

# 2022-February-16: Minutes NRO EC Face-to-Face Meeting

FINAL

Date: Wednesday, 16 February 2022, 9:00 AM Dubai UAE (+4 UTC)

## Attendees

### Executive Council:

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

### Observers:

Anton Strydom (AS)	APNIC
Tony Smith (TS)	APNIC
Karla Skarda (KS)	APNIC
Jamie Gillespie (JG)	APNIC
Pablo Hinojosa (PH)	APNIC
Ernesto Majó (EM)	LACNIC
Chris Buckridge (CB)	RIPE NCC
Richard Jimmerson (RJ)	ARIN
Bill Sandiford (BS)	ARIN

### Secretariat:

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

# **Agenda**

## **1.- Welcome**

## **2.- Agenda Review**

## **3.- NRO Strategy Review Plan**

### **Status**

- NRO EC to discuss any last development on the NRO strategy review.

## **4.- Coordination Group Updates**

### **a) Communications Coordination Group 2022 Work Plan**

### **b) Engineering Coordination Group 2022 Work Plan**

### **c) Public Safety Coordination Group 2022 Work Plan**

### **d) Registration Services Coordination Group 2022 Work Plan**

### **e) Public Affairs Coordination Plan 2022 Work Plan**

## **5.- AFRINIC Situation Update**

### **Status**

- NRO EC to discuss any last development on AFRINIC.

## **6.- 2021 NRO Expenses Report**

### **Status**

- NRO EC to review and discuss the 2021 NRO Expenses Report

## **7.- 2021 NRO Distribution Formula**

### **Status**

- NRO EC to review and discuss the 2021 NRO Distribution Formula

## **8.- Reverse DNS Resolution Content in the IANA SLA Update**

## Status

- In 2020 the NRO EC agreed to add reverse DNS resolution in the IANA SLA

Last version of the document with both parties comments (November 2020)

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.

NRO EC to review updates

## 9.- Meeting with ICANN Board During ICANN 73

### Status

- A meeting invitation has been extended to the ASO to meet on Wednesday 9 March 2022, 20:30 UTC
- ICANN Board Chair Maarten Botterman has proposed the following topics for the joint meeting:
  - What are your key priorities for ICANN work in 2022, how do these priorities help achieve ICANN's common objectives as expressed in the FY 2021-2025 Strategic Plan, and how do you see the ICANN community, Board, and org moving forward together on a way to achieve these?

If any, what suggestions would you have to enhance ICANN's effectiveness and efficiency with regards to the process of implementation after adoption of a PDP or Review recommendations?

- The ASO is welcome to provide its set of topics/questions for the joint meeting by Wednesday, 16 February 2022.

NRO EC to evaluate this invitation.

## 10.- RIR CEO Updates

### Status

- Optional updates from the CEO on internal news of their RIRs

## 11.- Open Actions Review

## 12.- Minutes Review

- **2021-January-18: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - DRAFT (Pending: AFRINIC, ARIN)**

### **13.- Next Meetings**

**a) Tuesday 22 March 2022**

**b) Tuesday 19 April 2022**

**c) Tuesday 17 May 2022**

### **14.- AOB**

### **15. Adjourn**

=====

## **New Action Items**

**New Action Item 220216-1: The Secretariat and GV to work on a response to the invitation to meet with the ICANN Board During ICANN 73.**

## **New Resolutions**

**R-20220216-1: The NRO EC resolves to approve the 2021 NRO Expenses Report.**

**R-20220216-2: The NRO EC resolves to approve the 2021 Distribution Formula.**

**R-20220216-3: The NRO EC resolves to contribute USD 250,000 to AFRINIC's legal representation expenses. This amount is to be included in the 2021 NRO Expenses Report.**

## **Minutes**

### **1. Welcome**

PW welcomed everyone both in the room and connected remotely. The meeting began with general introductions.

## **2. Agenda Review**

PW went over the proposed agenda while showing it on screen.

It was suggested to begin with a brief read out of what we heard and learned during the strategy review held in the past two days, perhaps before the coordination group reports.

No other additions or modifications were proposed.

## **3.- NRO Strategy Review Plan**

PW noted that the report has not been written up yet, but that the main body of the work was identifying and then discussing in detail some of the biggest risks and opportunities that we feel we have as the NRO, then prioritizing and making some decisions about what we're going to do about them.

After the first day of discussions, we arrived at the decision to allocate some resources for each of the prioritized items and to recruit a dedicated resource—a program manager—for each of the three priority areas which we termed 'programs.' These program managers will possibly be collectively recruited, will use resources that are allocated specifically by each of the RIRs, will be dedicated to running and achieving the goals of their specific programs, and will report to a steering group of individuals from each of the RIRs, with the steering group being a sort of senior group delegated to actually take all the necessary decisions required by the program managers. The initial agreement is that the steering group would be the NRO EC, with delegation as needed to the right individuals at each RIR. This model was discussed as it might apply to the first Program that was identified, namely RPKI.

The other two programs identified after further discussion during the Strategy Review were cybersecurity in the RIRs and government engagement. After PW shared some of the aspects that the EC had discussed during the strategy retreat, the conclusion was that both these programs might be approached in the same way as RPKI, with specific peculiarities depending on the program which will be discovered as time goes on.

The Strategy Review mapped out a whole set of timelines and objectives for engaging internally within the RIRs, particularly with the coordination groups, before defining and launching the recruiting processes.

All of this must be written up and validated with the EC, as it involves budgetary issues that might come up during the course of the year.

PW noted that the second day of the Strategy Review was spent talking about operational model, mostly about the coordination groups. He said that they had observed that the work of the CGs can be divided into two types: 1) strategic work they are tasked to do/joint cooperation on a

particular project which is agreed as a joint party, and 2) cooperative/collaborative work that is more self-directed.

Regarding the more collegial work, we thought that a useful way forward might to allow the CGs to transform themselves into a sort of ‘guild’ of RIR staff with overlapping, common, intersecting responsibilities and for that group to decide in its own way how it wants to organize (e.g., the need for a formal work plan, deciding whether they want to rotate the chair, etc.), i.e., those staff simply making their own decisions on what they're doing and how they are doing it, and how they think they need to work together, but always within their own job roles and management structures.

JC added that the five RIRs do a lot of things that look the same —engineering, registration, and so on— and we want the CGs to be seen and used as resources to hear what's happening in the other RIRs, inspire ideas and be something the members of the CGs look forward to participating in. Historically, we have tasked the CGs. Now, we’ve realized that for things that are really important we need to have unified results and a unified timeline, so we will be taking a different approach, which is the Program approach PW described earlier. This is a substantial change, but it responds to the input we’ve heard through the RIR staff survey, which is that the NRO work coming through the CGs sometimes doesn’t feel like part of, or is unrelated to, the staff’s main job. Hopefully, we’ll see the coordination groups with a more relaxed model. “These are your coordination groups, how you want to work with your peers and within your organization?” How the CGs work and what work they do is really to help you do a better job in your own organization.

PW suggested that he or the other CEOs might join the next CG meetings and not rely on the chairs to convey this information. The EC needs to let CGs know that a lot of time had been spent reviewing the results of the work that Glenn Price and Terry Reynolds from Leadershape, hugely diverse feedback with a wide spread scores, which was interesting and challenging to work out.

PH commented that it was great that such an agreement and strong commitment had been reached and said he should be ready to collaborate in the implementation of these programs.

#### **4.- Coordination Group Updates**

##### **a) Communications Coordination Group 2022 Work Plan**

TS shared 2022 CCG Work Plan on screen and went over some of its highlights. He noted that even while drafting the Work Plan the CCG was aware that the Strategic Review was ongoing and that the CCG Work Plan might change depending on new priorities the CCG might need to work on, so it was kept open pending the results of the Strategic Review.

PW asked whether any of the things on the plan has concrete deliverables, other than IGF which has a concrete date.

TS replied that they do not, largely because the CCG was waiting to hear the outcome of the NRO Strategy Review. Traditionally, a lot of the work the CCG has done has been fairly reactive, servicing the needs of the other CGs as opposed to establishing our own ideas and plans for what we want to do. Now that we've heard more about the Strategy Review, this may change.

HPH agreed that communications is not a goal in itself but more of a tool for all the other projects and initiatives. He then wondered if there is any information on what is going on with the Internet Health Indicators, as they have been on the list since 2017 and we haven't created anything in common.

TS said he knows that work is going on in APNIC, and that he is aware that they need to coordinate with the other RIRs to find out progress and see if we can make any announcements or communications.

JC said the communications team is doing great in communicating about the work that is going on throughout the RIRs. He then asked if there is anything the CCG is working on that is not part of the existing goals of the day-to-day jobs of the members of the CCG.

TS said that at the moment there is not. As an example of something that had been new and different and directed by the NRO EC, he mentioned the IANA transition, which the CCG had worked on a few years back.

PW mentioned that the IGF falls into that category. There's more done there than just the RIRs working individually, it's a cooperative job.

JC noted that the NRO EC may not have been the clearest in helping the CGs understand the victory conditions and we are aware of that.

TS said it was no problem and added that doing the Strategic Review had already helped frame some things, i.e., now that we know that RPKI and cybersecurity will now be some of our big focus areas. Also, now that the NRO has more members on the IGF MAG, it may be an opportunity to have meaningful influence and dialogue at the IGF that we did not have in the past.

## **b) Engineering Coordination Group 2022 Work Plan**

Next, AS proceeded to present the proposed 2022 ECG Work Plan, commenting on some of its highlights.

JC thanked AS for his great report, noting that it's excellent to see the level of coordination the ECG is achieving and the fact that it is happening organically to some extent.

He added that the EC is aware that the collective community is increasingly looking at the RIRs as offering a set of shared services, even if they are doing it in five different registries, so the RPKI discussion is likely to lead to the RIRs talking about more similarities and more coordination.

JC noted that a structure needs to be created for coming across those decisions at the NRO EC level. He reiterated that he loves the coordination that is happening and said that hopefully, the EC can offer the ECG some guidance, but that the EC needs to figure out how to do this, because, even if we provide the ECG guidance and the ECG finds out that it's too hard or requires resources, a control mechanism is still needed, and we don't really have that today.

PW asked whether the stats file is an Engineering problem or a Registration Services problem. Is the RSCG involved with the stats file?

AS replied that this is the same case as ITHI, the Health Indicators that HPH mentioned earlier. The ECG works very closely with the RSCG in terms of definitions and what the answer should be, but the implementation happens in Engineering.

PW added that in both cases the semantics belongs to Registration Services.

AS confirmed this.

JC noted that the NRO should decide what our goals are in this area and set formal directions. If our goal is to have standard transfer logs and standard extended stats files, we no longer need to guide our Registration Services and Engineering teams because we've given them a milestone. This is something we need to think about.

### **c) Public Safety Coordination Group 2022 Work Plan**

JG presented and commented on the 2022 PSCG Work Plan.

JC thanked JG for an excellent report. He noted that when the NRO starts looking at the Government Engagement and Messaging Program and starts setting goals, public safety coordination may also be involved.

### **d) Registration Services Coordination Group 2022 Work Plan**

Then it was KS's turn to present the RSCG 2022 Work Plan.

JC thanked KS for the report and for the great coordination work. It's good to see that the registry teams are getting together to deal with problems that I hadn't really thought about. Again, as much as possible, in cases where there are clear commitments and deliverables from the NRO EC level, we're going to try to be clearer on what our priorities. That's what our workshop over the last two days was about.

PW asked about the Fraud Communication Framework.

KS explained that people need to be aware of the mechanisms they need to use to actually use this framework, which is now just sitting there as there have been zero reports. It's a matter of reporting in a way that will be useful for the other regions to understand what everyone is dealing with.



PW asked whether the Framework then allows specific information to be shared about specific cases.

KS replied that it does. It is a very select group, literally one person from each RIR and legal representative, which is appropriate to make sure that the information is managed effectively.

PW thanked KS for her report.

#### **e) Public Affairs Coordination Plan 2022 Work Plan**

PH observed that the PACG does not have a full-fledged Work Plan for 2022, as they were waiting for the outcomes of the general Strategy Retreat. He said that, if possible, he would like to have a conversation with the EC today about what the EC envisages the PACG's role will be to help scope the new Governmental engagement Program that was announced today.

He then presented the following update:

PACG is a really great group with many new members, so there is an opportunity for a fresh approach to the PACG. This year, it also has a unique opportunity because three RIR staff members have been selected to the IGF MAG. The group is ready for a very difficult and particularly intense 2022, mostly on the governmental front. During 2021, PACG worked on a quarterly basis, mostly on information sharing, as while quite a lot was happening in the political and regulatory world, the covid situation made it difficult to have a coordinated engagement approach. The exception was the response PACG prepared to an OECD paper on routing security.

Throughout the years. PACG has had a stable set of intergovernmental Internet governance and I\* engagements where we coincide and share information (ITU, the UN, the IGF, I\* dynamics, relationships with ISOC and ICANN). The ITU is very unique and there will be a lot of politics and threats related to standardization, cybersecurity, or other topics.

Now, the PACG seems to have found an opportunity for a face-to-face PACG meeting on 3 March in Geneva around the ITU WTSA meeting, so PH would like to seek the NRO EC's endorsement for this PACG meeting and ask for the NRO EC's direction on what would be the best outcomes the PACG should produce from this meeting to get the best value from this f2f meeting, during which the PACG can also start to think about the recently announced Government Engagement Program.

Before concluding, PH noted that he had uploaded to the NRO wiki outline of global processes PACG will be covering in 2022.

PW replied that, in his opinion, the discussions about the coordination groups being a voluntary and opt-in model also applies to f2f meetings. He added that if it turns out that four RIRs happen to be converging in one place, the fifth might feel motivated to be there, but we wouldn't be endorsing an official meeting unless something in connection with a program activity. He asked

PH whether other RIR staff have already confirmed they will be in Geneva or were waiting to see if there's some kind of official meeting to justify a trip.

PH replied that representatives of four of the RIRs had confirmed their presence (all but AFRINIC) and added that remote participation would also be available.

According to PW, under the new model, the idea would be to encourage that meeting very much, to see how important group members believe it is to join the meeting physically. Right now, we don't know what the modus operandi will be.

In JC's opinion, right now there are no program managers or steering committee, so the decision is on the EC. I don't problem with us making the call, I have faith that if one of our CGs believe they need to meet to get their job done, they should get the chance to do so.

PW added that each RIR decides whether to budget for one, two or zero people depending on their budgets and priorities.

PH explained that if there is something that the PACG can do to support the establishment of the Program, this would be a good opportunity to work on that. Otherwise, we can proceed with a more general agenda as all PACG members have a lot to share and work to do on the engagements listed in the PACG space of the NRO wiki.

PH said that it would be fantastic to have someone from AFRINIC at the f2f meeting in Geneva but added that remote participation would also be an option.

PW asked whether the PACG would need a meeting room, a social dinner, and so on, noting that this would be ok.

JC agreed that they all have individual budgets, but that coordination still needs to happen.

PH asked for confirmation that it would be ok to organize for a meeting room and charge the cost to the NRO at a suitable time.

No objections were heard.

## **5. AFRINIC Situation Update**

EK noted that he had shared the latest news on the mailing list: AFRINIC won the appeal. This was a major milestone, but not the end of the cases, as there are multiple ongoing cases.

## **6.- 2021 NRO Expenses Report**

While displaying it on screen, GV proceeded to present the final 2021 NRO Expenses Report, explaining that all the information has been validated by the CFOs. He said that, generally speaking, two-thirds of the budget were executed and that expenses for meetings were not executed.

He then went over and explained the various items and columns included in the budget, adding that he would have a meeting with the CFOs later in the day to organize the transfer of the money.

JC then moved to approve the 2021 NRO Expenses Report as presented and direct the CFOs to do transfers as necessary per the distribution formula. PW seconded the motion, no objections were heard, and the motion carried.

### **R-20220216-1: The NRO EC resolves to approve the 2021 NRO Expenses Report.**

#### **7.- 2021 NRO Distribution Formula**

GV displayed the 2021 NRO Distribution Formula on-screen and reminded the EC that each year they are asked to review the distribution formula.

At OR's request, GV explained that the distribution formula is based on the self-declared revenue for registration services. This criteria of making this calculation based on revenue for registry services declared each year was adopted in 2013. The CFOs share the numbers with each other based on a common definition of registration services.

Having the NRO EC reviewed it, JC moved to approve the 2021 NRO Distribution Formula. HPH seconded the motion, no objections were heard, and the motion carried.

### **R-20220216-2: The NRO EC resolves to approve the 2021 Distribution Formula.**

#### **8.- Reverse DNS Resolution Content in the IANA SLA Update**

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) is ongoing.

#### **9.- Meeting with ICANN Board During ICANN 73**

PW explained that there had been an invitation sent to Constituency and Stakeholder Groups Chairs to a meeting with Göran Marby in preparation for ICANN 73. For PW was offered a 1:1 meeting with Göran, but that was at 3 a.m. Australia time. He checked, but ICANN replied that there were no other available time slots, that ICANN would be happy to reach out to him as soon as they begin scheduling the next round, and that if there was anything PW wanted to discuss with Göran Marby 1:1 before the next round, to please let them know.

OR believes it would be important to first have a conversation to establish coincidences and topics. That would be more beneficial than having the extended meeting proposed by ICANN.

After some further discussion, JC proposed a reply along the following lines: "The NRO does not have any questions for this joint meeting, we have no comments, ICANN's objectives are predominantly focused on your DNS constituency. We do, however, welcome the invite and feel that, given the dynamics going on in each of the RIR communities, it might be good for the RIR

CEOs to have a call with yourself and Göran to update each other periodically.” He added that the RIR community is not present at ICANN meetings.

PW summarized by saying that they might reply as follows: “We don't have answers to these questions, we think everything at ICANN is going well, as far as we're concerned. However, we would like to take the opportunity to report on some developments in the RIR world, for which we would like to schedule a meeting between Göran, Maarten, and the NRO EC.” Then it would be up to each of us to decide whether to participate. PW would attend, and so might EK and the others. As mentioned earlier, this was already proposed by ICANN, but the only available timeslot was at 3 a.m.

This was agreed and the following action item was decided:

**New Action Item 220216-1: The Secretariat and GV to work on a response to the invitation to meet with the ICANN Board During ICANN 73.**

## **10.- RIR CEO Updates**

OR presented the following update on LACNIC:

- LACNIC is considering having objective criteria to accept candidates to the LACNIC Board. This is a difficult process and one of the first steps is for the Board of Directors to suggest having these procedures presented to the General Assembly. If the Board approves the idea, it will be presented at our next General Assembly (3 May). OR will update the others when there are any new developments.
- At the same time, LACNIC is introducing many changes in the Bylaws. These were ready to be presented at the 2020 General Assembly, which was cancelled. The Board is just waiting for the General Assembly to happen. The changes are not major (conflict of interest and introduction of two new directors, moving from seven to nine, sequentially).
- This month LACNIC is launching with the Interamerican Development Bank a blockchain regional initiative called LAC Net (and it is part of LACChain ecosystem).

JC then provided the following ARIN update:

- He shared the status of RDAP - ARIN has moved to the common profile agreed with the other RIRs.
- ARIN is in the middle of consultations, a governance working group has been looking at our or permanent structure and tools in the area of elections and they've been making proposals to the community for discussion.
- We've discussed changes to the election nomination process, increasing the number of trustees, there is a chance that we will use a single transferable vote system at some point in the future. All of this will be discussed by the Board at a workshop to be held on the 25<sup>th</sup>.
- The ARIN meeting in Nashville will be held face to face with a safety protocol (we will encourage but not require vaccination, distribute test kits upon registration). Also, for

ARIN sponsored travel (Board and Advisory Council), ARIN doesn't travel unless you're a 'travel cleared' employee or volunteer (vaccinated or recently recovered from covid).

Then, all discussed details of various voting systems based on rankings vs majorities, potential legal implications, election vendor systems, and how these systems are perceived in each region. Examples of the use of the different systems both within and outside the RIR context were also shared.

As for AFRINIC, in addition to the legal business discussed earlier, EK mentioned that AFRINIC is planning to have many face-to-face meetings with the stakeholders and customers to improve the AFRINIC membership engagement level.

In relation to the RIPE NCC, HPH mentioned the following:

- The RIPE NCC still has no business travel except by special approval by HPH. He's hoping to get rid of this next quarter, but this might depend on how the global situation evolves.
- RIPE 85 in Berlin in May and SEE in April are being planned as hybrid meetings.

PW then provided the following update on APNIC:

- Elections are coming up, there are ten candidates. APNIC is doing a due diligence process for board members, as there are no investigations into the candidates' credentials, simply a self-declaration.
- JC explained how conflicts of interest are handled in the ARIN region. PW also described how a conflict of interest or interests against APNIC or the RIR system might be handled in APNIC. Further discussion ensued regarding how the inability to perform in a director role might be treated in each RIR region.
- APNIC has a fee structure change that has been implemented this year and is underway, requiring that holders of historical resources take out an account, where the difficulty is that the vast majority of them are not routed or contactable.
- APNIC 53 will be held fully online the week after next. There are provisions for APNIC 54 to be held as a hybrid meeting, in a suitable hub location (to be determined) in September. APNIC is going to describe all future meetings as hybrid and "online first".

## **11.- Open Actions Review**

Action Item 230316-4 remains in progress.

There were no other open actions to review.

## **12.- Minutes Review**

- **2021-January-18: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - DRAFT**

December 2021 minutes were reviewed and are ready to be published.

### **13.- Next Meetings**

#### **a) Tuesday 22 March 2022**

No conflicts were raised in relation to this date.

#### **b) Tuesday 19 April 2022**

This is the day after Easter Monday, but no conflicts were raised.

#### **c) Tuesday 17 May 2022**

It was proposed to tentatively move this meeting to the 24<sup>th</sup> to avoid clashing with the RIPE meeting. All agreed, pending confirmation closer to the meeting date.

### **14.- AOB**

After discussing the latest updates on AFRINIC's legal situation and the ruling in the appeal case in which AFRINIC was involved, the NRO EC resolved the following:

**R-20220216-3: The NRO EC resolves to contribute USD 250,000 to AFRINIC's legal representation expenses. This amount is to be included in the 2021 NRO Expenses Report.**

### **15. Adjourn**

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 PM Dubai Time (+4 UTC) .