

2022-September-20: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference

Date: Tuesday, 20 September 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:

Pablo Hinojosa (PH)	APNIC
Tony Smith (TS)	APNIC
Kenny Huang (KH)	APNIC
Ernesto Majó (EM)	LACNIC
Esteban Lescano (EL)	LACNIC
Richard Jimmerson (RJ)	ARIN
Glenn Price	LeaderShape

Secretariat:

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

Agenda

1.- Welcome

2.- Agenda Review

3.- NRO Strategy Update

- a) LeaderShape new proposal
- b) RPKI implementation update

4.- Coordination Groups Reports

- a) CCG – IGF 2022 Activities
- b) PACG – ITU Plenipot

5.- IETF Trust vs IETF LLC Contribution

6.- IGFSA Contribution

7.- AFRINIC Update

8.- RIR CEO Updates

9.- Open Actions Review

10.- Minutes Review

- 2022-August-16: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - DRAFT (Pending: AFRINIC, APNIC, ARIN, LACNIC, RIPE NCC)

11.- Next Meetings

- a) Tuesday 18 October 2022 Teleconference
- b) Tuesday 15 November 2022 Teleconference
- c) Tuesday 20 December 2022 Teleconference

12.- AOB

13. Adjourn

New and Updated Action Items

New 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).

New Resolutions

R-20220920-1: The NRO EC resolves to contribute US\$ 50,000 to IGFSFA in 2022.

Minutes

1.- Welcome

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

2.- Agenda Review

No comments were heard so the agenda was approved as written.

3.- NRO Strategy Update

a) LeaderShape new proposal

PW said that there is a proposal from LeaderShape and that GP is here to present it to us.

GP thanked PW, adding that this is coming from the discussions we had in Miami and with others later. He has put together a couple of slides and his intention today is to step the EC through the five areas where he thinks he can assist and when he thinks this could happen.

While sharing his screen, GP explained that the first area where he believes he can be of help is the NRO 5 Year Strategy Narrative, i.e., creating a set of communication assets that the CEOs could approve and use for different stakeholders, both internal and external. The possible timing for this would be 2-3 days (Q4 2022).

The second main area is what he called Operationalizing the NRO Strategic Plan, which would include two parts: 1) Consultation and engagement to onboard CG chairs and CG members through communicating the strategic process and how programs and program managers work; and 2) Program acceleration to assist in helping the Joint Numbers Registry to work using Strategic Program Action Plans and CGs (identify and work with program Leads and Steering Group to refine and update Strategic Program Plans including a detailed set of program goals and/or objectives to be proposed to the NRO EC; assist in creating a PM manager job description and global communication to find applicants; presenting shortlisted applicants to the NRO EC). The suggested timing for this would be 6-10 days (Q1 2023) and it would likely be done virtually.

The third area is a crisis response plan. This one is not critical, but it's about spending a couple of days, initially this was on PW and GP, to put together a unified approach, a set of crisis situations and how we would respond to those mainly from a communications approach.

Fourth, GP was also asked to look at a discussion document around NRO incorporation, fairly high level. This is not including a recommendation or advisory, so we did not take too deep of a look at the legal side of things. We did want to say "This is what it could look like, this is how

long we think it would take, and these are the risks involved,” prepare a strawman for discussion. At the chairman’s request, GP would like to work alongside PW and JC on this.

The fifth and final area is fairly simple: an NRO EC f2f meeting, as we’ve seen the progress that happens when all five CEOs are in the same room, especially with observers. This could be 3-5 days on the back of existing travel commitments in Q2 or Q3 2023.

GP showed some costs he has put together for all to discuss. As for his rate, GP feels that it is best for this exercise simply to go with the discounted per day rate, the other option would be a retainer fee. He is also open to working on a per project basis.

PW thanked GP. This is not something that's been discussed by the EC but it will be discussed today. We obviously need help in pushing this forward through implementation as we discussed.

OR asked whether the estimated time included in GP’s spreadsheet is the time he would be allocating to the project or the EC’s time.

GP replied that it would be his time purely so that the EC can have an idea from a cost perspective.

JC added that we certainly need help, and this looks like help.

GP thinks that the EC can achieve something in a fairly short timeframe if we have someone focus on it.

PW thanked GP for his report.

Before leaving the call, GP said that he looks forward to everyone’s feedback and asked GV to update Action Item 220726-3 on him and PW, as it has been covered by the second stage plan he presented today.

PW said that, while he had not discussed this with the others, we seem to need help to keep this moving, so he asked GP if he was available and, if so, what was his suggestion. He came back with this plan. PW understands that if they move forward, the costs would be mounting, but added that, while we've paid for the work that's been done, we need to be able to operationalize it and bring it forward. If we agree that we need help, we know that GP is available. If we don't agree, we need to consider what we can realistically do.

In JC’s opinion, operationalizing the programs that we have (objective 2 on the slide) is a pretty high priority. He is not against the others but doesn't know if they are priorities.

PW said that some communication is needed which he volunteered to do but has found that it is difficult without imposing his own views. He thinks that GP has a neutral position. He feels that this messaging is important because it’s largely missing from the internal work we’re doing. He then asked JC if he was proposing going ahead with this particular subset of the work (Operationalizing the NRO Strategic Plan) and leaving the others for future consideration.

JC does feel that Operationalizing the NRO Strategic Plan and NRO Incorporation are two items with which GP can help and have clear deliverables that will not go nearly as fast without GP's help. In the other cases, JC is not sure that the downside to the NRO is quite as poignant if we don't engage GP in them.

Returning to the narrative, PW said this does not involve a lot of time and that there are loose ends in the internal communications that if GP can put forward a document with a set of communications that encapsulate what we've been doing and that we're all comfortable with it would be of help.

JC said that he did not disagree, but would try to prioritize, leaving LeaderShape's participation in Crisis Response and f2f Meeting to the end. In his opinion, Operationalizing the NRO Strategic Plan would be number one, with Narrative and Incorporation would probably be tied at number two.

HPH mentioned that it will be very difficult to operationalize the strategy without having good internal communication on what we're doing, so the two are tied. Part of this would be to engage with the comms teams in the five RIRs, so that would be a good investment. Crisis response, he thinks that it's very easy to underestimate this, and that pushing it out into the future basically says that if there is a crisis, we will deal with that individually. However, if there is the assumption that we will handle crises together, then we need to sit down before the crisis starts and agree how we will do that.

JC agreed that the Narrative might be prior to Operationalizing the Strategic Plan, in which case those two would be our two priorities. Because of the size of the operationalizing, we're still talking about a sizable sum.

OR agreed that we need this work to be done and that we should accept all the help that GP offered. If we need to reduce one, the Incorporation is the one that might be done without his help. If not, he suggests going for the full proposal.

After some discussion regarding priorities, PW summed it up as follows: 20 days from now until the end of the year, prioritizing 1 (NRO 5-Year Strategic Narrative) and 2 (Operationalizing the 5-year NRO Strategic Plan).

b) RPKI implementation update

Re Action Item 220816-2, PW then asked JC if he had enough going with operationalizing RPKI.

JC replied that the RPKI group had asked for input and that they have not got back together to collate that input into a job description for the NRO RPKI program manager position, which is the next step at this point. That's on PW and JC, who said he will redouble his efforts.

PW thanked JC and said that if JC can take the next step, he would really appreciate it. JC agreed to do so.

4.- Coordination Groups Reports

a) CCG – IGF 2022 Activities

TS presented the following update:

- IGF is coming up at the end of November and there will be a physical NRO booth and a virtual NRO booth that will be populated with links to information.
- Normally we take a lot of printed materials, but we've decided that these need an update.
- Instead of taking more printed materials, the idea is to create a mobile-friendly micro site.
- Effectively what will happen is that we'll turn the Continuing Cooperation brochure into this micro site. People will come up to the stand and scan a QR code with their mobile which will take them to the brochure-style website.
- The content for this site is being developed and is expected to be ready for review in early to mid-October. The final approval and launch of the website will be in time for IGF.
- The biggest question at this stage is mainly staffing, who from the RIRs will be going. The event will be held in Ethiopia and Ashil Oogarah has mentioned that AFRINIC will be sending staff, we need to agree who will be going.
- The number of people needed to staff the booth depends on who else is going from other CGs, not just the CCG, i.e., who will be going and who would be willing to spend some time at the booth.

PW observed that given that the QR code will be at the booth, it would not be a disaster if the booth were not staffed 100% of the time.

TS agreed but added that a staffed booth is more effective and better for interaction.

OR asked how many people need to be involved in the booth.

TS replied that, with travel restarting, they are not sure how many people will attend IGF. At least two people who are willing to share the responsibilities of staffing the booth would probably be the minimum, but more would help. It really depends on budgets.

OR then asked what other options the CCG had explored for this presence at the IGF.

TS explained that the booth is something we've had for the past many years and the physical presence we've considered important to have, but it really depends on how much time and effort we're willing to invest in this, if there were going to be many proposals from the NRO and the RIRs to IGF, then we would expect to back that with more visibility on site.

OR followed up by saying that once we tried to evaluate how this booth at the IGF works and we had the feeling that it was not as good as we wanted because it attracted very few people and required two people to be there, and these are our managers. Yet every time we try to do something new, we always come back with the same idea. That's why he wanted to know if the

CCG had in mind any other options, regardless of the budget. Perhaps not for this time, but for the future.

TS replied that he understands OR's frustration, that he has never been to an IGF before so feels he's not thoroughly qualified to answer this, but that, for any communication exercise, the brief comes from how much as an organization we want to invest in it, i.e., how important the IGF is to the NRO. Is this something we're doing because we have to do it? Is it something we feel is very important and goes to one of our strategic goals? And this comes down to the EC.

OR asked TS if they still have time to do this exercise before the IGF.

TS said that we have two months, so if there's more that we want to get out of this event, that this is something that the NRO wants to invest in, then we can do that. But the CCG will just need to get direction on what the NRO is looking to get out of the IGF as an organization that's different from the past.

OR said that the result of the exercise will be that we are still doing the same thing with similar results.

HPH said that at RIPE NCC they have had similar discussions. In the case of the IGF, determining the effect or outcome is difficult because it's not result oriented. His understanding is that we are supporting the IGF so there is a venue to discuss everything regarding the Internet that doesn't belong in technical meetings.

PW agreed with HPH.

JC noted that, historically, the IGF has existed so that there's a place to have these discussions absent outcome almost by definition. He added that this has worked for many years, but it no longer works, so he also wonders if this is really productive. He does not mind doing it this year, but he thinks we have a strategic issue about what we are doing with IGF. We need a strategy for how to engage with governments and other parties, and then we can see whether IGF or other institutions fit into it.

TS agreed with JC.

PW suggested that what we might do with our presence at IGF this year is use it as an opportunity to gather more information about the IGF and its value from our point of view. If we charge the CCG to make this a research exercise rather than just the default PR exercise, then we might have a better basis to make a decision next time.

Point of order: JC asked that we set aside the CCG report for a minute, as the IETF Trust item is an operational item that needs consideration before EK has to leave the call.

PW said that rather than setting aside the CCG report, what we've said might be enough as guidance for the CCG.

All agreed.

b) PACG – ITU Plenipot

PH said that there has been a lot of coordination work for the ITU Plenipot by the different staff attending and there has been a long preparatory process.

The reason he asked PW to discuss the Plenipot today was to know if the CEOs would be attending or whether the CEOs have any particular plans or last-minute coordination at the highest level.

JC is not going to the Plenipot. Einar Bolin will be in attendance and Michael Abejuela will also be in attendance for a short time.

HPH will be going as he is signing an MoU with the Arab ICT Association on the first week, and then he will be part of the Norwegian delegation for the better part of the last two weeks. RIPE NCC also has 4-5 staff members who will be there.

5.- IETF Trust vs IETF LLC Contribution

JC explained that the IETF Trust is being restructured and the NRO agreed to provide support. When we went to do it, we were told that it was better to make the contribution via the IETF LLC because ICANN is matching funds contributed to the LLC. We'd like to help but at the same time we'd like better engagement with the IETF Trust. JC said he had proposed on the mailing list a three-point response: a) Acknowledge Glenn's message and indicate that our intentional to support the IETF Trust directly was simply in response to the 22 June 2022 request from John Levine indicating that direct support of the IETF Trust would be helpful; b) Note that we don't have a preference as for support mechanism, so if they would provide details regarding how to make the \$25K contribution via the IETF LLC (e.g., whom we should work with at the IETF LLC) then that would be fine; and c) Suggest that it might indeed be good to meet with the IETF Trust folks in the near future to help better understand one another.

PW suggested that GV draft and send that reply.

No objections were heard, so the following action item was decided:

New 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).

7.- AFRINIC Update

EK presented the following update:

- There are no serious updates about what's happening in court, things are at a standstill.
- The list of board recommendations grew to six people.

- There is a potential meeting with ministers in Seychelles, EK thought about reaching out to the NRO to see if there could be a sponsorship option and even consider being present. He's also extended the invitation to ISOC and ICANN, but the meeting has not yet been confirmed.
- It was an interesting experience to speak at ICANN, he received a lot of positive feedback even from the African delegations.
- Board members intend to have an official retreat in Mauritius.
- The more he looks at the possibility of meeting with the governments, the more he believes it's important to meet with them and clarify our position.

PW reiterated that they have all expressed their complete support of AFRINIC and asked EK whether they should wait for any request for the RIRs to help through the EC, the CCG, etc.

EK will check with the team that has been in contact and send his reply to the NRO EC list.

EK left the meeting at this point.

6.- IGFSA Contribution

GV explained that we received a request from Markus Kummer regarding the annual contribution from the NRO to the IGF support association. We budgeted 50,000 US dollars this year for this purpose. GV forwarded the request to the NRO EC list and is bringing up the matter with the EC for approval to execute the contribution as budgeted.

JC moved to pay the amount of 50,000 US dollars to the IGFSA for all its activities in support of the IGF. HPH seconded the motion, no objections were heard, and the following resolution was decided:

R-20220920-1: The NRO EC resolves to contribute US\$ 50,000 to IGFSA in 2022.

GV will follow up with EK to make sure he has no objections and share his answer on the NRO EC list.

JC pointed out for the record that this is also an expense that at some point we need to review in terms of the return on investment to our community.

8.- RIR CEO Updates

ARIN update by JC:

- ARIN announced a change to our registration services agreement (simplified the definition of registration services).
- ARIN also announced that our fees for legacy resource holders will still be capped for those entering an LRSA next year, but in 2024 legacy resource holders who enter an agreement with ARIN will pay the same fees as everyone else.
- Legacy resource holders are dropping rapidly and in the next two years less than 20% of the resources in the ARIN region will be uncontracted legacy resource holders (when

resources are transferred, the new holder is not considered a legacy resource holder). This is different from other RIRs, and we're seeing more and more discussion about what a legacy resource holder is.

- ARIN has added more board members and is into the election cycle.

9.- Open Actions Review

GV went over the list of open actions, updating their status as necessary.

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.). OPEN

Action Item 220816-3: PW to respond to Kim Davies' message regarding PTI Engagement for Fiscal Year 2024 based on the suggestions sent by PW to the EC list on 15 August. OPEN

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

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) OPEN

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

Action Item 220624-1: OR to draft a message to John Levine of the IETF Trust and share it to the mailing list. Themes for the message: the RIRs will provide the requested support but we'd like you to use the rest of the ecosystem; the RIRs are just hearing from the IETF Trust now; it would be good for the IETF Trust to come to the RIRs more often so we can hear how you are benefitting our community. CLOSED

10.- Minutes Review

- 2022-August-16: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - DRAFT (Pending: AFRINIC, APNIC, ARIN, LACNIC, RIPE NCC)

11.- Next Meetings

a) Tuesday 18 October 2022 Teleconference

b) Tuesday 15 November 2022 Teleconference

c) Tuesday 20 December 2022 Teleconference

No objections were raised with respect to these dates.

12.- AOB

-

13. Adjourn

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 13:45 UTC.