

# 2024-December-17: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference

**FINAL**

**Date: Tuesday, 17 December 2024, 11:00 UTC**

**Attendees**

**Executive Council:**

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

**Observers:**

Pablo Hinojosa (PH)	APNIC
Jeremy Harrison (JH)	APNIC
Richard Jimmerson (RJ)	ARIN
Michael Abejuela (MA)	ARIN
Ignacio Estrada (IE)	LACNIC
Eduardo Jimenez (EJ)	LACNIC
Alejandro Guzman	LACNIC
Athina Fragkouli (AF)	RIPE NCC

**Secretariat:**

German Valdez (GV)	NRO Secretariat
Laureana Pavon (LP)	Minutes

**New and Updated Action Items**

**New Action Item 241217-1:** GV to draft (and send to the NRO EC for review) feedback to the ASO AC about the EC's preferred option on how to handle the publication of the results of the survey on the ICP-2 Principles document: publish in December a general announcement indicating that a comprehensive report with full analysis will follow in the coming weeks, stressing the importance of producing a thorough, high-quality report and explaining how the answers were handled. This should also clarify RIR staff commitments to support them (APNIC and RIPE).

**New Action Item 241217-2:** HPH to coordinate with GV to draft a response to ICANN's questions about the CEOs plans for ICANN 82.

**New Action Item 241217-3:** HPH to ask the PACG to appoint a person to be on the ICANN Meeting Strategy Group.

## **New Resolutions**

-

## **Agenda**

### **1.- Welcome**

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

### **3.- AFRINIC Update**

#### **Outline**

- Update from last events in AFRINIC

### **4.- ICP-2 | ASO AC Monthly Report**

#### **Outline**

- Update on last developments on ICP-2

### **5.- ICANN82 Preparation**

#### **Outline**

- NRO EC to discuss plans for ICANN82 in Seattle

### **6.- ICANN Meeting Strategy Group**

## **Outline**

- NRO EC to review if ASO representatives should be appointed.

### **7.- APNIC's Announcement on Registry Audits | [Announcement](#)**

## **Outline**

- APNIC to present topic to the NRO EC

### **8.- RIR CEO Updates**

### **9.- Minutes Review**

- [2024-November-12: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference](#) - DRAFT (Pending APNIC, LACNIC, RIPE NCC)
- [2024-November-11: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference](#) - DRAFT (Pending APNIC, LACNIC, RIPE NCC)

### **10.- Next Meetings**

- a) Tuesday 21 January 2025 Teleconference
- b) Tuesday 18 February 2025 Teleconference
- c) 10-11 March f2f Meeting in Seattle USA (ICANN 82)

### **11.- Open Actions Review**

### **12.- AOB**

### **13.- Adjourn**

## **Minutes**

### **1.- Welcome**

HPH welcomed everyone and the meeting began at 11:03 UTC.

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

The agenda was displayed on screen and approved as written.

### **3.- AFRINIC Update**

GV noted that Nirmal Manic (NM) is on leave.

MA explained that the election should go through no later than June next year.

JC wondered whether the NRO should formally reach out to the OR to congratulate him on his appointment and the good news about the elections. We could also note that the EC does significant coordination work and ask that he either participate or appoint someone to participate in our monthly calls.

All agreed.

#### **4.- ICP-2 | ASO AC Monthly Report**

HPH observed that there are two streams to discuss: 1) Monthly update from the ASO AC, 2) ICP-2 implementation procedures.

Regarding the first stream, GV explained that the consultation on the ICP-2 Principles document had closed on 6 December and that the CCG has shared a report. Considering this input, the ASO AC has decided to meet at APNIC 59 in Malaysia with the goal of having a document ready for the NRO EC to discuss at ICANN 82 in Seattle. He also explained that about half of the approximately 300 responses that were received appear to contain the same text and may be fake/ generated by AI. CCG Chair Maria Gayo sent a request for the EC to consider two options: 1) Publish a detailed report accompanied by the raw data (with this option the publication would align with ICANN, however, the CCG remarked there might be some issues providing comms support due to the holiday season); 2) Publish a general feedback announcement indicating that a comprehensive report with full analysis will follow in the coming weeks (this option ensures full availability of the CCG to manage follow-up support).

JRL noted that the timeline is tight but option 2) buys us more time.

JC said he wants to make sure that if we take additional time, it's so the ASO AC can provide a full explanation of how they handled the process and the responses. Being thorough with what we get to the community is extremely important and we need to get this message to the ASO AC.

EM observed that the "fake" contributions present the greatest risk. While they are easy to identify and separate from real contributions, if we don't publish the results early, we can open a discussion about why we are not showing the results. He is concerned about the contamination of the survey with so many fake opinions.

HPH noted that neither option considers producing a full analysis now. The second option is the only responsible option right now, but he is worried about the timeline. He agreed with JC that we should not move on to the next stage without this analysis. As for the "fake" responses, if we do a qualitative analysis (as opposed to a quantitative analysis), they will not be a problem.

JC agreed: the same point repeated 100 times does not change its merits. This isn't a vote.

JRL said that ICANN would be publishing their results and analysis, wondering if this was not a duplication of efforts.

HPH replied that we have our procedures, ICANN has theirs.

AF added that ICANN felt they also had to have a consultation for their constituency and that ICANN has their own tools and processes for this. The RIRs and ICANN agreed to have two surveys but with the same content, and both will feed into the analysis by the ASO AC. ICANN presents responses as they come in, as that's how their system works. We will have a full analysis of the results of the RIR survey by Jan/Feb,

EM fully agrees with JC's comment that it is very important provide a full explanation of how the process and the responses were handled and to communicate this to the people working on the report. Regarding the timeline, he noted the most importance of producing a good analysis/report.

HPH mentioned that the report we received from the CCG is a quantitative analysis. We need a high-quality qualitative analysis, and we need to make sure that the ASO AC has appropriate staff support for this, as this may be a weak point for us.

GV mentioned that the ASO AC might be expecting the CCG to help them through this process.

HPH said that we need to find staff who has time and can make supporting the ASO AC a priority for the next couple of months.

JRL asked if ASO AC needed more support, and said that we could volunteer policy support staff, in his case, Sunny.

HPH said he would talk to the people who have already been supporting this effort to see if they believe it makes sense to have someone working on policy analysis also support the ASO AC, AF has been involved in this up to now.

**New Action Item 241217-1:** GV to draft (and send to the NRO EC for review) feedback to the ASO AC about the EC's preferred option on how to handle the publication of the results of the survey on the ICP-2 Principles document: publish in December a general announcement indicating that a comprehensive report with full analysis will follow in the coming weeks, stressing the importance of producing a thorough, high-quality report and explaining how the answers were handled. This should also clarify RIR staff commitments to support them (APNIC and RIPE).

Regarding the ICP-2 procedures, they agreed to discuss this later as there were no updates to share at this time.

## **5.- ICANN82 Preparation**

HPH noted that the first draft schedule for ICANN 82 was shared the week prior to ICANN 81. HPH has not participated in the two calls that have already been held with the chairs of the SOs and ACs as part of the planning cycle. GV mentioned that he will start attending those meetings to keep an eye on them.

GV mentioned that ICANN has some questions for the NRO EC:

- Is the ASO Chair planning to give a speech during the Welcome Ceremony?
- Is the ASO planning to collaborate with ICANN OCTO or IANA to offer sessions like “How it Works” or “Let’s Talk About Numbers”?
- Will there be requests to have one-on-one meetings with the ICANN Board Chair, ICANN CEO, or any other ICANN executives?

HPH replied that he is happy to speak during the opening ceremony, as showing presence is important. All agreed.

As for collaborating with ICANN OCTO on “How it works” / “Let’s talk about numbers” sessions, HPH noted that the last one was presented by GV and Angela Dall'Ara (staff member of the RIR of the region where the ICANN meeting took place).

JC said that if the EC agrees that this is important for us to cover, he will send somebody to present, as ICANN 82 is taking place in the ARIN region. He is not against this, simply trying to be faithful to how we spend our members’ funds. If the NRO EC believes it’s important to do this, JC is happy to commit to having someone cover.

Looking at it more generally, JRL wondered whether it is important for us to have presence at ICANN. If we agree that it is, then it’s just a matter of deciding how we want to do that. Do we want to have a presence at ICANN (newcomer or other sessions)? ICANN has acknowledged that there are two Ns in ICANN, but they don't really see much of the second N. This might be a way for us to have that presence. It's up to us whether we want to choose to do that or not.

JC suggested that the next time the IC is together they should discuss how to make such commitments more formal. At some point, the NRO might formally consider this and commit to making it a responsibility of the respective RIR in the region. Meanwhile, we should take a look at the staff we are sending.

After some further discussion, it was decided to reply to ICANN’s question “Is the ASO planning to collaborate with ICANN OCTO or IANA to offer sessions like “How it Works” or “Let’s Talk About Numbers?” as follows: “We are happy to collaborate, what do you have in mind?” And then take the dialogue from there.

HPH asked about having one-on-one meetings with the new ICANN CEO, the ICANN Board chair, or other ICANN executives. As the four of them will be present at ICANN 82, HPH would

personally like for the EC to sit down with the new ICANN CEO, so we should develop some speaking points and some requests for him.

All agreed on focusing on Kurtis Lindqvist and reviewing how we work with ICANN.

EM suggested inviting Kurtis Lindqvist to join us at our NRO EC meeting room, not at his office.

HPH agreed.

**New Action Item 241217-2:** HPH to coordinate with GV to draft a response to ICANN's questions about the CEO's plans for ICANN 82.

## **6.- ICANN Meeting Strategy Group**

GV said that there was another request from ICANN to send a representative to the ICANN Meeting Strategy Group, a group created in 2013 to review how ICANN organizes its meetings. They are looking at this more as a cost reduction exercise, and they are asking if we will send two representatives as we did 10 years ago.

HPH said that there had been a session about this with the SOs/Acs and they were very critical of the process.

JRL explained that the question ICANN is asking themselves is whether they should continue to have three meetings per year or reduce the number of meetings to two.

HPH replied that the question asked by Sally Costerton was broader: "Are we working as effectively as possible?". The RIRs meet at our own meetings for our policy work, so we are different from the other SOs/ACs.

JC agreed, adding that the ASO's requirements for the ICANN meeting structure are very modest in that we're able to accommodate whatever they are doing to support the DNS community. He would hesitate to give any opinion whatsoever, as ICANN meetings are gatherings of the DNS community and so meeting structure and format should be up to the DNS community.

HPH said another option would be to appoint someone from the NRO EC or one of our staff to actually be there and pay attention, not necessarily to weigh in one way or another.

EM said that it might be good to have somebody representing the ASO, watching what's happening and informing us. He suggested that this could be a member of the PACG.

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

**New Action Item 241217-3:** HPH to ask the PACG to appoint a person to be on the ICANN Meeting Strategy Group.

## **7.- APNIC's Announcement on Registry Audits**

JRL explained that APNIC had started their audits of APNIC and NIRs with the NIRs in India and Indonesia. They found some suspicious delegations there and are now investigating and working with the NIRs. Long story short, for the next year APNIC is going to conduct an independent audit on all NIRs including APNIC itself. We might also discover some questionable delegations and clean them up.

EM shared that the situation in the LACNIC is different. There are two NIRs founded before LACNIC was created. They have exclusivity to assign IP addresses in their countries and we have a good and strong relationship with both. Also, the contracts with both NIRs include the obligation to make regular audits. Since 2018 we made biannual audits and we didn't find any big issue. All parties recognize the value of this exercise and jointly we ensure that we are providing the same QoS to the entire region and preventing potential issues in the allocation of IP addresses.

HPH observed that there are no NIRs in the RIPE region, so this doesn't directly apply. RIPE NCC has had two third party assessments (on the transfer processes whether they are fit for purpose, and on the sanctions processes and whether they are sufficient and whether we follow the process). We will have a new third party assessment at the end of next year, but we haven't decided the topic yet, we have these assessments every two years by request of the board.

JC shared that ARIN has periodic internal audits, as well as external audits.

HPH asked whether JC was suggesting putting together a group to work on these stalking points / messages.

JC replied that there is no need to put together a team, simply make sure we are all following similar messaging.

## **8.- RIR CEO Updates**

EM:

- LACNIC had its board meeting in December, the main element to share is that the board approved the budget and plan for next year.
- The board also approved the contingency budget for 2026, that will be useful just in case we can't have quorum for approval of next year's budget. This is something LACNIC began two or three years ago to prevent potential risks.

JC:

- The ARIN board will meet in January, no unusual changes, some flexibility because we are still working on defining specific goals for next year (e.g. whatever goals come out of the common NRO RPKI program).



JRL:

- We had our board meeting, the main thing was for the board to approve the updated strategic plan. Once it is published, JRL will share it with the EC.

HPH:

- Lots of things have been happening since we met in Istanbul.
- HPH went to Jordan for a Middle East round table, this time the meeting was in Arabic so we had real time interpretation.
- As for budget, Budget: we've been frugal and able to spend less without cutting initiatives.
- The RIPE NCC is expecting even more savings on the technical side next year as we will be getting rid of old hardware for measurement services.

## **9.- Minutes Review**

2024-November-12: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - DRAFT

2024-November-11: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - DRAFT

2024-October-15: Minutes NRO EC Teleconference - DRAFT

GV noted that most of the minutes have already been approved.

## **10.- Next Meetings**

a) Tuesday 21 January 2025 Teleconference

b) Tuesday 18 February 2025 Teleconference

c) 10-11 March f2f Meeting in Seattle USA (ICANN 82)

No issues were brought up regarding the 21 January and 18 February meetings. The March meeting will be held f2f in Seattle. Depending on what happens in Seattle, we can cancel the 18 March teleconference.

At JC's request, GV went over the meetings that have already been scheduled for Seattle with a view to finalizing travel arrangements.

The group then discussed their preferences for the Seattle meeting (begin Sunday afternoon at the earliest, don't schedule anything for Thursday).

With this information, GV will coordinate the logistics with ICANN.

## **11.- Open Actions Review**

**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.

**ONGOING**

**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.

**ONGOING**

**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." **CLOSED**

Re Action Item 241112-3, JRL observed that if we can identify certain meetings and identify which of our board members will be attending, then we can arrange for those board members to meet. That should be good enough. He suggested closing the action item and seeing how we can coordinate this.

**Updated Action Item 241111-1:** HPH to schedule a meeting with Sofia Silva to discuss how the RPKI program is going and what challenges she sees in each of the regions to gain better insight. (Updated to reflect that this action item is on HPH) **OPEN**

EM shared that Sofia is in Montevideo, so I have met with her.

**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. **OPEN**

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

**Action Item 241015-1:** HPH to follow up with the PACG about how they coordinate on Internet governance and ask them for a plan. **DELETED**

Action Item 241015-1 overlaps with Action Item 241112-1, so it was closed.

**Action Item 241015-2:** HPH to ask the PACG to share any statements on RIR issues from now on so that, if they agree, the other RIRs can issue statements to the same effect (collectively or individually), each with their own tone and adapted to their own region.

**12.- AOB**

GV shared with the EC that Nirmal Manic had asked him to wish them all a Merry Christmas.

**13.- Adjourn**

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 12:50.

---