

# 2025-March-18: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference

**FINAL**

**Date: Tuesday, 18 March 2025, 11:00 AM UTC**

**Attendees**

**Executive Council:**

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

**Observers:**

Yogesh Chadee	AFRINIC
Anton Strydom	APNIC
Jeremy Harrison (JH)	APNIC
Richard Jimmerson (RJ)	ARIN
Michael Abejuela (MA)	ARIN
Nancy Carter (NC)	ARIN
Bill Sandiford (BS)	ARIN
Mark Kusters	ARIN
Ignacio Estrada (IE)	LACNIC
Eduardo Jimenez (EJ)	LACNIC
Alejandro Guzman (AG)	LACNIC
Carlos Martinez (CM)	LACNIC
Athina Fragkouli (AF)	RIPE NCC
Felipe Victolla Silvera (FVS)	RIPE NCC
Sofia Silva	NRO

**Secretariat:**

Laureana Pavon (LP)	Minutes
---------------------	---------

## **New and Updated Action Items**

**New Action Item 250318-1:** Sofia Silva to determine which resources are allocated/needed from each RIR to achieve the goals prioritized by the CTOs for the RPKI program.

**New Action Item 250318-2:** The CTOs to start developing a common set of business/functional requirements for what they are trying to achieve with the RPKI program (TA solution).

## **Agenda**

- 1.- Welcome
- 2.- Agenda Review
- 3.- RPKI Program Year Review
- 4.- ICP-2 Review Timeline
- 5.- ICP-2 Draft Document
- 6.- AOB
- 7.- Adjourn

## **Minutes**

### **1.- Welcome**

HPH welcomed everyone at 11:03 UTC.

### **2.- Agenda Review**

The agenda was reviewed and finalized.

### **3.- RPKI Program Year Review**

HPH said the idea was to discuss the RPKI program with Sofia S. and the CTOs.

Background: There is some general concern about whether we've taken on too much and if we have the resources to do so.

JRL noted that, to set up the RPKI program for success, the EC decided to have a meeting with the key people and see what the priorities of the RPKI program should be, agree on one or two key things to focus on, so Sofia will help us achieve them.

JC added that the RPKI program has been excellent for obtaining a baseline of where the RIRs are, understanding the different approaches, tradeoffs, and so on. Now we need to focus our efforts on prioritized deliverables.

EM noted that the EC would like to see now is more concrete progress, a more concrete advance in the project after clearly defining the goals we want to achieve this year.

HPH echoed what has been said and suggested going around the table to see what the CTOs would like to prioritize.

After thanking the EC for the chance to have this discussion, Anton replied that, for APNIC, the top priority would be to design the new TA and at least get some concept at the end of the year. As a secondary priority, he noted that APNIC is planning to do the ASPA implementation by the end of the year.

Felipe agreed that it's good to have this conversation. He also agreed with Anton that the biggest impact is the NRO TA solution. In this sense, the most important deliverable will be submitting an IETF draft with the specification, which is the first step to have the NRO solution in place. He would also suggest not trimming anything from the RPKI program just yet.

Jogesh noted that AFRINIC has a different kind of problem right now in terms of staffing for the RPKI program. AFRINIC is doing projects one by one, not in parallel and is accumulating a lot of lateness, but they can still participate in projects like the TA configuration.

Markk echoed the others: the TA solution is one of the largest, most impactful things we can do. The others are smaller tasks, e.g., uniformity of language between the registries, dealing with a common set of services we offer, those are sort of low hanging fruit. There is not much development going on this year, but this will certainly change for next year.

Sofia observed that while in March last year we mentioned we wanted to have subgroups within the Steering Group working in parallel, that has not been very effective. Based on that, she made sure there are clearly defined names for each initiative who can work independently. As for priorities, we do have quite a few results for each objective. The pieces of work that require the work of most of the Steering Group are not that many, as most of the initiatives are primarily on her. It's important not to lose sight of what the most important objectives are for the whole group.

HPH agreed that having named people is very important.

Carlos echoed what was said by Felipe and Markk: the most important item we must work on this year is the single TA / constraints file. That will be a powerful signal to the community that

the five RIRs are committed to operating RPKI. Another tangible outcome for LACNIC: being aligned on the importance of the ASPA implementation.

HPH summarized the discussion as follows:

- The NRO TA solution is one thing there is consensus on.
- Felipe articulated that he doesn't want to remove anything but have smaller coordination.

HPH then inquired about the timeline for an Internet draft.

Sofia said that for the work on the TA configuration improvement, the timeline we agreed on for the next steps was to improve the proof of concept in the next few months, then have another opportunity to realign with the Steering Group and align with the EC. If everything goes well, by the November IETF meeting we should be able to have a draft submitted.

JC said that this conversation helps with appreciation of what we've done and what's ahead of us. Summarizing, we have a couple of challenges with this program, 1) We're trying to synthesize input from different regions that is not consistent, 2) We've got something we can do in terms of the trust anchor and documentation for that.

He added that each community has its own spectrum of people who are more or less involved with RPKI, but this doesn't mean we don't have to work together. It's our job to tease out what we have in common. The approach suggested by Sofia to provide higher focus to the program has his full support.

HPH mentioned that getting the clarification of the top priority was useful, and the next steps should be defining which resources are allocated/needed from each RIR to achieve these goals.

New Action Item 250318-1: Sofia Silva to determine which resources are allocated/needed from each RIR to achieve the goals prioritized by the CTOs for the RPKI program.

Sofia said she is happy to put this together and share it with you in the coming days (top priorities, allocation of resources).

The group then discussed the best way to monitor progress (Sofia having regular check-ins with just the CEOs, check-ins with the CEOs and CTOs, etc.).

After some discussion, it was decided to set aside 30-60 minutes every second month or every quarter to include the RPKI program update in the NRO EC monthly teleconference agenda, inviting Sofia and the CTOs.

Regarding the trust anchor, JC then observed that we may have to provide a short statement at NRO EC level of the expected use case and behavior of the NRO TA solution.

HPH agreed: we need to agree on a common set of business/functional requirements for the TA solution we are putting together.

Slightly diff topic, Felipe noted that we will also need help from the RSCG for inter RIR transfers. He and Carlos plan to meet with the RSCG in São Paulo and discuss this with them.

New Action Item 250318-2: The CTOs to start developing a common set of business/functional requirements for what they are trying to achieve with the RPKI program (TA solution).

Sofia and the CTOs left the meeting at this time.

#### **4.- ICP-2 Review Timeline**

-

#### **5.- ICP-2 Draft Document**

HPH mentioned that Athina had sent the document with comments earlier today.

Athina noted that the document includes edits and changes from our discussions last week, and that the idea is to have this input finalized this week to send it to the ICANN lawyers.

While it was displayed on screen, all went over the text and comments.

Conclusions:

- The CCG will be tasked with finding another term to use instead of ‘policy’ (criteria, agreement, other).
- We still have to review the definition of service region, but it’s not necessary to do so before sending the document to ICANN
- A definition of policy or numbering policy can also be decided after sending the document to ICANN.
- The legals will continue to work on what happens upon recognition/de-recognition, with regards to the services.
- Other than that, we can share a clean version of the document with ICANN.

Athina then went over the timeline for ICP-2:

- The deadline for input from ICANN is 31st march. Athina suggested we also inform Kurtis and the others of this tight deadline and the idea that they should only highlight major red flags and concerns.
- We have to send the document to the CCG by 4 April, and to ICANN by 8 April.
- Public consultation / public comments for the RIR and ICANN communities will be launched on 14 April.
- The document will be sent to the AC after receiving feedback from ICANN.

#### **6.- AOB**

#### **7.- Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 13:12 UTC.