# 2024-November-12: Minutes NRO EC f2f Meeting

**FINAL**

**Date: Tuesday 12 November 2024 | 9:00 AM 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 |
| Bill Sandiford (BS) | ARIN |
| Michael Abejuela (MA) | ARIN |
| Alejandro Guzman (AG) | LACNIC |
| Ignacio Estrada (IE) | LACNIC |
| Eduardo Jimenez (EJ) | LACNIC |
| Athina Fragkouli (AF) | RIPE NCC |
| Simon-Jan Haytink (SJH) | RIPE NCC |
| Piotr Strzyzewski (PS) | RIPE NCC |

**Secretariat:**

| | |
|---|---|
| German Valdez (GV) | NRO Secretariat |

# New and Updated Action Items

**New Action Item 241112-1**: The PACG to come up with a list of what's on the horizon (e.g., IGF) and a proposal of what the RIRs can do together as the NRO. This will be discussed by the NRO EC during their January meeting to decide if the RIRs want to do something together.

**New Action Item 241112-2:** GV to follow up with Simon-Jan Haytink to produce a new version of the NRO Procedures document based on NRO EC feedback during Istanbul meeting.

**New Action Item 241112-3**: HPH to reply to the request for a joint RIR Board Meeting during 2025 along the following lines: "If there is clear purpose described for such a summit, we will discuss it. Otherwise, we will not be organizing this meeting."

# New Resolutions

# Agenda (Cont 11 November 2024 f2f Meeting)

### 8.- Internet Governance Coordination among RIR

**Outline**

- NRO EC to assess the need that the PACG improve coordination on Internet Governance matters.
- Especially WISIS+20 in 2025

### 9.- IANA-RIR SLA Amendment Update

### 10.- NRO Website Content Review

**Outline**

- Technical Section
- RIR Accountability Information https://www.nro.net/accountability/rir-accountability/

### 11.- NRO Finance

**Outline**

- 2024 NRO Expenses and Forecast Execution
- 2025 NRO Budget First Draft
- NRO Distribution Formula Forecast

### 12.- NRO Procedures

**Outline**

- Mou Signing Procedures
- Management Approvals (expenses, travel requests, etc)

**13.- NRO EC 2025 Meetings**

**Outline**

- NRO EC to review 2025 meeting plan

**14.- Proposed RIR Board Meeting in 2025**

**Outline**

- NRO EC to discuss proposal for a joint RIR Board Meeting during 2025

**15.- AOB**

**16.- Adjourn**

# Minutes

HPH welcomed everyone and noted they have a couple of leftovers from yesterday and the main topic for today is Internet Governance Coordination among RIRs, with three major events coming up in the near future (IGF in December, WSIS+20, and IGF next year in June). He opened the floor to hear from the others.

**8.- Internet Governance Coordination among RIR**

PH explained that the PACG has been sharing information from different perspectives, but believes that more engagement at the leadership level and a more coordinated approach would be helpful. He shared that Hisham and Nacho have committed to collaborating more. ICANN and ISOC also bring a cleared direction and mandates to their teams, so there is hope for a much better collaboration as well. Also, there's the new I* coordinating bodies emerging, and it's important to build bridges between the new I* and the technical community coalition.

The CEOs then shared their opinions on the importance of IGF for each RIR and whether to have common participation. If so, what would be their contribution and what would they obtain from such participation. Each shared what they have been doing in terms of the IGF so far. They also shared their opinions on the current multistakeholder model and players in the various regions. They mentioned and discussed the use of the term "multistakeholder" and challenges in the various regions.

After the discussion, there was consensus on the find some common ground with governments, inform and brief them on how their public policy goals intersect with what we do, and say something more concrete than participate in the multistakeholder model. There was a suggestion to help governments understand what they can and cannot do. We should be engaging with

governments. I think we should proactively be telling them what makes sense to regulate and what doesn't.

HPH said the PACG had asked for directions and wondered whether they would like to do this top-down or instead ask the PACG to put their heads together and come up with a proposal for the NRO EC to discuss.

They then discussed whether this government engagement would be part of the NRO strategy plan (with additional support from a PM) or simply coordination among the PACG.

JRL said that they could begin by looking at what's on the horizon first, and then if we do need to put in resources to make it a proper program, we can structure that.

HPH agreed, adding that there is not enough time before IGF to start a hiring process. If the PACG thinks we need a PM, we can look among our staff and see if we have someone who can dedicate 20% or 50% to this for that time period, or even look externally, but that would not be permanent but simply for some months.

**New Action Item 241112-1**: The PACG to come up with a list of what's on the horizon (e.g., IGF) and a proposal of what the RIRs can do together as the NRO. This will be discussed by the NRO EC during their January meeting to decide if the RIRs want to do something together.

### 9.- IANA-RIR SLA Amendment Update

While sharing the document on screen, GV presented a brief update on how they came to the current version of the document. He then noted that the SLA Amendment Update is now ready to signed.

After pondering some options, it was decided that the document would first be signed by JC, who would send it to the others to sign while in Istanbul and give it to Kim Davies.

### 10.- NRO Website Content Review

GV shared on screen the NRO website, noting that it would be useful to have a look at the RIR Accountability section to see if it is consistent with what we are doing with the community right now.

HPH observed that this involves two levels: making sure that existing is up to date, and also having a constant way of keeping this up to date. He asked whether this is a job for the legals or for the comms teams.

MA replied that the comms team could make sure that everything is appropriate, and the legal team would be ready to support them if needed.

JC has no objection to making sure the information is accurate but would not like to put too much of an investment here as this will be overtaken by the ICP-2 update and whatever artifacts come out of that.

HPH noted that these are actually two reviews. He agreed with a first, smaller small (checking links, accuracy, consistency and so on) and then perhaps have a second phase for a substantive legal review.

## 11.- NRO Finance

SJH of the RIPE NCC joined the session remotely. HPH noted that SJH had a joint proposal from the CFOs, who had recently met at RIPE 89.

SJH explained that the utilization of the NRO budget has been significantly below what had been anticipated, so the CFOs have decided to focus on budget control ("trust is good, but control is better"). He then went over the NRO Budget for 2024 (budget, actuals, full year forecast).

The NRO will be under budget, and the reason for this is that they decided not to go ahead with the two other programs that had been planned under the strategy review.

SJH then presented a draft of the NRO Budget for 2025, which is based on the 2024 full year forecast, explaining the main changes. He then clarified some questions he had for the CFOs, who in turn asked for a few clarifications.

HPH summarized as follows: the CFOs' budget is on the table (2024 budget plus inflation). Then it's up to the NRO EC to add new activities. Nothing is rolled over by default, if we want to add more program managers, engagement, or something else, we can still do that, but it would be an active decision.

After some further discussion and at JRL's suggestion, it was decided to postpone approval of the 2025 NRO Budget until the December NRO meeting.

## 12.- NRO Procedures

SJH then shared on screen a draft version of a proposed NRO Procurement Procedure. He noted that the document still needs another CFO review as well as a legal review.

After going over the document in detail, he would like to know if the CEOs agree with the direction in which the CFOs are moving with the procedure.

Clarification was requested on whether Legal Review means review by the entire Legal Team, or simply by the chair of the legal team.

SJH replied that procurement within the approved NRO Budget would be executed by an RIR selected by the NRO EC, who would be responsible for the Legal Review. With regards to

procurement of anything outside of the approved NRO Budget, the authorization and check is a bit more extensive.

SJH then displayed on screen and explained the proposed MoU Signing Procedures.

HPH noted that it's good to have all these things in a single document and suggested that if the legals have anything they would like to discuss, then should do it and get back to the EC (e.g. language limited to signing of MoUs). One thing we need to discuss is this: as written, the procedure says that the initiator prepares a request and then asks for advice from the Legal Team. Does that mean that anybody (e.g., GV, Sofia) can make a request to the Legal Team or do they have to go through the NRO EC? Do we do this bottom up or top down?

In EM's opinion, they should go through the EC before entering the legal discussion.

HPH noticed that requests should first go through the steering groups to follow a bottom-up procedure.

EM noted that the first step should be to go to the NRO Chair.

Several other details of the proposed procedure were discussed, while SJH updated the document live to reflect the EC's opinions.

Future steps: SJH will update the document to make sure that the suggestions of the CEOs are properly reflected and share it with the other CFOs.

**New Action Item 241112-2** GV to follow up with Simon-Jan Haytink to produce a new version of the NRO Procedures document based on NRO EC feedback during Istanbul meeting.

## 13.- NRO EC 2025 Meetings

HPH asked GV for an update on the ASO AC's plans for 2025.

GV replied that the ASO AC is planning to have two f2f meetings in the first half of the year, the first possibly during the APNIC meeting in Malaysia, the second one during the ICANN meeting in June. However, there is no final decision yet. GV has suggested to the ASO AC chair that he should send their meeting plans for 2025 before the end of the week for budgeting.

HPH asked the following: 1) Are we OK in principle okay with the ASO AC meeting two times, justified by the ICP process? 2) Does that mean that the NRO EC should also meet more than once?

After GV noted that the CEOs typically meet twice a year (either at ICANN meetings or at RIR meetings), the group discussed what substantial things would benefit from in-person discussions: the first is the ICP-2 document that is coming, the second is strategy. Also, the possibility of having someone from AFRINIC on the NRO EC next year.

AF noted that ICP-2 draft, according to the current timeline will be ready to be published in April (circulated earlier).

In HPH's opinion, it would be better for the NRO EC to meet after the ICP-2 document is ready.

After discussing several alternatives, the NRO EC decided to meet f2f in Seattle during the ICANN meeting. All agreed to work out the details at a later date.

They all agreed to discuss a possible meeting in the second half of the year if needed.

**14.- Proposed RIR Board Meeting in 2025**

HPH explained that during the joint APNIC-RIPE NCC meeting in 2018 there was a proposal for a joint RIR Board meeting during 2025, which was repeated last year.

JRL noted that there really needs to be topics that have to be discussed in order for all board members (40-50 people) to travel.

JC mentioned that he organizes meetings when he must solve a problem and invites the people needed to solve it, but in this case, he is unsure what the problem is. If such a meeting is organized, ARIN will participate, but ARIN will not advocate for it.

KH explained he has the mission to present that while some board members attend RIR meetings and get to know others, we could use a more programmatic way of meeting people. For instance, if we can agree that all RIRs provide information about which board members will be traveling to which meetings so we can organize a dinner or a short meeting, as this will add a lot of value in terms of meeting people. Currently LACNIC and RIPE have a shared calendar with this information, it would be great if the others could also share theirs.

EM agreed that we should increase engagement between board members of the different RIRs, not necessarily a joint board meeting.

HPH's opinion is that a joint board meeting is not needed. He shared that he has included in his budget the possibility of board members to travel to other RIR meetings, he can recommend that they go but cannot guarantee that they will.

All then discussed various ways in which interaction between board members might be increased, including sharing travel information, brief meetings among those present at RIR meetings, etc.

**New Action Item 241112-3**: HPH to reply to the request for a joint RIR Board Meeting during 2025 along the following lines: "If there is clear purpose described for such a summit, we will discuss it. Otherwise, we will not be organizing this meeting."

**15.- AOB**
Before adjourning the meeting, the group discussed their agenda for the rest of the day.

**16.- Adjourn**
There being nothing further to discuss, the meeting was adjourned.