to produce the outcome, i.e., the document. He added that the consultants should make their expected role and contributions clear in their proposals, so the NRO EC could wait and assess the proposals and discuss this with the consultants during the interview process.

OR suggested asking the consultants to state their expectation regarding the time that the EC would need to allocate to this process so that this would be clear from the start.

JC commented that, when the EC evaluates the responses, they should make sure that there is clarity on what the expectation is on what the consultants need from the EC in order to get to a result. He added that the NRO EC was not hiring an editor for a document, but that he'd like the consultant to produce a document using input from the EC.

EK checked with GV whether, if the process started in July, a working document might be ready by November and GV confirmed that the timeline included in the RFP states that the review will be ideally completed by the last day of November.

OR noted that the timeline was perfect, as it will also allow the RIRs to include some strategies in their own operational planning for next year.

HPH noted that the EC would have to set aside some hours a week during the strategic planning period and asked how many days that might be.

OR noted that a face-to-face workshop might be an option.

JC said he does not expect to put more than one day a week into this process.

HPH added that they might be talking about one day a week plus the workshop.

4. Recap HPH Meeting with Göran Marby

HPH explained that the reason this meeting had come together as a one-on-one meeting was that normally ICANN sends a meeting invitation to all SO/AC chairs once a month, but that this month they had only sent him the invitation with 24 hours' notice, so he had politely declined and suggested the one-to-one.

HPH said that he had been unable to share any of the points the EC had given him and had suggested a meeting with the five members of the NRO EC after the ICANN meeting. He added that if he doesn't hear anything about this after the ICANN meeting, he would follow up on that.

5. PACG/PSCG Update

CB began the updates with the PSCG report, saying they had two meetings and the minutes of the April call are published on the wiki. He added that he has also set up a Slack channel, noting that during the first half of the year the information sharing had been very useful, including presentation materials and a new wiki.

CB observed that the other main activity for the PSCG had been operationalizing our M3AAWG membership. He said that last week had been the 52nd M3AAWG meeting and that they had stepped up their participation, including an hour-long RIR introductory session presented by Kevon Swift, Leslie Nobile and CB and had a good turn out and some questions. He added that the other interesting session was the open round table, where one session was about IPv6 customer allocation prefix sizes. He concluded that this was a demonstration that it is useful for RIRs to be involved in these processes. He added that virtual ICANN meetings are not a very useful engagement mechanism, so the group is looking forward to going back to face-to-face meetings and that, as a group, they are also interested in having some interaction with other working groups.

As for PACG, CB said he had also had two quarterly calls plus a meeting to discuss a response to OECD paper on routing security. He added that the minutes of the second call are also published on the wiki and that these encompass the key points for the PACG and what the group is doing at the moment.

He noted that PACG did not see a statement by the NRO or the EC as particularly useful or powerful, but it did agree that building alliances with industry partners was something that we should absolutely prioritize in this space.

CB noted that PACG had also discussed the points that OR had made in relation to the 2021 PACG workplan, particularly the engagement with the ITU (i.e. that our descriptions were very focused on events, rather than on issues) and that they definitely need to document this better. He said that PACG is having some preliminary discussions now and they will have another PACG call about this to nail down what we see as the issues in the coming discussions.

CB noted that events and the schedule had been affected by COVID, and that now next the WTDC, the WTSA and the Plenipotentiary would all be happening within twelve months of each other, so it's going to be a real challenge not, not only for the RIRs but also for many smaller Member States.

CB then observed that the IGF was the other major point they had discussed. IGF spaces continue to evolve and there has been some discussions quite recently about the creation of a pilot Multi-Stakeholder High Level-Body (MLHB) and how this might fit into the structures of the IGF, either as a subset of the MAG or separate from the MAG, as the proposal itself concedes that there's a lot of overlap with the current MAG role.

CB mentioned that next week is the next MAG meeting and open consultation, so he asked the NRO EC for feedback on the following. Invitations have been sent out for international bodies such as each of the RIRs to make an intervention during the meeting on their current Internet governance related activities or developments, and the PACG feels it would be good to have a joint response from the RIRs. CB said they had drafted some language which essentially says that Internet governance issues have become very important for us, that these issues have practical and operational impacts, that we provide a venue for this kind of multistakeholder discussions, that we would like to stress the importance of national and regional groupings and governance spaces focused on specific issues such as IP addressing, and that we want to see the IGF continue to evolve and improve, taking onboard those national and regional initiatives and incorporating them into its model. CB said they would then talk about MLHB, saying that we see a need for high-level connection between the IGF and other UN agencies and governments, but that we share some of the concerns in terms of funding and in terms of defining the scope and would like to see some more work go into that.

OR said that, during the presentation on the MLHB, it was his understanding that it was a decision already made, that they were not open for consultation but explaining what they did. He asked whether there is still room for slight changes to this plan.

CB replied that he is not sure based on the presentation yesterday.

JC said he had seen the NRO EC draft statement and supported it, that the NRO EC should participate and talk about what the NRO EC sees happening in terms of Internet governance activities and the activities of governments, that the NRO EC should encourage the multistakeholder approach, and note options for MHLB (part of the MAG, a formal linkage to

the MAG). He noted that these decisions are made by other people and other modes and the NRO EC needs to be flexible. In short, JC said that he is supportive of the statement drafted by the PACG.

6. Open Actions Review

Action Item 210525-1: The legal team to come back with a new version of the NRO MoU, which should include the suggestions decided in the NRO EC meeting held on 25 May 2021, including the use of the term “Joint Internet Numbers Registry.” OPEN

GV reported that the legal team is working on this, noting that he sent the legal team the minutes and the open actions and will send them a reminder of the next NRO EC meeting in July.

Action Item 210525-2: HPH to report back to the EC on the RIPE NCC’s plans for RDAP and implementation of the joint RIR RDAP profile. CLOSED

HPH said he had obtained confirmation that this is going to happen.

Action Item 210525-3: GV to inform the role of the ICANN due diligence review to the ASO AC so they can make a determination on informing the winner of the ICANN Seat 9 election of the results so he has the proper motivation to obtain the documentation that might allow announcing the election results (self-declaration and/or third-party criminal check), making it clear that the NRO will reimburse any costs incurred by the winner for this check. CLOSED

GV noted that this action is now closed. He explained that Alan Barret had sent a self-declaration and then a third-party certification, that it had been made clear that the final decision was up to the constituency (in this case, the ASO AC), that the election for Seat 9 was now closed, and that the Secretariat is just waiting for the ASO AC chairs to give the Secretariat the word to delete the information and records related to the election.

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. OPEN

HPH said that there has been no reply, that he will follow up on this, and asked the Secretariat to include this in the agenda for the next NRO EC meeting.

Action Item 210316-4: HPH to follow up with Kim Davies about their (second round of) comments to our proposal to include reverse DNS resolution in the SLA. OPEN

HPH said he has not done this yet and asked GV to share with him the latest exchange with Kim Davies.

7. Minutes Review

HPH said he would be approving the last three meeting minutes shortly.

8. Next Meetings

a) Tuesday 20 July 2021

OR noted that he has a potential conflict for this date and asked, if possible, to reschedule it.

HPH said that pushing it to the 27 July would give the EC one more week to study the strategic planning review proposals.

All agreed and it was decided to move the meeting to July 27th.

b) Tuesday 17 August 2021

c) Tuesday 21 September 2021

9. AOB

10. Adjourn

There being no further business to discuss, JC moved to adjourn the meeting, EK seconded the motion and the motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 12:24 UTC.