2025-March-9: Minutes NRO EC f2f Meeting

FINAL

Date: Sunday 9 March 2025 | 10:30 AM Seattle Time.

Attendees

Executive Council:

Hans Petter Holen (HPH)	RIPE NCCC	Chair
John Curran (JC)	ARIN	Vice-Chair (Remotely)
Ernesto Majo (EM)	LACNIC	
Jia Rong Low (JRL)	APNIC	Treasurer

Observers:

Kenny Huang (KH)	APNIC
Joyce Chen (JC)	APNIC
Jeremy Harrison (JH) (Remotely)	APNIC
Nancy Carter (NC)	ARIN
Michael Abejuela (MA)	ARIN
Esteban Lescano (EL)	LACNIC
Ignacio Estrada (IE)	LACNIC
Eduardo Jimenez (EJ)	LACNIC
Athina Fragkouli (AF)	RIPE NCC
Hisham Ibrahim (SJH)	RIPE NCC
Maria Hall (MH)	RIPE NCC
Hervé Clement (HC)	ASO AC Chair
Nick Nugent (NN) (Remotely)	ASO AC Vice Chair
Lacina Kone (LL)	Smart Africa
Anne Rachel Inne (ARI)	Smart Africa
Aretha Mare	Smart Africa

Rodrigue Guiguemde (RG)	Smart Africa
Yvan Guehi	Smart Africa
Diane Bazoza	Smart Africa
Claudine Uwimbabazi	Smart Africa

Secretariat:

German Valdez (GV)	NRO Secretariat
Laureana Pavon (PV)	Minutes (Remotely)

New and Updated Action Items

New Action Item 250309-1: The PACG to propose common messaging for WSIS+20.

New Action Item 250309-2: The PACG to document the current definitions of the Internet used by the different RIRs and present one or more proposals for a common definition of the Internet to be used in the future so we can have a concrete discussion on the wording.

New Action Item 250309-3: The NRO EC to get back to the ASO AC with a comprehensive response on the ICP-2 Document "Policy for the Recognition, Maintenance, and Derecognition of RIR" so that the ASO AC can publish the document and the RIRs can begin their public consultation.

New Action Item 250309-4: The NRO EC to review and send their comments on the ICP-2 timeline to the ASO AC.

New Action Item 250309-5: GV to invite the CTOs and Sofia Silva to the monthly NRO EC teleconference next week to discuss the RPKI program.

New Resolutions

None in this meeting

Agenda

1.- Welcome

2.- Agenda Review

3.- Joint Session PACG

- a) NRO Incorporation
- b) Unified Messaging and Effective Collaboration on Competent Authority and Intellectual Property Rights Holders Engagement
- c) WSIS+20 Positioning and IGF Oslo Coordination

4.- AFRINIC Situation Discussion

5.- ICP-2 Review (Herve Clement, Nick Nugent, Esteban Lescano)

- a) Presentation ICP-2 Document "Policy for the Recognition, Maintenance, and Derecognition of RIR"
- b) how to manage the process of working with ICANN (carefully worded roles and process, clarify the language); and
- c) Alignment with ICANN when they will do their public consultation.
- d) ICP-2 Communication Update (APNIC AGM Feedback)

6.- Joint Session with SMART AFRICA

7.- Revisit NRO incorporation discussion (action item for PACG)

8.- RPKI Program

9.- Any Further discussion from previous topics

10.- NRO strategy review (next phase)

11.- Next Meeting

- a) Teleconference
- b) F2F Meeting

12.- Adjourn

Minutes

1.- Welcome

HPH welcomed everyone and opened the meeting at 10:32.

2.- Agenda Review

Approved as presented.

3.- Joint Session PACG

WSIS+20 Positioning and IGF Oslo Coordination

The session began with a PACG update by HMI IMH.

HMI spoke to the WSIS+20 Payloads, and all discussed each item as it was presented:

- RIPE NCC contribution to the ITU WSIS + 20 Review
  o Reaffirm the foundational principles of an open, inclusive and secure Internet
  o Recognize the essential role of community driven technical governance
  o Continue capacity building efforts for upscaling network connectivity
  o Re-focus on closing the digital divide and preparing for tomorrow's technologies
  o Ensure the internet continues to serve as a catalyst for innovation, growth and empowerment for everyone and fulfilment across the UN SDGs
- Integrate WSIS mechanism with the GDC implementation
  o Leverage the IGF multistakeholder NROs to collect information on and monitor progress on SDGs
- Reiterate the need to preserve the interoperability, availability and integrity of the global Internet
  o Safeguard open standards and the integrity of unique internet identifiers
  o Recognize the role of governance structure like IETF, ICANN and the RIRs
  o Strengthen the technical community's role by improving information-sharing and communication between technical community, governments and other stakeholders

It was noted that each RIR would decide whether to use the messages or not, they will not be used as NRO messages/positions.

New Action Item 250309-1: The PACG to propose common messaging for WSIS+20.

HMI then shared a presentation on the NRO at IGF OSLO.

- Proposed NRO workshop #1 (APNIC + RIPE NCC – LACNIC expressed Interest)
  o Balancing Digital Sovereignty and a Borderless Internet
  o Sub-theme: Building digital trust and resilience
- Proposed NRO workshop #2
  o IPv6 Deployment for SDGs achievement: Enabling Universal Connectivity
  o Sub-theme: Building Universal Access and Digital Rights
- Proposed workshop #3 (RIPR NCC)
  o Multistakeholder Internet Governance: The Complementary Role of Internet Communities (NGOs) alongside IGFs (NROs)
  o Sub-theme: Building Digital Cooperation

All discussed the pros and cons of submitting the workshops as individual RIRs vs as the NRO.

HMI: 1) We will have a more prominent booth this year at the IGF; 2) The deadline for submissions is Wednesday this week; 3) He wanted to confirm that the NRO is comfortable with GV submitting one workshop we can put under the NRO (IPv6).

No objections were heard.

JRL observed that we should have a consistent message of what the Internet is to make sure we all use the same language every time at the IGF and WSIS.

HMI replied that the PACG has been working on this and has invested a lot of time talking about it with ISOC and ICANN, as there is a lot of confusion. He is not sure if they will all be able to agree on language, but there are some commonalities

New Action Item 250309-2: The PACG to document the current definitions of the Internet used by the different RIRs and present one or more proposals for a common definition of the Internet to be used in the future so we can have a concrete discussion on the wording.

NRO Incorporation

HMI noted that there might be other ways to clarify what the issue is, real risks to the NRO and what can be done. Yesterday, the PACG wasn't able to clearly articulate risks and the solution seemed to turn back to incorporation.

JC replied that the first thing we need is to define the problem statement, understand what problem we have which incorporation would solve.

After some discussion, it was decided to close Action Item 250121-1 (Each CEO to talk to their PACG teams to figure out the problem statement for incorporating the NRO, pros and cons, etc. and see if there is consensus on having establishment of the NRO as a priority).

4.- AFRINIC Situation Discussion

JC observed they had spoken to the new Receiver, who has expressed willingness to engage with us, as he realizes that AFRINIC needs to work with the other RIRs. The Receiver has opened up the option for some AFRINIC staff to travel, his priority now are the elections. It was a brief call, JC mentioned the monthly calls of the NRO EC and invited the Receiver to join as an observer.

JC added that he had offered the other RIRs' support if / when AFRINIC needs it, and the Receiver had seemed very receptive and open.

HPH mentioned that he had asked the Receiver whether AFRINIC would be able to do the workshop and consultation on the ICP-2 review, and the Receiver had replied that they would.

5.- ICP-2 Review

Hervé Clément and Esteban Lescano were present in the room, Nick Nugent joined the meeting remotely.

a) Presentation ICP-2 Document "Policy for the Recognition, Maintenance, and Derecognition of RIR"

HC spoke to the work of the ASO AC and the RIR staff on the Draft Policy for the Recognition, Maintenance, and Derecognition of Regional Internet Registries, which has been delivered to the NRO EC.

NN added some comments on the Principles document and how the community feedback received through the public questionnaire had been incorporated.

HC then spoke to communications regarding the updated ICP-2 document.

NN commented on the main points of the Draft Policy for the Recognition, Maintenance, and Derecognition of Regional Internet Registries while it was shared it on screen.

JC thanked them and said it is an incredible document. One of the things the community is not aware of is the amount of coordination that goes on constantly among the RIRs.

EL said that the document was drafted by the ASO AC, but with the views of the community.

EM also thanked the ASO AC for their work on an outstanding document, adding that there are, however, some elements that we need to discuss and may require some adjustment in the final text.

The group then discussed various articles of the document (Rectification, Memberships, Decision Procedures, Changes in RIR Status, Recognition, Derecognition, Periodic Review, among others).

They also discussed how the role of the NRO is included in the document vs that of the RIRs as well as several of the definitions.

Conclusion: The RIR CEOs and legals will chat, as we owe AC ASO a comprehensive response.

New Action Item 250309-3: The NRO EC to get back to the ASO AC with a comprehensive response on the ICP-2 Document "Policy for the Recognition, Maintenance, and Derecognition of RIR" so that the ASO AC can publish the document and the RIRs can begin their public consultation.

b) How to manage the process of working with ICANN (carefully worded roles and process, clarify the language)

JC suggested, as a courtesy, sending the document to ICANN to ask whether there is anything they would like to comment on before we begin our consultation process.

c) Alignment with ICANN when they will do their public consultation

All went over the ICP-2 timeline going forward.

EC agreed that it would is imperative for both consultations on the ICP-2 draft document (RIRs + ICANN) to occur in parallel.

HPH stressed in the importance to bring clarity and details to the timeline and attach to it. More work is necessarily on this.

The need for clear and crisp communications/messaging was also stressed.

EL thanked the NRO EC for allowing the ASO AC to meet f2f.

New Action Item 250309-4: The NRO EC to review send their comments on the ICP-2 timeline to the ASO AC.

6.- Joint Session with Smart Africa

Director Général Lacina Kone, Aretha Mare, Unit Manager for Data Governance , Rodrigue GUIGUEMDE, Internet Governance Advisor ,Yvan Guehi for communication and Marketing, Diane Bazoza, for Entreprenours program. Claudine uwimbabazi , DG Assistant, Anne Rachel Inne Advisor joined the meeting

NRO EC and Smart Africa met to discuss about the AFRINIC Situation on how work together to bring back AFRINIC as a fully functional RIR.

HPH welcomed everyone at 15:11 local time. This was followed by a brief round of introductions.

HPH invited the guests to share their interests.

 LL: Since we met in Istanbul, we all know the situation AFRINIC is in, so we decided to raise the issues of AFRINIC to a decision-maker level, which is one of the reasons we invited our Administrative Round Table here this morning. I think there are good news in a way, a new receiver has been appointed, we've been mobilizing the community in every country about voting to surpass or exceed the number of people who participate. Mobilization is key. We need to involve the regulators in each country. We have a Smart Council of African Regulators. I also paid a official visit to the new appointed minister of ICT and digital economy of Mauritius who seems to be very open and very receptive of all these situations, and he did promise a few things, I think, in the coming weeks. We're going to see, actually, if the changes will occur or not. But we do have a plan A plan, B, and plan C

 JC observed that the situation with AFRINIC was very unfortunate. We all run collectively the five RIRs functioning as a single coordinated registry with five entities. Unfortunately, in the past three years AFRINIC stumbled. The good news is that operationally AFRINIC is still coordinating with the other four RIRs. AFRINIC no longer has a member on the NRO EC because their representative's term ended, and they have no board. However, the leading staff member, Nirmal Manic, has been coordinating with us and we have been able to continue coordinating despite the problems. Other than that, we leave each RIR to operate according to

the regulations of the country where they are incorporated. As we've shared, we are available to provide support if they so request. There is now a new receiver who seems more engaged, we've met with him and things are looking more positive at this point. We'd really like AFRINIC to participate fully in the decision-making processes and hope that their election will be forthcoming. We've also asked ICANN to visit AFRINIC and see that they are operationally stable, which we were reassured they are. We've also been supporting AFRINIC financially occasionally when needed.

ARI: Thank you for stepping in and helping AFRINIC survive, we hope we will soon be over this situation. One of the things for the hearing committee is to make AFRINIC an organization that cannot be subject to some of the issues that have arisen. We have more and more governments involved. Getting to a point where we can get AFRINIC to be a public benefit organization is what we are working on. There are ten of us on the committee with quite substantive experience, our hope is that we'll get somewhere. As soon as we have something we can share, we'll be sure to do that.

HPH replied that they have a lot of common ground. Community engagement is important, as is having strong support from the whole continent.

JC said that we need to make sure that AFRINIC gets to a situation where it can make a decision and evolve. We hope that there will be elections soon. JC then shared that the RIR system functions very well under a policy known as ICP-2 and explained the work the NRO is currently doing to update that document. He noted that this process is ongoing, so this meeting is very timely. If there is something you believe we should do, please weigh in, we will come out a lot stronger.

LL: We will mobilize our communities to vote, but what would happen after that? We need to get AFRINIC a more suitable structure, more government involvement in in the registry for their continent.

JC replied that there are a variety of organizations operating as RIRs, these structures work because they have a combination of membership that dictates how the organization runs and it's backstopped by the legal system.

HPH added that, no matter what we put in place, what is needed is a culture in the governance of the organization that will allow it to evolve and stay strong.

ARI: This is part of the pains of growing up. AFRINIC only has 2300 members on a continent that has 1.5 billion people, proportionally it's nothing. Not enough people participate in the governance. Hopefully now people will be more energized to participate and find a solution.

MA noted that, with the election coming up, getting people to vote and having people on the leadership is very important.

LL: What we are doing is giving people the right information and guiding members on how they can support the election and the right people. Also, mobilizing the people to vote. The election is coming soon, so we need to be more proactive, go more public, and do more

Members of Smart Africa thanked the EC for taking the time to listen to us and for their support.

8.- RPKI Program

JRL said that he had caught up with Sofia. She's frank that if things stay the same, the problem will not be solved (project managing the RPKI program is not the solution). We might want to rethink this.

HPH noted that what JRL said is very similar to what Sofia told him. To HPH, it sounds like we have not staffed the project, we have not allocated the proper resources. On a high level, there isn't any tangible outcome yet. HPH really wants this to become a success, but we need to do something.

EM said that he had also talked to Sofia and one point she brought up is that she needs the collaboration of our staff. EM recalled that we agreed to ask our staff to work on the project, so the 1st thing we can do is align our staff. Sofia needs the participation of our staff.

JC said that, in retrospect, we didn't realize how hard it would be. We didn't actually tell her "Do this". We told her "See what our teams think they can do to get a better service." There is now a very thorough spreadsheet of tasks. Unfortunately, there was this theory that working with the EC she would be able to set goals that people would pursue, but this did not happen. Up to this point, we haven't set specific RPKI goals for the program.

It was suggested that maybe we need to have Sofia and our CTOs present to us what they are going to do, then we tell each of them "that's the plan" so it's really clear.

After some further discussion, it was decided to select one or two deliverables, which we can ask our CTOs to define.

New Action Item 250309-5: GV to invite the CTOs and Sofia to the monthly NRO EC teleconference next week to discuss the RPKI program.

9.- Any Further discussion from previous topics

Going back to the workshops to be submitted for the IGF, MHI suggested submitting the workshops as the RIRs, not as the NRO, as the deadline is tomorrow morning. All agreed.

10.- NRO strategy review (next phase)

JC observed that one of the outcomes of our past strategy review was that our CGs were not effective and that we would not task them to do things. Instead, they coordinate on the things they need to and take a different approach for others. As for hiring a PM for each of the three

programs we defined during the review, we've agreed that there's no need for a Government Interaction PM, as there's not sufficient benefit. JC then proposed that we formally remove Cybersecurity as a joint program future initiative, i.e., we work jointly on cybersecurity with our experts, without the program. Our people can come up with something that will help us coordinate better.

EM added that perhaps when we decided to create those programs, we believed they were the way to solve a problem. The priority remains that we need to work together in this area, but perhaps in a different way.

HPH observed that we don't have a security coordination group and that perhaps we should.

The group continued to discuss the possibility of having an NRO cybersecurity program.

11.- Next Meeting

a) Teleconference

EC to meet in the regular teleconference on 18 Mar 2025
b) F2F Meeting

12.- Adjourn

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 6:00 pm (Seattle time).