2022-November-15: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference

FINAL

Date: Tuesday, 15 November 2022, 11:00 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	

Observers:

Karla Skarda (KS)	APNIC
Kenny Huang (KH)	APNIC
Richard Jimmerson (RJ)	ARIN
Pablo Hinojosa (PH)	APNIC
Chris Buckridge (CB)	RIPE NCC
Nirmal Manic (NM)	AFRINIC
Glenn Price	LeaderShape

Secretariat:

German Valdez (GV)	NRO Secretariat

Minutes: Laureana Pavon

Agenda

1.- Welcome

2.- Agenda Review

3.- NRO Strategy Update (Glenn Price)

a) Strategy Narrative

b) Program Acceleration

4.- RSCG Report (Karla Skarda)

5.- AFRINIC Update

6.- 2023 ASO Review

7.- Meeting with IETF Trustees

8.- ASO Appointment to ICANN Leadership Program

9.- RIR CEO Updates

Outline

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

10.- Open Actions Review

11.- Minutes Review

- 2022-October-18: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - DRAFT (Pending: AFRINIC, APNIC, ARIN)
- 2022-September-20: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - DRAFT (Pending: AFRINIC, APNIC, ARIN)
- 2022-August-16: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - DRAFT (Pending: AFRINIC, APNIC, ARIN)

12.- Next Meetings

a) Tuesday 20 December 2022 Teleconference

b) Tuesday 17 January 2023 Teleconference

c) Tuesday 21 February 2023 Teleconference

13.- AOB

14. Adjourn

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

New and Updated Action Items

New Action Item 221115-1: GV to reply to ICANN asking them to reserve two places for the NRO at the ICANN Leadership Program (LP) 2023 to be held at ICANN 76. The names of the two participants will be provided in due time once the ASO AC chair and vice chair are elected, but no travel support will be required from ICANN.

New Resolutions

R-2021115-1: The NRO EC resolves to defer the ASO Review to 2025 in alignment to ICANN Board Resolution in June 2022.

-

Minutes

1.- Welcome

PW welcomed everyone and the meeting began at 11:00 AM UTC.

2.- Agenda Review

PW went over the draft agenda, no comments were heard, and the agenda was approved as written.

3.- NRO Strategy Update (Glenn Price)

a) Strategy Narrative

b) Program Acceleration

PW thanked GP for his participation.

While sharing his screen, GP said his intention was to provide an update on the three strategic projects LeaderShape has been asked to help with and he has some decision points for the EC.

The original project plan included three big buckets that had come out from Miami. The first is "Communication," which includes the strategy narrative; the second is "Engage and Recruit," which includes consulting and engaging with co-ordination chairs and groups, and recruitment of

program managers); the third is "Program Acceleration," including the RPKI program (the focus is now to see how GP can assist the EC prior to the Christmas break), the cybersecurity program, and the engagement program.

Regarding the strategy narrative, our goal was to make sure that all relevant players are fully aware of and understand the intention and direction of our five-year Strategic Plan. GP has already created the draft narrative which he will share within the next 24 hours so that everyone can provide input and validate it.

GP suggested that he can then join the NRO EC meeting scheduled for 20 December for a final review and ratification of the narrative. The reason is two-fold: 1) it will allow you to share with your internal teams; and 2) the narrative could be ready for publishing around 21-22 December, a shortened version for the website and social media just before Christmas.

PW asked the other CEOs whether this narrative will have to go to their boards for consultation before publishing.

JC replied that, because this lines up with what his board asked him to proceed with, he is not planning to bring this up with his board unless the others want him to.

PW noted that this is an individual decision for each RIR.

In turn, OR replied that he has already communicated the general strategy to his board, and that in his opinion his board doesn't need precise details on how we are going to work in each program. In addition, one of his board members was present at the Miami retreat, so at this stage he will need to explain the status of the programs, without the details about the strategy.

PW thanked JC and OR for their replies.

GP then noted that the next project has two parts: consulting and engagement with our coordination chairs and groups, which is really important, as we need to provide them with a clear, empowering scope to enable people to collaborate. He added that he is already working on a workshop that he would like to run first with the CG chairs, then socialize the strategy, get feedback on how to engage their teams more effectively, and then have a workshop with each of the coordination groups, even those that may not be of a technical nature, such as comms or legal.

His suggestion is to delay having those conversations until mid-January, as the CG chairs will rotate on 1st January.

All agreed.

PW asked JC if his staff is ready to take on the coordination group chairing in January.

JC replied that they are ready, which is why it is really important to get the word out because we don't often give a mandate to coordination groups.

Then, GP noted that the next area involved the recruitment of the program managers. He mentioned that he has brought onboard somebody to help him look at the global PM role, his former COO, Ashley, a global program manager who has been of great help. With Ashley's help, GP has been able to reach a role definition. GP and Ashley would like to work with the RIR's HR leaders to get their input and buy-in and asked the CEOs to let him know who their HR leaders are so we can get aligned. After consultation with the HR leaders, the job description will be ready and the ads that will be going both on job boards and social media can be outlined.

GP has already talked with the current CCG chair, Tony, and he believes that with the help of Tony' and GV they will be able to get the adds out before Christmas. From an HR perspective, we know that year end is when people tend to look for new job opportunities.

Lastly, GP addressed program acceleration. He knows that we're working on RPKI first, that there's a steering group whose names GV has shared with him, and after reading the information available on Confluence he believes there is an opportunity for acceleration.

GP added that he would like to see even just one major final step prior to Christmas, so his recommendation is that he and Ashley hold a 90- or 120-minute call with the RPKI steering group to define what GP has termed a draft Program Charter, i.e., define what are the key results we are looking for, the scope we are trying to achieve in the next 12 months. Then, in a second workshop, we can begin to prioritize and distribute actions. So, even if it's taking us some time to get a PM on board, at least we've started to take some steps. Would everyone be OK with GP setting up this 90-or 120-minute virtual workshop?

JC said this was a great idea, as the group has stalled, and this will get the group going once again and set some clear objectives.

GP then asked GV to help set up a Doodle poll to determine the best date for the first workshop with the steering group on RPKI.

At PW's request, GP clarified that the additional person he has brought in to help will be at no additional cost to the NRO. He would like to introduce Ashley to the NRO during this workshop so that they can see some of his skills for themselves. His assumption is that the NRO will be pleased with Ashley's work, so it would make sense for him to continue on calls like this to observe and make sure that we're picking up on things as we go along.

No objections were heard.

Regarding the programs and coordination groups, HPH asked if there is a mapping between the programs and the coordination groups. We have not activated the security coordination group, which would be important moving forward.

GP agreed. Ideally, the steering groups for programs 2 and 3 would be completed prior to Christmas, but we can at least identify the steering group because we would be having a workshop with them.

GP added that not all of the coordination groups are mapped back to the three strategic projects, but that one of the outputs of the workshops with the coordination groups should be to produce this mapping. In GP's opinion, there will be three groups. The first will have some natural connection (e.g., RPKI, cybersecurity, and engagement), there will be some groups that don't naturally fit in so he wants to work with those groups to map them in, and then there will be some groups that will have a supporting role (e.g., communications or legal). This output will come once we finish the workshops with the coordination groups in mid to late January.

HPH asked whether GP has bundled RPKI and cybersecurity and mapped them to the ECG. HPH's preference would be to use this opportunity to kick off a dedicated security coordination group. This is more than getting an existing group on board. If the coordination groups are going to play a large role, the ECG is not where the RIPE NCC security people are.

PW said that they are forming steering groups from the ground up for each of the programs, as one of the benefits of the programs is to break through some of the silos of the coordination groups. This is not a magic solution, but if we're looking at the RPKI group and deciding the scope of the coordination group, it can be done without the assumption that this is the ECG but, instead, the people that need to be involved given the scope of the program and the purpose of the steering group.

HPH agreed. That was his assumption prior to this meeting, but now suddenly the existing coordination groups appears to have a prominent place on the map that was not evident in earlier versions of the plan.

GP explained that the goal was to clarify to the existing coordination group structure what their role will be next year, which was discussed during our retreats. We can't just turn off this structure, we still want to have their collaboration and input. For the steering group, GP strongly suggests that each RIR involve their specialists in those areas.

GP concluded his update by thanking everyone for their time and for ratifying the decisions. He said that he would share the slides he used during this meeting to the NRO EC mailing list. He will also share an email with an outline of a few things he needs from the NRO in terms of moving forward and sharing the narrative. He asked that if anyone has any questions to please send them to him.

GP left the call at this point.

4.- RSCG Report (Karla Skarda)

While sharing a slide deck on screen, KS presented the following RSCG update:

- In July, the NRO requested feedback from the ECG on the scope of what was required.
- There was some pushback from the ECG as there is an imbalance among the RIRs, in level of requirement (priority) for this piece of work.

- The RSCG acknowledged that this issue needs to be addressed, even if not all the RIRs are equally affected now, as it is likely they will be in the future as the number of transfers and participating territories increase, at least until ipv4 exhaustion.
- Anton Strydom (APNIC, ECG chair) re-introduced the topic at the ECG last week, as the mandate from the NRO was to map out a possible solution and understand the scope.
- The ECG has asked for a single slide defining the problem and they will readdress it.
- Something for further consideration is whether we abandon this as matter for the RSCG work plan and address it between APNIC and RIPE (or maybe between APNIC, RIPE and ARIN), which is where most of the challenges have been experienced (due to the volume and frequency of this type of transactions).

To summarize, KS noted that they have not made much progress on this, but she is leaning in on it and will keep the NRO posted.

OR thanked KS for following up on this topic and asked what she meant by "a level of imbalance."

By way of an example, KS mentioned the fact that AFRINIC is not doing transfers at all as they don't have a policy for that; also, as far as LACNIC is concerned, there aren't many transfers happening into different regions.

OR then asked whether the ECG is going to review this problem and come up with a proposal.

KS replied that this is what she asked Anton: to reintroduce the idea at the ECG meeting they had last week. Basically, the ECG said they didn't feel there was a requirement for it. The NRO has asked us to draft the scope and understand what's required before we make any decisions about whether we going to proceed or abandon it. We're not asking them to do the work, simply the scoping. There may have been some misunderstanding, as George Michealson (APNIC) who led the charge at the meeting in July has moved into a different role.

HPH noted that he still doesn't understand whether what's needed is a clear description of the process or the automation of a clearly described process. The first step should be to have a clearly written, formal process, then, if the volume is high, it can be automated. It's a cost-benefit decision for each of us to see how much engineering time we can put into developing something. He added that this can't be handed over to the programmers if the process isn't clear and asked KS whether the process is there.

KS replied that the process is quite clearly defined, but the process is quite different between each of the RIRs. She takes onboard what HPH is saying: first we need to put some effort into mapping out the actual processes before we start asking for a solution.

KS concluded her presentation on inter-RIR transfers by saying that she will continue to lean on this problem so that hopefully some conclusion can be reached by the end of the year.

Moving on to the next challenge, the ITHI implementation, KS noted that this is also something

that has been languishing in the RSCG work plan for a long time, a mandate that originally came from ICANN and had an enormous amount of value at the time because it brought attention to the fact that we needed to start measuring the accuracy of Whois databases. When we introduced the topic at the meeting we had at ARIN, it became clear that everybody is using vastly different processes and ways of measuring the three C's.

The RSCG then set up a full day to discuss this and found the following points against continuing the project:

- It has outlived its usefulness.
- The original mandate came from ICANN, who is no longer asking for it.
- A large chunk of resources / resource holders is excluded from these measurements, which makes the measures inaccurate.
- Value add is to continue sharing the information with a goal to achieve greater data accuracy for the Whois. However, trying to compare apples and oranges dilutes the information that can be shared (each RIR is vastly different).

She then shared the positive aspects that should be continued:

- The idea behind "Comprehensive, Correct, and Current" still has a lot of value and we should come up with a way for each RIR to measure what's important to them in light of the status of their operations.
  o Comprehensive: should also show NIR and legacy space.
  o Correct: general agreement that the point of contact should consist of the legal name of the organization and email verification, but exclude phone numbers, as phone numbers have become obsolete given the transition to remote work forces.
  o Current: should be represented in time blocks showing when we last contacted each customer in one-, two-, five-, and ten-year categories.

KS concluded by saying that this is something on which the RSCG were hoping to get some direction from the NRO: whether we can abandon the rigid specs for the ITHI or we can move on to something that is more useful considering the different aspects of the RIRs.

OR recalled that this work had had some benefits for the operations of the RIRs, at least it did for LACNIC. We tried to comply with our commitment with ICANN but also to obtain some benefit. It's a shame that we were not able to do something that was of real benefit for everyone, but if ICANN is not asking for this anymore, let's try to recover the things that are relevant to us. At least in the case of LACNIC, it has made us pay attention to something we weren't paying attention to before.

KS agreed that the ITHI project had achieved its goal of getting all the RIRs to start sharing their data, but this may be an opportunity to close up this project and ask ourselves whether we should change the approach.

HPH thanked KS for bringing this up. Like OR, HPH likes the idea and added that getting definitions that make sense for us and can be implemented, as well as numbers that are comparable makes a lot of sense. It's also important for the reputation of the global numbering

system that we have a common way of measuring comprehensiveness, correctness and currentness across the system.

In JC's opinion, it is important that we have some program to measure the accuracy and health of our joint registry. However, he reiterated a note of caution when it comes to legacy space: he is in favor of including it, but we all use different definitions (e.g., in the case of ARIN, legacy resources are intimately tied to the organization they were assigned to, not to the resources themselves).

PW summarized the NRO position as follows: there appears to be consensus to continue working on something along these lines and to resolve the question of legacy or other resources, so that all resources can be treated in a consistent and sensible way. The response to the RSCG is: "We agree with you with the continuation of these aspects and the abandonment of the others. Let's forge ahead."

All agreed with PW's summary.

KS thanked everyone for their feedback, adding that she will take this position back to the RSCG when they meet in December and put some more work into defining some of these approaches.

KS left the meeting at this point.

5.- AFRINIC Update

PW thanked NM for his presence as the only AFRINIC representative on the call.

NM apologized to the others for not presenting the AFRINIC update, as he cannot do so without knowing exactly the way forward.

NM said that he has not yet been appointed either as acting or the officer in charge. At the moment, NM is serving as a liaison officer but cannot make any decisions or take any actions on behalf of AFRINIC.

PW said he understands NM's situation.

JC noted that, in the conversations they just had with GP, the four CEOs concurring is a unanimous decision, and we are legally able to proceed with everything that is already in the NRO work plan. However, we are in a challenging situation when it comes to addressing something that has not already been approved by the five RIRs. There's the question of whether there is somebody to confirm from AFRINIC.

HPH said he fully understands NM's position and fully supports JC's point that we are in a very tight situation and that we should reach out again to the AFRINIC board chair for an update.

PW mentioned his concern about the AFRINIC staff members' wellbeing and welfare. While there is nothing we can do formally, we can at least have a gesture from the other RIRs as colleagues, a token of appreciation recognizing that the AFRINIC staff is in a difficult situation.

NM said that this is a topic on which he can comment. Staff morale is very low, we now have no CEO, the staff is asking what will happen. He reassured everyone that the heads of each department are doing their best for the operations of AFRINIC.

JC said he is in favor of anything we can do to recognize the staff, as he has the highest respect for the AFRINIC staff for their perseverance and dedication in this situation. The good news is that AFRINIC is continuing to operate and serve its customers.

PW said that this is a topic for a retreat, as it might be a major issue for the next year or two.

JC observed that this may have to wait a year, as it is unclear whether AFRINIC will have a governance body that represents its members (this might take six to nine months).

HPH brought up a topic indirectly related to this: the IGF will be taking place in Africa this year, yet not many people from the RIRs will be attending.

CB explained that this is due to budget issues and added that it might be problematic to not have anyone at the first IGF to be held in Africa.

HPH agreed with CB. The presence of AFRINIC representatives at the IGF in Addis Ababa would be important to meet with the AFRINIC community and explain the current situation. If there is some way to support the participation of AFRINIC representatives, that would be very important.

PW asked whether, considering that there is no board member who can represent the board and official representation from the staff will be difficult, perhaps some of the members of the Council of Elders might play a role?

NM said he had received requests from three AFRINIC staff members to attend the IGF. Given that AFRINIC has almost exceeded its travel budget, he is trying see if they can send at least one.

PW observed that, if budget is the only problem, this is something that the NRO can contribute to.

JC agreed with PW and under the circumstances considers it a reasonable shared experience.

HPH thinks it is very important as they will be able to answer the many questions that are sure to come up at the IGF.

NM thanked the EC for their support and said he would have a chat with the head of stakeholders and then get back to the EC via email.

PW thanked NM once again. He will speak with GV and talk about sending something for the AFRINIC staff on behalf of the NRO as a token of appreciation.

6.- 2023 ASO Review

GV explained that this agenda item relates to last year's resolution from the NRO EC, when the ASO review was due for 2022 and the EC resolved to postpone it for 2023. We then found out that, as a consequence of the ATRT3 recommendations, in June 2022 the ICANN Board adopted a resolution to postpone all supporting organization reviews for three years, so the ICANN Board is not expecting any review to start until June 2025.

GV added that he had shared this to the EC mailing list so there will be a record for transparency and accountability to our community of why we are postponing this review in alignment with the ICANN approach.

No objections or comments were heard, so it was decided to come back to the ASO Review at a future time, around 2025.

R-2021115-1: The NRO EC resolves to defer the ASO Review to 2025 in alignment to ICANN Board Resolution in June 2022.

7.- Meeting with IETF Trustees

JC explained that the EC has a request to meet with the IETF Trustees. Glenn Deen has asked us to find a slot that works for us, so it's a coordination item: when are we all available to have a conversation with them to gain a better understanding of the IETF Trust and what they do as opposed to the IETF Endowment?

PW suggested inviting the IETF Trustees to the next EC meeting.

JC agreed that PW's suggestion might work, but the Trustees may be expecting a dedicated meeting, so we might set aside a 30-minute block at the beginning of the regular EC meeting.

All agreed, so GV will get back to Glenn Deen after this call with an invitation for IETF Trustees interested in doing so to join the EC for a 30-minute chat during the December EC meeting.

8.- ASO Appointment to ICANN Leadership Program

GV explained that this relates to the ICANN Academy, a program designed for current and incoming leaders to understand ICANN complexities, develop facilitation skills, and network with other leaders. ICANN is asking whether there will be any appointments (two seats are reserved for the ASO). The program will take place in March 2023 at the next ICANN meeting in Cancun.

HPH said that this is an exercise to learn how to interact with ICANN, not to engage and wondered whether it is really necessary for anybody on the EC or the AC to be there at all. On

the other hand, HPH has been in touch with his representative on the ASO AC and believes that the AC would like to send the ASO AC Chair and Vice Chair, but these positions will not be elected until January.

PW doesn't see the need for any AC or EC members to be there if the purpose is for them to be trained in ICANN policies and procedures (as most are outside the scope of the ASO).

OR said that LACNIC ASO AC representatives will be attending ICANN 76 with LACNIC resources. He will be at ICANN 76 as well because the LACNIC Board will meet there prior to the ICANN meeting. However, he suggested thanking ICANN for the invitation and dropping this opportunity.

JC noted that he would not be able to put ARIN region ASO AC members into this program in good faith, as it is not germane to their duties. If we have ASO members there already and they want to participate, he has no objection to that, but does not consider this a priority. As to its strategic value, there's an open question about our relationship with ICANN and our own governance that needs to be answered before he can determine whether there's any need to reinvigorate our ICANN engagement.

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

New Action Item 221115-1: GV to reply to ICANN asking them to reserve two places for the NRO at the ICANN Leadership Program (LP) 2023 to be held at ICANN 76. The names of the two participants will be provided in due time once the ASO AC chair and vice chair are elected, but no travel support will be required from ICANN.

9.- 2023 ASO AC f2f Meeting

GV shared that, during their last monthly meeting, the ASO AC decided to have their next f2f meeting in Cancun, going back to the pre-covid approach of meeting during the first ICANN meeting of the year. The main justification for this meeting is to continue to work on a review of the ASO AC procedures. The AC had a very good meeting at RIPE 85, they made good progress in the review, and their goal is to have the procedure updates ready before the start of the next election cycle (September 2023). The Secretariat has been supporting all the meetings that the ASO AC is holding in connection with the procedures review, and they are doing good work in terms of optimizing and improving the procedures, which were in need of a revamp.

PW thanked GV for this information.

OR noted that he had had the chance to observe some of the work on the procedures that the AC did in Belgrade and fully supports allowing the AC to continue with their momentum. One thing we should emphasize is the need to include considerations for maintaining the ASO AC's operation even in situations such as the one we are facing with AFRINIC (inability to appoint NRO representatives).

JC also supports the ASO AC meeting.

PW asked whether the EC should convey to the AC the need to consider the type of circumstances described by OR.

GV replied that the AC is doing that already. The AC has asked GV to share with the NRO EC their concern about the lack of representatives from the AFRINIC region. Mike Silber's position will expire at the end of the year, so only one AFRINIC representative will remain. The AC is aware of the situation and will address it in the review.

All agreed that the ASO AC can go ahead with their f2f meeting at ICANN 76.

10.- RIR CEO Updates

JC provided the following update from ARIN:

- ARIN had a successful joint meeting with NANOG in Hollywood

- A new policy development process will be out shortly (the same as the previous PDP, just a clearer document).

- ARIN has now reopened its offices completely and reviewed all positions to determine how many days in the office each requires.

- We made some changes to both our Relying Party Agreement and our RSA as sought by the ARIN community.

HPH then provided the RIPE update:

- We had the RIPE meeting in Serbia. We get some reactions from the northwestern part of the community, but that is outweighed by the local participation that we see when we meet outside the Schengen area.

- We made some updates to the Articles of Incorporation and some changes to the Bylaws mandated by Dutch law.

- It was a good meeting with good technical content and also related to sanctions.

- A new regional meeting is starting tomorrow in Central Asia, targeting the region of Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan and testing whether this region will come together.

No further updates were presented.

11.- Open Actions Review

Action Item 220920-1: GV to draft and send to John Levine of the IETF Trust a reply as suggested by JC in his email to the NRO EC mailing list dated 6 September 2022 (subject: Response to IETF Trust). IN PROGRESS

GV has exchanged several emails with John Levine and is waiting for the bank details to finalize the NRO contribution.

Action Item 220816-2: All to send to JC/OR a list of requirements so they can put together a statement of requirements of what the NRO would like to accomplish through incorporation (e.g., program managers, home for the RIR Stability Fund, etc.). CLOSED

Action Item 220816-5: JC to share the latest version of the NRO MoU to the list. CLOSED

JC suggested that the two action items from the August minutes should be closed or put on hold because, in light of the AFRINIC situation, we need to have a strategic workshop about our long-term RIR system goals and this will potentially overtake NRO incorporation. This, however, cannot take place until such time as we have a legal AFRINIC representative.

JC proposed closing out any action items that say "NRO incorporation."

All agreed.

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) CLOSED

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). OPEN

12.- Minutes Review

- 2022-October-18: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - DRAFT (Pending: AFRINIC)
- 2022-September-20: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - DRAFT (Pending: AFRINIC)
- 2022-August-16: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - DRAFT (Pending: AFRINIC)

GV noted that all CEOs have approved the pending minutes, except AFRINIC for obvious reasons and asked what he should do about that.

All agreed that the minutes should be published with a note saying that they have been approved by the four RIRs.

13.- Next Meetings

a) Tuesday 20 December 2022 Teleconference

b) Tuesday 17 January 2023 Teleconference

c) Tuesday 21 February 2023 Teleconference

No conflicts were brought up at this time.

14.- AOB

-

15. Adjourn

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 1:05 PM UTC.