

2022-July-26: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference

FINAL

Date: Tuesday, 26 July 2022, 11:00 AM UTC

Attendees

Executive Council:

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

Observers:

Andrew Sullivan (AS)	ISOC
Dawit Bekele (DB)	ISOC
Glenn Price (GP)	LeaderShape
Pablo Hinojosa (PH)	APNIC
Karla Skarda (KS)	APNIC
Vivek Nigam (VN)	APNIC
Kenny Huang (KH)	APNIC
Ernesto Majó (EM)	LACNIC
Esteban Lescano (EL)	LACNIC
Chris Buckridge (CB)	RIPE NCC
Richard Jimmerson (RJ)	ARIN
Bill Sandiford (BS)	ARIN

Secretariat:

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

Agenda

1.- Welcome

2.- Agenda Review

3.- NRO Strategy Update

4.- Status of Inter RIR Transfer

5.- Reverse DNS Resolution Content Update in the IANA SLA

6.- PTI Engagement for Fiscal Year 2024

7.- RIR CEO Updates

8.- [Open Actions Review](#)

9.- Minutes Review

- [2022-June-24: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference](#) - DRAFT (Pending: AFRINIC, ARIN, RIPE NCC)
- [2022-May-24: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference](#) - DRAFT (Pending: AFRINIC, ARIN)
- [2022-April-19: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference](#) - DRAFT (Pending: ARIN, RIPE NCC)

10.- Next Meetings

- a) Next NRO EC f2f Meeting.
- b) Tuesday 16 August 2022 Teleconference
- c) Tuesday 20 September 2022 Teleconference

11.- AOB

12. Adjourn

New and Updated Action Items

New Action Item 220726-1: JC to take the opportunity simplify the language and refine the language of the MoU prior to its signing.

New Action Item 220726-2: JC and OR to investigate pros and cons of incorporation, the steps and timing, risks and other considerations involved and prepare a strawman by December, with a check-in in late September or early October to see whether that path is still valid. (replaces action item 220624-4)

New Action Item 220726-3: PW and GP to propose in a one page document the new approach with the NRO CGs. How they will complement the role of program managers and how they'll continue their roles in the future. (replaces action item 220624-5)

New Action Item 220726-4: HPH will share with the EC draft output of the RIPE NCC'S recommended approaches to crisis response once this output is ready (2022 Q4).

New Action Item 220726-5: GP will work with PW (NRO Chair) to put together a very small team with limited time to work on a recommended approach to defining a crisis response plan (which is not a critical item).

New Action Item 220726-6: PW to send a note to Kim Davies saying that we are happy with the proposed amendments to the IANA SLA submitted by ICANN and are ready to sign the SLA, asking how ICANN would like to proceed, and indicating a preference for remote signing.

New Resolutions

R-20220726-1: The NRO EC resolves to accept the proposed amendments to the IANA SLA submitted by ICANN and are ready to sign the SLA.

Minutes

1.- Welcome

Because PW advised that he would be 30 minutes late, the meeting was opened by NRO vice chair HPH at 11:03 UTC.

2.- Agenda Review

-

3.- NRO Strategy Update

GP said he sent a slide deck, that he will not go through each slide but instead has some questions they can go through before PW joins the call.

While sharing it on screen, GP spoke to the latest version of the NRO EC 3-Year Strategy Workshop Capture & Recommendation Report. He first addressed accountability, timing, action items for the following key decision points (see NRO EC Strategy Summary Report v5): 1) Signing of the MoU by all the RIRs, 2) Evaluation of NRO incorporation, 3) Co-ordination group communication. As each of these three key decision points were discussed, GP updated the report accordingly.

For the first key decision point, the following action item was decided.

New Action Item 220726-1: JC to take the opportunity simplify and refine the language of the MoU prior to its signing.

Regarding the second key decision point, a new timeline was discussed and agreed to replace Action Item 220624-4:

New Action Item 220726-2: JC and OR to investigate pros and cons of incorporation of the NRO, steps and timing, risks and other considerations involved and prepare a strawman by December, with a check-in in late September or early October to see whether that path is still valid. (replaces action item 220624-4)

Regarding the third key decision point (Action Item 220624-5), GP noted that the EC hasn't defined how to bring the CGs into this so that they actually understand their role, which is complementary to the role of the program managers. He added that he and PW will come back to the EC with a one-pager of what that would look like, how long that conversation needs to be, how do we keep them involved, etc.

New Action Item 220726-3: PW and GP to propose in a one page document the new approach with the NRO CGs. How they will complement the role of program managers and how they'll continue their roles in the future. (replaces action item 220624-5)

GP then moved on to discuss the focus, accountability, timing, and possible action items for some recommendations prompted by things that were noted by GP or by the others during their off-site meeting (again, see NRO EC Strategy Summary Report v5): 1) NRO critical incident mitigation, 2) Communication and publication of the NRO 5-year Strategic Plan, 3) Program acceleration, 4) Resourcing.

While going over each of these recommendations and once everyone had provided their input, GP updated the report.

NRO critical incident mitigation:

HPH and his CISO are developing a crisis management process for the RIPE NCC crisis team. This includes the criteria for a crisis, minimal resources for the crisis team, how to communicate internally and externally and how to make operational decisions to mitigate the crisis, most often on a daily basis. This will be ready in 3-4 months, and HPH will share this and make a proposal for the NRO based on this process so for the NROs consideration.

New Action Item 220726-4: HPH will share with the EC draft output of the RIPE NCC'S recommended approaches to crisis response once this output is ready (2022 Q4).

JC observed that ARIN has a crisis response plan and a messaging plan, a full scope crisis team, which has never been triggered.

Importance of scoping. There are two options for NRO critical incident mitigation: something that would be triggered quite a bit or something that's only for cataclysmic events.

HPH said that, while he has no documented process yet, the process has been activated three times this year at ripe NCC. The RIPE NCC has established a criticality framework with the community, and the criteria for activating crisis management will be aligned with this.

Challenge noted by JC and HPH: how do the ARIN and the RIPE NCC crisis response teams interact with an NRO crisis response team?

OR observed that, while crisis management is paramount in our current situation, the NRO EC has prioritized RPKI and the other programs. As long as we don't get traction on those, these other activities don't matter. This is the old NRO, the one that is unable to address what the community expects from us. He requested everyone not to derail their work by trying to do all these things before doing the actual things that we need to do to change the NRO.

JC said he would limit it to messaging and only for the most significant events and when the CEO triggers it, i.e., "look, before each of us communicates, can we at least get on the first page with our messaging?" That would have some value. However, if we decide to incorporate the NRO, the NRO will have a crisis response plan because the scope of how we message collectively will almost certainly fall to the NRO LLC entity.

Conclusion: everyone agreed on this focus point.

New Action Item 220726-5: GP will work with PW (NRO Chair) to put together a very small team with limited time to work on a recommended approach to defining a crisis response plan for the NRO (not a critical action item).

Communication and publication of the NRO 5-year Strategic Plan

GP said that we now have a 5-year Strategic plan, we need to determine the correct medium and narrative for key stakeholders of the NRO 5 Year Strategic Plan, and to update the NRO website with refreshed vision, mission, and purpose. But this is not urgent.

Program acceleration

GP explained that this refers to how we make sure that we move forward on the three critical programs within the strategic plan. He does not need an output today, but he wants to know whether we've done what we need to in order for those plans to move forward. He expressed his concern that they don't have a lead person driving each of those programs.

JC mentioned two personal requirements: first, the need to know who the lead is for each program (he would be happy to be the lead for the RPKI program); second, the need to know if our goal is to drive the work forward or to drive the process forward. As long as there is clarity on that, he is fine. Before moving ahead, he needs to know whether he has the authority to start the process, e.g., pushing to recruit an RPKI program manager at the NRO level. We need to know if we have delegated to someone the authority to start the process, e.g., hiring the program managers, etc.

To GP, having a lead means not doing the work but making sure that the work is progressing.

PW joined the meeting at this point.

GP asked for suggestions on how to move forward the programs we agreed in Dubai and confirmed in Miami. He would like some level of confidence that the steering groups are happening, job descriptions are being placed, adds are going out globally and so on. This might not be for tonight, but he left Miami concerned because there is so much to do. One approach for the next part would be to work individually with leads, the other approach would be to at least begin to form steering groups.

Way forward: everyone will reflect on this. GP will capture some questions stemming from this call and share those with the group. Hopefully on the EC's next call or in between calls we can make sure that we're doing what the NRO needs.

JC observed that he is not yet taking action because he does not have power of authority. GP added that this really comes down to the chair and vice chairs.

GP left on a high note saying that he was really pleased with the work they had done and that he truly hopes that everyone feels the same. Now, we've got to go do it, but the text in the four columns (Resilience, Stewardship, Efficiency, Engagement) is a strong narrative that gives us a guiding light.

He thanked everyone for their time and concluded by saying that he will come back with some outlines once he's spoken to PW for clear communications and will probably see everyone on the next call.

GP and EL left the call at this time.

4.- Status of Inter RIR Transfer

PW gave the floor to KS.

KS spoke to an RSCG ppt presentation on Inter-RIR Transfers she shared on screen, adding that she'd also invited VN who might be able to better answer some questions the EC may have.

She began by explaining the challenges inter-RIR transfers are experiencing (they are being coordinated via email and respective databases are being updated separately) and then explained the problems the RSCG is trying to solve, namely: 1) increase security, 2) Increase efficiency, 3) Eliminate human error, 4) eliminate time lag.

She noted that the volume of inter-RIR IPv4 transfers is increasing exponentially and explained how long each transfer takes based on the answers that RIPE NCC, LACNIC and APNIC had provided to the question. All involve a significant number of working days and man hours.

She also spoke to how success might be measured and provided some compelling examples.

She concluded her presentation by explaining the benefits they hope to gain.

OR thanked KS for her presentation, said he understands the problem but is not sure what her proposal is for solving these challenges.

KS explained that the RSCG at this point is trying to present the problem, but now would move on to finding a solution. She added that they do not have the resources and that this hasn't got traction since 2018 is because it has not been mandated. She knows that there is talk of getting a PM on board, perhaps that would facilitate this as well.

CB thanked KS and asked whether the exponential growth she mentioned is envisioned as a spike that will then become lower or that it will be sustained in time.

VN replied that current statistics show no signs that it will slow down and that it will continue to increase for at least for a couple of years.

JC asked KS if she could send a copy of the slides to the NRO EC.

HPH noted that they had not agreed to have a program manager for this area at this level any time soon and suggested the RSCG bring this to the ECG.

OR commented that this is a complex topic, a challenging situation for operations. The NRO EC recently prioritize the most relevant topics in our agenda and we didn't have information about this one, so this is not one of the three topics the NRO EC chose to prioritize in the short term. Also, the EC realized that we do not have the organization we need to address challenges such as the one KS is presenting. The EC is not ready to answer what are the next steps and was hoping that you had already discussed this with the ECG or the internal engineering departments.

KS replied that this has been discussed at APNIC with the engineering team, as APNIC is chairing the ECG this year. She observed that this is a mandate that initially came from the EC so, if it still requires priority, then it would have to be mandated once again by the NRO EC.

JC echoed OR's comments. Do the RIRs agree that automation of inter-RIR transfers is a priority project? JC doesn't know. He has a full engineering roadmap from ARIN and wonders how this will fit in, as it's more complicated than it looks. We're trying to be good CEOs, not tasking working groups any more but tasking our own people. In his opinion, this is something that will not be planned for 2022, for 2023 it needs to be prioritized like everything else.

HPH mentioned that sanctions will probably trump automation of inter-RIR transfers this year and probably next year.

OR offered to ask his CTO Carlos Martinez who is at the IETF meeting, to listen carefully to see if this problem is discussed and to see how we can imagine a solution from LACNIC's side. That would help us understand the effort we need to set aside and plan something for next year.

All agreed that the following step would be for KS to post the RSCG presentation on inter-RIR transfers to the engineering group for discussion.

KS and Vivek left the meeting.

5.- Reverse DNS Resolution Content Update in the IANA SLA

JC said we got back an amendment to our SLA with ICANN, which he reviewed and determined it is similar but not substantially different from the agreement we proposed. ARIN is fine with the proposed amendments, but others may not be.

OR thanked JC for his review. He agreed that it's very similar to what we had and added that we should advance and get it signed, it is a good start, we are already receiving this service.

PW, EK, and HPH also agreed so the following resolution was decided:

R-20220726-1: The NRO EC resolves to accept the proposed amendments to the IANA SLA submitted by ICANN and are ready to sign the SLA.

After discussing the possibility of having a signing ceremony, the following action item was decided:

New Action Item 220726-6: PW to send a note to Kim Davies saying that we are happy with the proposed amendments to the IANA SLA submitted by ICANN and are ready to sign the SLA, asking how ICANN would like to proceed, and indicating a preference for remote signing.

6.- PTI Engagement for Fiscal Year 2024

Postponed until the next meeting.

7.- RIR CEO Updates

Postponed until the next meeting.

8.- Open Actions Review

Postponed until the next meeting.

9.- Minutes Review

- [2022-June-24: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference](#) - DRAFT (Pending: AFRINIC, ARIN, RIPE NCC)
- [2022-May-24: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference](#) - DRAFT (Pending: AFRINIC, ARIN)
- [2022-April-19: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference](#) - DRAFT (Pending: ARIN, RIPE NCC)

EK observed that unless there is something urgent, he would prefer to do his review of the minutes it in two weeks, as he is on vacation.

No objections were heard.

10.- Next Meetings

a) Next NRO EC f2f Meeting.

b) Tuesday 16 August 2022 Teleconference

c) Tuesday 20 September 2022 Teleconference

No modifications to the dates of the next three NRO EC meetings were suggested.

11.- AOB

-

12. Adjourn

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 14:09 UTC.

