2024-November-11: Minutes NRO EC f2f Meeting

FINAL

Date: Monday 11 November 2024 | 1:15 PM Istanbul Time

Attendees

Executive Council:

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

Observers:

Kenny Huang (KH)	APNIC
Pablo Hinojosa (PH)	APNIC
Jeremy Harrison (JH)	APNIC
Micheal Abejuela (MA)	ARIN
Alejandro Guzman (AG)	LACNIC
Ignacio Estrada (IE)	LACNIC
Eduardo Jimenez (EJ)	LACNIC
Athina Fragkouli (AF)	RIPE NCC
Piotr Strzyzewski (PS)	RIPE NCC

Secretariat:

| German Valdez (GV) | NRO Secretariat |

New and Updated Action Items

New Action Item 241111-1: Each member of the EC to schedule individual meetings with Sofia Silva in the coming year to discuss how the RPKI program is going and what challenges she sees in each of the regions to gain better insight.

New Action Item 241111-2: HPH to ask Sofia Silva to prepare a one-pager on the resources needed for the RPKI program. This will be used as a discussion point for the allocation of resources to the program.

New Action Item 241111-3: HPH to propose to Sofia Silva to hold at least monthly meetings to have somebody drive the RPKI program forward.

New Resolutions

Agenda

1.- Welcome

2.- Agenda Review

3.- AFRINIC Situation

Outline

- Update from last events in AFRINIC
- How to support election process
    - Reconsider retake AFRINIC Engagement Plan to support election awareness and participation ?
    - Coordinate with ICANN to support OR

4.- ICP-2 Update

Outline

- Update on last developments on ICP-2
- Next Steps According to ASO Timeline
    - ASO AC to meet f2f in ICANN82 and second f2f meeting RIPE90
- ICANN ICP-2 Implementation Document

5.- NRO Strategy Review

Outline

- Having two new RIR Leaders on board, HPH proposes to have a recap and review of the last NRO Strategy

6.- NRO RPKI Program Challenges

Outline

- NRO EC to continue discussion on the challenges presented by Sofia Silva in their last check in call with the NRO RPKI Manager.

7.- Cybersecurity and Government Engagement Programs

Outline

- NRO EC to discuss future of the 2 NRO Programs.

Minutes

1.- Welcome

HPH welcomed everyone to the meeting. This was followed by a round of introductions.

2.- Agenda Review

HPH walked everyone through the proposed agenda for the four work sessions to be held over two days.

GV proposed adding an agenda item for Tuesday morning: Signing SLA-RIR Amendment.

HPH proposed adding to the agenda a proposal he received from an APNIC Board member to have an NRO summit, a suggestion that has been going around for two years.

3.- AFRINIC Situation

MA noted that there has not been much of an update since the last NRO meeting.

Now that the process of organizing the elections is starting, the group wondered whether to restart the African engagement plan or perhaps develop a new one. All agreed that it's important to engage the African community in this process, but that it will be easier once we have information about the election process. The group then discussed potential options for engaging with the African numbers community, potential target audiences, where we should put out efforts and what would be the message.

Suggestion: put together a group of 4 or 5 people to make this their number one priority to work on communications to engage the AFRINIC community.

JC said that, if we're discussing a problem statement about what we're trying to solve, he doesn't mind spending resources to do it, but we need to be realistic.

JRL said he is very pessimistic and would think very well before doing something that we know is going to be very difficult.

4.- ICP-2 Update

AF provided an update the two tasks the ASO AC has been working on: ICP-2 implementation procedures and a principles document for the new version of ICP-2. The first will be agreed upon this week, and hopefully it will also have approval from the ICANN Board. Question: what is the approval process for this operational document?

Several options for this approval were discussed.

MA explained the changes ICANN had proposed/things they had opposed in the RIR version of the ICP-2 Implementation Procedures and how these disagreements had been solved. MA will share the latest version of the document with the EC to make sure that everyone is OK with it.

Because this is an interpretation of an existing agreed document (ICP-2), there's normally no need to go to the RIR boards for formal ratification.

MA observed that, in the interest of time, it might be good for the NRO EC to have a formal resolution approving and adopting this document. ICANN appears to be ready to sign it.

EJ added that they might want to delegate to HPH the signing of the formal signature or communication.

5.- NRO Strategy Review

HPH noted that there are two new members on the NRO EC, so it would be good to go over the NRO strategy plan review. He then went over parts of the document in detail, including the areas of focus they had identified and two of the programs they've decided on: RPKI and RIR cybersecurity. So far, only the RPKI program has started (the RPKI PM was hired in early 2022). A third area of focus that was identified in the strategy plan is government engagement, where a common starting point was identified (pointing governments to how they can interact with the NRO). He then went over the schedule for the RPKI program and explained its status, which is somewhat behind schedule. He noted that the EC made similar plans for cybersecurity and government engagement. Since then, we've decided that we would hire the RPKI manager first and then decide what to do with the two other programs. He then opened the floor.

JC said that, while it's taken quite some time, our RPKI program has determined a set of effective objectives and is working on them. We were able to identify the problem statement very clearly and everyone understands what we're trying to accomplish. There's a common terminology, common approaches of how our systems work and an improved knowledge base on RPKI (one slide deck vs five). In his opinion, the RPKI program is a success and will be more so moving forward. As for the other programs, we're only just now learning our lessons from the first program. If they are to succeed, we will need a remarkably clear problem statement, and he doesn't know if we're there yet.

HPH said he would like to dive into the RPKI program first.

6.- NRO RPKI Program Challenges

EM suggested revisiting and identifying which of our goals have been met and which are still relevant. But this is not an hour-long but a much longer exercise. We need to analyze whether we've done everything we can to accomplish our goals before moving on to other programs.

HPH: for the RPKI programs we have four objectives (definition of what a single RPKI system looks like; better understand and improve transparency and robustness of the system; enhance security consistency of the RPKI system across different areas; technical community keep those informed and engaged through the program). The plan defined key results for each of the four. In his opinion, this program is moving much slower than he had anticipated. The PM has certain concerns (e.g., have we assigned sufficient resources to work on the program?).

JC believes the program has been moving slowly because during this period we were simultaneously creating a process for joint programs, hiring the PM and doing the actual program. He doesn't think the program is short of resources, we at ARIN we are orienting our resources to work more on the RPKI program. It's early to judge, but they have a ser of clear objectives that were thoughtfully constructed. We are at the point where it is accomplishing things, so he believes we should continue this program.

JRL noted that the PM might believe there is a lack of planning and engagement with the program, but she is not blaming anyone in particular.

EM suggested we can add some individual goals for our staff and promote the program within out teams. This is a typical problem when we are invited to participate in a program or activity, but our goals are not aligned with that. Suggestion: we can set some goals for our people involved in the RPKI Steering Group, and we can also talk to them and reinforce the importance of this.

JRL said one problem the PM is noting is that it's not clear who is responsible / empowered to do the things that need to be done to meet an objective. Suggestion: make sure we work with our own team members to be more responsive to the PM. Another issue might be the expectations of the team members themselves. If we make it very clear that this is in their goals, then things will align better.

JC said he's actually sat on the steering committee. Assignment of resources is a particular thing done at the top level of the organization; management of a program is done at a lower level and sometimes involves management of resources, but it also has to do with setting the goals and breaking down tasks and things like that. Then there's development and coding, which is what the engineers do, although there's not a lot of development and coding that needs to be done by the joint RPKI program. There is a huge amount of management (what everyone's role is, how do we handle interaction between RPKI program and RIR work, sharing knowledge and current practices). There's a huge amount of pretty technical work to be done which is not programming

or resource allocation, but program management and technical management. This is what the PM needs from us right now.

JRL agreed with JC. What is the problem? The problem is the management and the technical management features. Suggestion: the best way is to be very specific, ask the PM to tell us exactly who is not playing their part, so we can talk to them. But right now we are not able to be specific and identify the problem. Another question that is for the PM: does she feel empowered or not? Who is really supporting her?

JC said we probably need to engage with her a little bit more to get some clarity on what resources she believes she is short on.

HPH disagreed, saying that it is the role of the steering group in any Program Management methodology he's worked in to provide the project with resources. If your representative on the steering group doesn't have those resources, that person needs to go back to you and make sure they have. If we move that to the NRO EC, we become the de facto steering group, and they become the project group working doing the work, which is why it's important to distinguish between these two functions.

Noting that he is an outsider in this matter, EJ spoke to JRL's point saying that this may have a lot to do with the culture, as for some cultures it is easier to point fingers and blame someone than for others. For Uruguayans this is particularly difficult. It might help the PM if you told her that from now on she is expected to point fingers.

JRL I think we can talk to her about how empowered she perceives herself.

EM said that the PM can consult with the steering group if she feels the need, but she will not be talking to them every day. In reading her report, I believe there may be a disconnect between EC level information and staff level information. Perhaps we can address that.

HPH suggested asking the PM to prepare a "one-pager" with the total capacity needed in terms of head counts in all the RIRs together working on RPKI and how many of them are working on the RPKI program (resources allocated to the program). But perhaps it may be too early for this yet.

JRL suggested that the steering committee should clarify the names of whoever is involved so the PM has access to them, not to point fingers but for escalation. This may also include expected response times, escalation path, communication paths, and so on (an SLA).

JC suggested that it might be good, in the coming year, for each of us to take time to speak with the PM directly about how our organization's participation in the joint RPKI program is going, as there may be different issues with each of us.

All agreed and the following actions were decided:

New Action Item 241111-1: Each member of the EC to schedule individual meetings with Sofia Silva in the coming year to discuss how the RPKI program is going and what challenges she sees in each of the regions to gain better insight.

New Action Item 241111-2: HPH to ask Sofia Silva to prepare a one-pager on the resources needed for the RPKI program. This will be used as a discussion point for the allocation of resources to the program.

New Action Item 241111-3: HPH to propose to Sofia Silva to hold at least monthly meetings to have somebody drive the RPKI program forward.

HPH said that, in the end, he would like to empower the steering group, so the CEOs don't have to manage the program themselves.

All agreed.

Going back to the ICP-2 implementation procedures, JH read the following proposed text to be used if a resolution is needed:

The NRO EC resolves first to adopt the ICP-2 implementation procedures as attached, subject to the adoption of these procedures by ICANN, to take effect on the later of the date of this resolution, the date of adoption of the procedures by ICANN, or as otherwise agreed between the parties, and second authorizes Hans Petter Holen as NRO EC chair, to sign any documents and take any actions reasonably necessary to give effect to this resolution.

All agreed and the meeting was adjourned.