

2021-November-30: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference

Date: Tuesday, 30 November 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:

| | |
|----------------------|----------|
| Pablo Hinojosa (PH) | APNIC |
| Kenny Huang (KH) | APNIC |
| Ernesto Majó (EM) | LACNIC |
| Chris Buckridge (CB) | RIPE NCC |
| S. Moonesamy (SM) | AFRINIC |

Leader Shape: Glenn Price (GP)

Secretariat:

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| German Valdez (GV) | NRO Secretariat |
| Laureana Pavón | Minutes |

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Agenda Review
3. NRO Strategy Review Plan
4. AFRINIC Situation Update
5. Reverse DNS Resolution Content in the IANA SLA Update
6. 2022 ASO Review
7. 2022 NRO EC Roles
8. RIR Updates
9. Open Actions Review
10. Minutes Review
11. Next Meetings
 - a) Tuesday 21 December 2021
 - b) Tuesday 18 January 2022
 - c) Tuesday 15 February 2022
12. AOB
13. Adjourn

=====

New Action Items

New Action Item 211130-1: GP to prepare the agenda for the NRO Strategy Review meeting to be held in Dubai in February 2022, attended just by members of the NRO EC.

New Action Item 211130-w: GP to prepare the set of questions for RIR staff and send it to the CEOs. The CEOs will then decide which members to send the questions to.

New Resolutions

R-20211130-1: In 2022, NRO EC roles will be distributed as follows: PW, chair; JC, treasurer; HPH vice chair/secretary.

R-20211130-2: The ASO Review originally scheduled for 2022 will be postponed until 2023.

Minutes

1. Welcome

HPH welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted that they would begin by discussing agenda item number 3.

2. Agenda Review

No items were added to the agenda.

3. NRO Strategy Review Plan

GP thanked the EC for making room for him in the agenda and proceeded to share on screen a presentation he had prepared, which he will send to GV to circulate on the EC list.

He then presented an update on the assessment phase, noting that Leader Shape had completed the connect, engage and align approach phase; the review phase; and four of the five qualitative 1-on-1 interviews with the RIR CEOs, the last of which (with JC) will be completed next week.

Regarding the qualitative interviews with focus groups and survey for each RIR, GP said that he had originally thought about doing two interviews (north and south hemispheres), but the more he thinks about this, the more he believes they can't have a joint interview with staff with board members. Another possibility might be for the CEOs to nominate 1 or 2 board members and Leader Shape can have separate calls (30-40 minutes with each), making sure that the topics capture their interests so as to engage the boards prior to the face-to-face meeting. As for the nominated staff, Leader Shape will probably send a brief tailored survey to obtain their opinion.

HPH noted that he had not planned to involve his board until after the NRO EC session in Dubai and that the Doodle poll GP had sent to the list had caused some stir.

PW noted that as he had suggested before, if the CEOs would have +1s at all, we should be aiming at a board level, as there are quite a number of critical issues to discuss which will inevitably end up with board level decisions.

JC said he understood PW's concern, i.e., nobody wants a situation where the output of the process is not viable with all the organizations. Having said that, he agreed with HPH. In his case 1 or 2 board members, as individual members, cannot speak for the organization. It's important for the board to sign off on what the EC does, but the board needs to do so collectively.

HPH underlined what JC said and stressed that strategy processes are prepared by staff, led by himself, and then presented to the board as a whole, not to individual board members.

GP said that the interviews he'd had so far made him realize the need to arrive at a plan that, when it gets to the boards, will give the boards the idea that their interests have been heard.

JC said that the output has to be reasoned and work for all the RIRs so that it can be brought to five different boards and be signed off and then to five different communities and be signed off. The output must be reasonable and work for all the RIRs.

GP said he would write a note of apology that can go out to board members tomorrow if need be and that he would put the board to one side for the moment.

GP said that he was preparing for offsite, that they need to come together as a team aligned by a common purpose, that time dedicated to working on team dynamics will be as important as the strategic choices they discuss. He said that there are a couple of options, that it's not necessary for the EC to decide right now: a) turn Dubai into a three-day event, the first for the CEOs only; b) have a two-day offsite in Dubai with the CEOs and maybe the +1s, followed by some time post offsite for each CEO to engage with their board for alignment and input, plus a second offsite to align and lock in the plan.

GP then mentioned that coming to the offsite with a board mandate to discuss, debate and decide key areas was essential.

PW said that he expects that his board chair would be his +1 for this meeting, however this would not make sense if there are no other board members. He said he would like to know who would be attending from the other RIRs.

JC said that it was essential for the five CEOs and Leader Shape get together and define what is the problem we're trying to solve and what we expect from this process, make sure we have a common view: "When we're done, if we've got X Y and Z, then that the process was a success". As for who would be attending the Dubai meeting, he was expecting it to be more focused, i.e., a +1 would not be reasonable if we don't know what the agenda will be.

EK said he doesn't have a +1 yet. He added that he was open to either of the options proposed by GP. Next week there will be an AFRINIC board retreat so he will later come back with more feedback.

GP recapped some of the things he has been hearing: the possibility of achieving a single internet registry, how the coordination groups fit in and how to get the most out of these groups, if the NRO needs to be incorporated and, if so, what budget should be put there. A lot of dissimilar stuff is being done globally, what are the two or three things that the five RIRs feel need full cooperation?

JC said that he is much more baseline: what do the RIRs need the NRO to be and accomplish in order for the RIRs collectively and individually to be successful? Until we have a shared vision

of what the NRO should be, he can't know the structure of the NRO. We must understand what we're trying to accomplish before deciding strategy, a shared vision of what we want of the NRO.

GP mentioned that this could be one of the objectives of this process.

JC agreed. The NRO is a part of making our organizations successful, but we need to come to a common view of what we're going to rely on the NRO for in the next 3, 5, or 10 years; everything else falls out from that.

PW reminded that we have an agreement (the NRO MoU) that's ready to be signed, so there's no need to go back to square one.

JC said the next step requires some visioning of priorities and what risks and opportunities we want to prioritize so we're in the best position for whatever might happen in 5 or 10 years.

HPH said that this discussion had led him to conclude that the five CEOs should talk without many others present, as creating the dynamic of the five CEOs without any +1s would be important and useful.

GP said that the note that had been sent out was purely in the assessment phase and confirmed that Leader Shape would not move forward with anything in level 4 of Leader Shape's proposed activities. He will contact GV tomorrow to confirm that. He said that the next thing we would do is prepare a draft agenda of his plan as a facilitator for Dubai so that, when people leave, they think the work they did was valuable.

OR said that, having heard JC and HPH, he now agrees that the CEOs need to first agree on what are the relevant things we need to discuss and decide, followed by a longer conversation to define the actions to implement those general agreements.

As for having a board mandate to decide, HPH said that he'd first need to know what decisions would be made. He then asked GP why he believes they need a mandate.

GP explained that, in the original response by Leader Shape's to the RFP it had been suggested that a plan would be created that the CEOs would take to their boards, but that he now understood that some would prefer to have this engagement later on.

GP then said that he would put together a suggested approach of what they will be doing over those two days so they will know clearly what they will be working on in Dubai.

New Action Item 211130-1: GP to prepare the agenda for the NRO Strategy Review meeting to be held in Dubai in February 2022, attended just by the 5 members of the NRO EC.

All agreed to take the meeting with the board off the table for the moment.

As for the survey for nominated staff, HPH proposed that GP send the questions to the CEOs, who will then decide which staff to involve.

All agreed.

New Action Item 211130-w: GP to prepare the set of questions for RIR staff and send it to the CEOs. The CEOs will then decide which members to send the questions to.

After some further discussion, all agreed to have the two-day meeting in Dubai with just the CEOs. Then, after engagement with the boards, a second, subsequent meeting to be decided later with the CEOs plus a member of governing boards (board appointees) of each RIR.

GP thanked the EC for their time and will be in touch with GV to get the minutes.

GP left the meeting at 11:54 UTC.

OR left the meeting at 11:56, leaving EM on the call with full powers

4. AFRINIC Situation Update

EK said that he would update the others as the process in court is still ongoing.

JC proposed that ARIN continue as treasurer. Considering that OR had chaired the EC last year and that HPH had done so this year, he proposed that PW serve as NRO EC chair in 2022.

EK supported this suggestion.

JC observed that ARIN was willing to continue as treasurer and that this might be prudent under the circumstances. As for the position of chair, JC said he had no preference and would be fine with HPH continuing as chair or having PW chair the EC in 2022.

added that LACNIC has no preference on who should be NRO EC chair next year, whether APNIC or RIPE, and that it was a matter for the two to decide.

PW said he was prepared to take on the chair role, with APNIC staff chairing the coordination groups.

HPH thanked PW for accepting the role.

HPH then volunteered to be NRO EC secretary in 2022.

The formal motion was put forward: In 2022, NRO EC roles will be distributed as follows: PW, chair; JC, treasurer; HPH secretary.

All were in favor, so the motion carried and the following resolution was recorded.

R-20211130-1: In 2022, NRO EC roles will be distributed as follows: PW, chair; JC, treasurer; HPH vice chair/secretary.

Before moving on to the next agenda item, GV reminded the EC that the secretary role was automatically assigned the vice chair position and that the EC had agreed in the past that the former chair would go on to be vice chair so there is some continuity.

5. Reverse DNS Resolution Content in the IANA SLA Update

HPH explained that he had sent a reminder to the IANA and had not heard back yet.

6. 2022 ASO Review

GV explained that there is a process for the review of the ASO, a public process that is published as part of the recommendations of the last public review. This ASO review is due in 2022, so GV has drafted the corresponding RFP and budget considerations, which is available on the NRO wiki. He added that the biggest question was whether to engage in the ASO review in 2022 or postpone it until 2023.

HPH invited the opinion of the others.

JC said that, technically, the ASO review is the review of how the ASO conducts its functions fulfilling its role within the ICANN organization, adding that this hadn't been clear in past reviews and that it should now be made very clear. He explained that, in his opinion, the ASO might benefit from putting the review off for a year but added that he was not aware of the downsides of not completing this ASAP.

HPH agreed, adding that having the ASO review after the NRO strategy review would be a good idea.

All agreed.

HPH asked for the following decision to be recorded in the minutes:

R-20211130-2: The ASO Review originally scheduled for 2022 will be postponed until 2023.

7. 2022 NRO EC Roles

Already discussed earlier.

8. RIR Updates

HPH shared that RIPE had held a meeting last week with more than 1000 registrants, that it would be the last virtual-only meeting, as RIPE announced that the next meeting will be held in Berlin, travel/meeting restrictions allowing.

He added that plenty of good stuff had taken place during the meeting: presentation of a new charging scheme that will be voted in May, activity plan and budget, with two proposals: 1) a proposal not to do sponsorships for Atlas probes but to have these fully funded by membership, and 2) a proposal to include sustainability as part of the work of the RIPE NCC.

9. Open Actions Review

HPH said that there was only one open action and that they had already dealt with it (IANA SLA).

GV confirmed this.

10. Minutes Review

2021-October-19: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - DRAFT (Pending: AFRINIC, ARIN)

HPH reminded EK and JC that they needed to approve the minutes.

EK and JC confirmed that they already have approved the October minutes.

11. Next Meetings

a) Tuesday 21 December 2021

EK and PW noted that this would be too much into the holidays.

PW reminded the others that GP had mentioned that he expected to attend the next NRO EC meeting. He added that there is more happening in the planning process, so perhaps the EC could have a short meeting with GP (in the week prior to the scheduled EC meeting), as this might be useful to make sure the process stays on track and on task through the rest of that period.

After some further discussion, all agreed to move the December meeting to the 14th, subject to confirmation by OR, who was no longer on the call when this change of date was discussed.

b) Tuesday 18 January 2022

All agreed to confirm this date during the December NRO EC meeting.

c) Tuesday 15 February 2022

HPH noted that this overlaps with the Dubai retreat.

EM asked whether they were considering adding another day to discuss regular EC matters or whether the Dubai meeting would be limited to planning issues.

After some discussion, it was decided to extend the Dubai meeting to include the morning of the 16 February so they can hold the February EC meeting in person.

12. AOB

JC said that he would not be reachable the week following this week and that Richard would be in charge of ARIN.

HPH said that he planned to take the last week of the year and the first week of 2022 but would still be reachable if anything happens.

13. Adjourn

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 12:31 UTC.