

2023-October 24 Minutes NRO EC Face-to-Face Meeting

FINAL

Final Version

Date: Monday, 24 October 2023, Hamburg Germany

Attendees

Executive Council:

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

Observers:

Kenny Huang	APNIC
Pablo Hinojosa (PH)	APNIC
Bill Sandiford	ARIN
Ernesto Majo (EM)	LACNIC
Athina Fragkouli (AF)	RIPE NCC
Ondrej Filip	RIPE NCC
Hervé Clement	ASO AC

Secretariat:

German Valdez (GV)	NRO Secretariat
Laureana Pavon	Minutes

New and Updated Action Items

New Action Item 20231024-1: GV Request the final version of the IANA SLA (SLA to include Reverse DNS) and the four CEOs (APNIC, ARIN, LACNIC, RIPE) to sign the document.

New Action Item 20231024-2: JC to draft a reply to the message received on 29 September 2023 from Yosuke Kaneko, President of the Interplanetary Chapter of the Internet Society.

Resolutions

New R-20231023-1: The NRO EC approves the adoption of the revised ASO AC Operational Procedures approved by the ASO AC via e-vote on 22 October 2023.

New R-20231024-2: In 2024, NRO EC roles will be distributed as follows: OR, Chair; JC, Vice-Chair/Secretary; HPH, Treasurer.

Agenda

1. ASO Review Procedures
2. ICP-2 Review by the ASO AC
3. Preparation for ASO - ICANN Board Public Session (Session with Hervé)
4. Update NRO Strategy Implementation

Hervé Clement (HC). was present for this meeting.

JC welcomed HC and went over the agenda for the session.

ASO Review Procedures

JC asked HC what the changes were and the reasons behind them.

HC explained that the ASO AC Operational Procedures are the base of the ASO AC's work. After several years, they have shown inconsistencies. Now, another problem is that we currently fewer than 15 members (after 31 December we will have no more members from AFRINIC). So, we wanted to make sure we can continue to fulfil our core functions. The review process began last year, we made significant improvements, the three f2f meetings we had were very productive. He thanked the NRO EC for having made this possible:

He then proceeded to list the main changes:

- How the ASO AC can function with less than 15 members.
- There is also the main notion of quorum: we removed the condition of regional representativity.
- We reviewed the composition of the various committees within the ASO AC.
- There was also a lot of work on voting to consider less than 15 members.
- Also, because we identified that there were multiple different rules for voting, we propose having a specific section on voting, with rules for internal voting and for voting in case of appointments (ICANN Board, NomCom).

- Global PDP section: We cleaned the language and updated some links. We also unified a list of definitions.

HC added that the text was finalized in Kyoto, there was a 7-day review period and then a 7-day voting period. He is happy and proud to say that all current 13 members cast their vote. All voted affirmatively, so even if we consider 15 members, this still represents more than the required 80%.

JC moved to approve the adoption of the revised ASO AC Operational Procedures approved by the ASO AC via e-vote on and presented by Hervé Clement, ASO AC Chair, to the NRO EC during the NRO EC f2f meeting in Hamburg.

With everyone in favor, the motion passed.

New R-20231024-1: The NRO EC approves the adoption of the revised ASO AC Operational Procedures approved by the ASO AC via e-vote on 22 October 2023.

OR and JC thanked HC for the ASO AC's work.

HC thanked everyone on behalf of the ASO AC.

ICP-2 Review by the ASO AC

JC said we need to write down and approve what we are going to task the ASO AC with. JC is hoping to have something in writing soon.

We already have ICP-2, which we can clarify simply by drafting implementation procedures. It is intended that the ASO AC and the NRO EC work on two procedures based on the current ICP-2, one for the recognition of an RIR, the other for the review and possible de-accreditation of an RIR. The ASO AC would work on that, we would help with that process (e.g., notification to ICANN, we would involve ICANN in that process), we would need some sort of public consultation. This would be a first tasking.

As for the second tasking, JC mentioned that we need a more robust and more complete set of responsibilities for an RIR to be recognised and include more robust responsibilities such as periodic accreditation. This is a second, longer procedure, perhaps involving something similar to a global GDP, it would need to be considered by all the RIRs communities and governing boards. In order to give the ASO AC some clarity, we are going to try to provide the ASO AC with those tasks along with our expectations for process.

HC thanked JC and added that this would help the AC work more comfortably on that. He noted that the AC has been discussing this for a month and are committed to this. The ASO AC has decided to form two working groups. The AC is conscious that there will be ongoing discussion with the NRO EC and ICANN, so a timeline (or an idea of a timeline) is needed. He noted that travel had been very important to get the AC's work done.

HC mentioned that OR had proposed that the AC start working in Montevideo in January, and suggested that the presence of the Legal Team might be important. The week before the AC meeting, the ICANN executives and the ICANN Board will be in Montevideo.

HPH said that it was a great idea to start this process in person. Because OR will be the NRO EC chair next year, HPH proposed already putting him in charge of this process. HPH has already charged Athina to work on this, and travel. He told OR to let him know of any support he might need.

HC then mentioned that, because there is the need to discuss with the community of the different regions, it would be good to have one AC member from each of the four regions present at each regional meeting (first round of conversations with the community in the first half of the year). One option to reach the African community could be the ICANN meeting in Kigali. Then we could have some sort of conclusion around June.

OR noted that the EC should consider the budget that GV has shared with us. Once we send the AC the description of the tasks, the AC will likely need to change the meeting plan/timeline.

HC agreed.

PW asked how would the communication with RIR communities be implemented, e.g. via specific sessions at RIR meetings, or otherwise?

HC replied that the AC has not defined how this will be managed. For example, for the next RIPE meeting, there should be a presentation from Randy Bush dedicated to that issue. For this first meeting, the ASO AC wants to have something to present, more to have input from the community. For the meetings in 2024 we don't have a concrete plan yet.

GV said he would be coordinating this across the regions.

HPH said that this was different for each region. In the RIPE region, the ASO AC chair's attendance to RIR meetings is covered. As for the sessions, that's not in his hands. There is a community plenary, the least HPH would like to have a timeline and the statement of the problem. If the AC wants a specific session, that needs to be worked out now

JC noted that those would be for the second task. For the first task, work will probably be done online. We need to get the two tasks clearly separated. We need to plan for the second task next year, the first task should be fast. JC would like to see a draft in about a month

JC summarized as follows: the RIR Legal Team will start working on the first draft of the ICP-2 implementation procedures and send them to the ASO AC. Montevideo will be the kick-off meeting for the second task.

HPH observed that if we are extremely efficient, we can present the first task in Montevideo.

HC asked when the tasking might be shared, and JC replied that he would have the taskings written down within two weeks.

HC thanked JC for his answer, as it clarifies how the AC will need to work on this.

Public Meeting with the ICANN Board

All once again went over the questions from ICANN to the ASO (both JC and HC will be there).

Question from ASO:

1 Could you briefly summarize the status of ICANN's CEO search and what input you need the ASO to provide?

Question from the Board:

1. What is the latest status regarding AFRINIC?
2. What is the ASO's plan to ensure RIR operational continuity and strengthen IP numbers governance?
3. Is there anything ICANN should be doing to better help the NRO/ASO?

JC then went through how he envisions how the Q&A session will go.

HC asked if it would be useful to share a quick update about the AIS meeting in Johannesburg (it was sponsored by ICANN).

HPH replied that maybe HC who was there could say some words about that.

JC agreed.

All agreed on the questions, so GV will send them in so that they can be shared on screen.

HC commented that for ICANN 77 there were remarks that not many people were attending our meeting. The idea was to see in advance how we can prepare for ICANN 79 and potential joint session with the ICANN Board of directors.

PW agreed that it would be useful to have more preparation and that GV could help with that.

HPH observed that we need to start planning soon, as planning for ICANN 79 probably starts next week. Very open question: do we need any meetings with any other committees? Food for thought.

PW has the impression that ICANN is planning to have something like an I* session.

HPH said he believes we agreed to set up I* meetings but we haven't had any.

JC said he was unsure why it was an open meeting. He will not be there, but his thinking is that if a meeting is not driving a particular goal, he would say nothing.

AF also noted that there has not been any internal preparation among us, she doesn't know what will be discussed, we don't have a position on any of these matters.

This session was adjourned at 11:03 am (local time).

Update NRO Strategy Implementation

GV provided the following update on the RPKI Program: Right now, we are having meet-the-team sessions with five candidates, four women and one man, four regions represented. We will finalize the assessment of the candidates next week, the final step will be an interview with the NRO EC, which could be between 13 and 24 November. We are preparing a comparison of comprehensive salary expectations as requested. Unsuccessful candidates have also been contacted. We still don't know how many candidates will go on to the final round (2 or 3), so he suggests reserving three slots for interviews (he will share a doodle poll).

He then provided an update on the Cybersecurity Program: There has been a change of ideas re this program. Perhaps explore the possibility of merging this with the RPKI Program (financial benefits), or we might take the second best-rated candidate for the RPKI program.

JC said he would like to slow down as much as possible the second program until we see how the first one works. It's nice to work quickly, but it might be good to learn some lessons before we move forward. At least see the first PM established and running before moving forward with the second, perhaps three to five 5 months into the program.

All agreed.

PW then asked what has happened with the Government Engagement Program, to which HPH replied that we've put it on ice for six months and we will then revisit.

JC said he is in favor of a serial process: do one, delay six months; do another, delay six months; then do the last one. He is very interested in lessons learned, as we don't have experience working with joint PMs.

OR agreed.

IANA SLA Signing

JC noted that ARIN approves the SLA, he is happy to sign it and assumes that the others agree. We can deliver to ICANN and they can sign it, but it is weird to deliver without five signatures.

OR said that, in his opinion, it is a pretty safe bet to try. Even if something gets complicated along the way, it is not a contentious topic, as it establishes responsibilities only for ICANN.

HPH observed that it's an amendment, not a new SLA.

OR further explained that it is not an annex, but includes some text that was not there before.

JC noted that we are collectively documenting an existing change that was made to the IANA services. It is a piece of paper simply formalizing what they are already doing.

OR said that there are good reasons for signing the document. All this started with the failure in the Reverse DNS in February 2019, we wanted to make sure that they did a proper post-mortem analysis. Kim Davies came up with some ideas and we also proposed that we needed to establish actual service levels (quality indicators) in our agreement. But we didn't want to include anything other than what we were already receiving from IANA services

JC summarized the reasons as follows: 1) It better describes the services we're getting from IANA; 2) We all said we wanted this and OR worked relentlessly to do it.

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

New Action Item 231024-1: GV Request the final version of the IANA SLA (SLA to include Reverse DNS) and the four CEOs (APNIC, ARIN, LACNIC, RIPE) to sign the document.

2024 NRO EC / CG Roles

JC said that after the rotation, OR will be the chair.

OR observed that the real conversation here is that his coordination groups are asking whether to expect plans for 2024 or if we are in the same mood as we were in 2022, when we didn't expect anything unless we were actively asking for something

JC replied that he believes the CGs will not be tasked with anything.

After all shared their views on whether the CGs should be tasked with making/expecting plans, OR summarized the message as follows: "We won't task the CGs with any coordination plans, we will task our individual teams and they will know what we are expecting."

Because OR is taking over as NRO EC chair, the WG chairs will be in his organization, so there is no need for an announcement about what we've discussed re the CGs.

New R-20231024-2: In 2024, NRO EC roles will be distributed as follows: OR, Chair; JC, Vice-Chair/Secretary; HPH, Treasurer.

Report on Governance of the Solar System Internet

JC said that they had received a report from the planetary ISOC folks, many others are involved, saying "this is how we believe the internet should work in space." In conclusion, it says that the

RIRs should handle the resources for space, but in case that doesn't work we need to do a deep space RIR. We haven't responded but we probably need to do so.

PW said that it would be no different from anyone based in the APNIC region coming to him and saying "We have a deep space network that needs IP addresses." Under APNIC's policies, we would be able to handle the request.

HPH asked what would happen if the request comes from Mars. He noted that it would not be a problem for RIPE NCC, as we accept members from outside our service region.

JC noted that it would not be a problem for ARIN either.

HPH said the problem would be if none of the five regions could fulfil such a request. But if they need new policies, they might want to create a new RIR.

JC read from the email from IPNSIG and noted that it expressed concern about potential for policy mismatch. He then said that it is his understanding is that whatever the requirements our existing IPv6 policy should handle just fine. The right response to this message is "Thank you for your valuable report, thanks for including us, we know the RIRs all have very broad and encompassing policies for accommodating IPv6 requirements, we don't know why any organization cannot use our resources. But we are happy to talk with you about this."

New Action Item 231024-2: JC to draft a reply to the message received on 29 September 2023 from Yosuke Kaneko, President of the Interplanetary Chapter of the Internet Society.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 4:10 pm (UTC+2).