

# IANA Review Committee Meeting

25 April 2018  
DRAFT Minutes

## Attendees

### AFRINIC

Madhvi Gokool (MG)  
Noah Maina (NM)

### APNIC

Simon Baroi (SB)  
Bertrand Cherrier (BC)  
George Kuo (GK)

### ARIN

Nate Davis (ND)  
Louie Lee (LL)  
Jason Schiller (JS) – Vice Chair

### LACNIC

Nicolas Antonello (NA)  
Esteban Lescano (EL)  
Ernesto Majó (EM)

### RIPE NCC

Andrew de la Haye  
Nurani Nimpuno (NN) (Chair)  
Filiz Yilmaz (FY)

### Secretariat

German Valdez (GV) - Executive Secretary  
Susannah Gray (SG) – Secretariat/Scribe

### Apologies

Omo Oaiya (OO)

## New Action Items

NEW ACTION ITEM
<b>NEW ACTION ITEM 20180425-1:</b> JS, NN to compile all the proposed changes to the RC operating procedures as discussed and circulate a new draft on the mailing list.
<b>NEW ACTION ITEM 20180425-2:</b> All review the new draft of the operating procedures and raise any concerns within one week of receipt.
<b>NEW ACTION ITEM 20180425-3:</b> GV to send a Doodle poll in November to schedule a teleconference at the end of November/beginning of December.

<b>NEW ACTION ITEM 20180425-4:</b> GV to open the call for nominations for RC Chair on 7 January 2019.
--

<b>NEW ACTION ITEM 20180425-5:</b> GV to add RJ to the RC mailing list.
---

## Agenda

0. Welcome
1. Review of Open Action Items
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Vice Chair Appointment
4. Chair Election Timing
5. Operating Procedures
  - Fixing inconsistencies between different versions
6. RC Report Post Mortem
7. Next Meeting
8. AOB
9. Adjourn

### 0. Welcome

NN welcomed the attendees and noted that there was representation on the call from all five regions.

### 1. Review of Open Action Items

**ACTION ITEM 20180313-1:** All to read the IANA RC Report and raise any objections or submit comments by 20 March.

CLOSED

**ACTION ITEM 20180206-05:** NN to formulate a proposal regarding changing the RC election timelines.

CLOSED

### 2. Approval of Minutes

NN noted an error in the attendee list of the 20 March Teleconference minutes.

Pending correction of the attendee list, there were no objections to publishing the minutes.

### 3. Vice Chair Appointment

NN explained that the procedures state that nominations for the RC Chair should be called for before the first meeting of year and that the Chair should be elected during the first meeting of

year in January. The Vice Chair should also be elected during this meeting. She noted that unfortunately, the timing was not adhered to this year.

NN added that, while the RC had asked for nominations for the Chair, it had not asked for nominations for Vice Chair.

She noted that JS is the current Vice Chair, the Vice Chair has a one-year term and JS has not had his term reviewed. She noted that in order to follow due process, nominations for Vice Chair should be called for and a person selected for this role.

There were no objections.

NN asked for nominations for the Vice Chair role.

JS noted that he would be happy to continue in the role for another term. BC supported JS's self-nomination.

NN called again for any other candidates.

There were no other nominations.

NN proposed that JS be selected as Vice Chair. There were no objections.

NN thanked JS for his support and work over the last year and for taking on the role for another year.

The RC congratulated JS on his appointment to Vice Chair for another year.

#### **4. Chair Election Timing**

NN explained that there had been some discussion previously about adjusting the timing of the RC Chair election. She noted that it had been suggested that the elections could be held in December but as some of the RIRs appoint their RC members in December, this would be difficult.

She noted that it is not ideal to hold elections at the beginning of the year. However, as most procedures are now already prepared and the RC has experience in preparing its report, she proposed that the RC sticks to the original timelines and holds elections in January.

She explained that this would mean that elections would be opened in the second week of January and one week would be allowed for nominations to come in. The Chair and Vice Chair selection would then be made during the January teleconference. She asked the group for its opinions on this proposal.

BC noted that last year, APNIC appointed its RC members during the February APNIC meeting. Sticking to the original timeline would rule them out of the selection.

NN accepted BC's point but noted that each RIR uses different processes and appoints its RC members at different points during the year: whatever timing is selected would mean that someone would be new to the committee or someone might be about to be rolled out. She

added that, if the original timeline is followed, someone joining the RC in February, for example, would still have the chance to be nominated in the next round of elections.

BC suggested that if each RIR's processes for selection or election of RC members could be noted then the RC might be able to work out a suitable timeframe that works for everyone.

JS noted that, in the ARIN region, elections are held during the October meeting where a new ASO AC/NRO NC member is elected. They serve on the IANA RC for a three-year term.

BC noted that, in the APNIC region, one person is selected and one elected. The next election is in September.

NN noted that, currently, in the RIPE region, the RC members are elected from the ASO AC members and they have two-year terms on the ASO AC. That election happens at the October/November meeting. She added that as people are serving on the RC for more than a one-year term, if they don't have the chance to be nominated in their first year, they would do so during the next year of their term.

MG noted that, in the AFRINIC region, members of the ASO AC are selected to serve on the RC for a two-year term, which begins in January.

EL noted that, in the LACNIC region, elections take place in September and the appointments start on 1 January the following year. He added that there were no objections from the LACNIC representatives to sticking to the original timeline.

BC concluded that the proposal to stick to the original timelines seems reasonable given that it is only the APNIC RC members who do not begin their terms in January.

FY noted that each RIR has their own procedures to elect or select people to the RC but their terms should be for a calendar year and at the start of each calendar year the representatives should be beginning their terms. She added that as this is an issue in a particular region it should be addressed locally. It is common practice to start committee terms at the beginning of each calendar year.

FY suggested that if a member is rolling out, and the newly elected member is already known, they could be invited to the last meeting of each calendar year so that they are already prepared and ready to start their role in January.

NN agreed that this would be a good idea.

NN asked if anyone had any objections to keeping the text for RC Chair election procedure as it is.

There were no objections.

## **5. Operating Procedures**

*- Fixing inconsistencies between different versions*

NN noted there are different draft documents.

JS noted that there are two versions of the IANA Numbering Services Review Committee Operating Procedures. He then went through the changes to the redline document:

- There is a procedure to do an out of cycle review.
- The review is done annually covering a calendar year.
- The final report will include the matrix and all community comments.
- Section 0, Role of the RC, was removed and posted on the website instead.

NN noted that it was her recollection that FY drafted section 5.2 on the community consultation and the RC subsequently approved this text. Therefore she didn't think there was a need to change the text at this point.

JS noted that for the most recent report, the RC published the matrix and asked the RIRs for comments. The draft report was then assembled and then this was sent to the NRO EC. The proposed procedure change states that the RC would receive the matrix, quickly draft a report and publish both the matrix and the report to the RIR communities at the same time, asking for input. Then the comments received would be added and the report sent to the NRO EC.

FY believed that that the RC had already discussed the format of the report and had decided not to include details about its format in the procedures with the view that the format might need to change over time. She added that the format should not be hardcoded in procedures: next year there might be different requirements. This is also why the community feedback text that she had drafted was intentionally left quite broad. She noted she would be wary of changing the text already drafted for 5.2. She would not like to see a more detailed text regarding the reporting format in the procedures. The main point is that the communities will be consulted and this is very clearly stated already.

JS noted that he was happy with section 5.2 and it should be kept as is.

FY noted that she was confused: what are the inconsistencies between the texts?

JS explained that the current agreed text is not inconsistent between 5.1 and 5.2. What is inconsistent is that there were some agreed changes to the current text that didn't get carried over to the version of the operating procedures that was subsequently adopted by the RC. He noted that he had gathered all these previously agreed changes and added them to the red line document. The question now is: does the RC still want these things to be changed?

JS suggested that 5.1. Expedited Report and 5.2 Community Feedback were adopted as part of the RC's procedures. Section 5. Review Process is kept as currently written, except for the part in section 5 about consulting the communities, as this would be replaced by text in section 5.2.

NN agreed and asked for any objections. There were none.

**NEW ACTION ITEM 20180425-1:** JS, NN to compile all the proposed changes to the RC operating procedures as discussed and circulate a new draft on the mailing list.

**NEW ACTION ITEM 20180425-2:** All review the new draft of the operating procedures and raise any concerns within one week of receipt.

NN noted that if there were no objections to the draft circulated, the procedures would be adopted after one week.

FY asked that the links to the documents remain the same.

## **6. RC Report Post Mortem**

NN asked the RC to discuss their experiences in producing the report and the lessons learned.

JS noted that there were some challenges in completing the report as it was the first attempt: none of it will apply next time.

ND commented that the format of the matrix meant that it could not be placed in final report very easily. He suggested that, for the next report, presentation is taken into consideration and proposed reaching out to the NRO's Communications Coordination Group (CCG) for help in finding a more suitable presentation format.

NN agreed that cosmetic changes should be made so the report is more legible.

NN noted that she believed that nothing substantial in the process needed to change for the next round. It is possible that there won't be any incidents in future and that the report will be a fairly simple process. However, the IC should discuss how it would manage the process if there were a significant failure of the IANA Services. She noted that she was not proposing new procedures or working methods but that the RC should begin discussing any failure soon after it occurs so it has a good idea of how it will be implemented in the report.

JS noted that, as no community feedback was received, there was no chance to experience that process. He thought that the RC needed to review how feedback was monitored, collected and displayed on the website.

NN noted that there is an RC member from each region monitoring the mailbox to receive feedback or answer questions. The NRO Secretariat created a page on the website and anything received would have been published there in raw format.

JS noted that as there were no comments received, the mechanics of this was not tested: he wondered how the comments would show up on the website or, if there were many comments, would the RC be able to handle the volume?

NN noted that two types of comment might be received: questions/comments on the work of the RC and questions/comments on the performance of the IANA. It is not the RC's remit to respond to questions about the IANA: the RIRs/IANA should handle this.

BC commented that the call for public comments was published on the RIRs' announcement mailing lists. There was no obvious place to post a comment on the website and it is not possible to post to any of the RIR announcement mailing lists.

NN noted that the communities were informed that they should send comments to an email address.

JS commented that in the ARIN region, he or LL gave a report on the IANA RC's work at each ARIN Meeting and asked for comments or concerns: there were none.

## **7. Next Meeting**

NN asked if the RC would like to hold a meeting in December to regroup and welcome any new members.

FY agreed: it is better to schedule one already and cancel if necessary.

There were no objections to scheduling a meeting in December.

**NEW ACTION ITEM 20180425-3: GV to send a Doodle poll in November to schedule a teleconference at the end of November/beginning of December.**

**NEW ACTION ITEM 20180425-4: GV to open the call for nominations for RC Chair on 7 January 2019.**

## **8. AOB**

ND informed the RC that he would be retiring at the end of the year.

The RC congratulated ND and thanked him for his work and support.

ND noted that RJ would replace him as ARIN's COO and would be providing staff support to the RC as of December. He proposed that RJ was included in the December teleconference.

NN noted that RJ would be welcome at the December teleconference.

**NEW ACTION ITEM 20180425-5: GV to add RJ to the RC mailing list.**

## **4. Adjourn**

The meeting ended at 13:15 (UTC).