IANA Review Committee Meeting

20 March 2019 | 12PM UTC
Draft Minutes

Attendees

	Community Representatives	Staff Representative
AFRINIC		
	Noah Maina (NM)	Madhvi Gokool (MG)
APNIC		
	Syam Zulfadly (SZ)	George Kuo (GK)
ARIN		
	Louie Lee (LL)	Richard Jimmerson (RJ)
	Jason Schiller (JS) - *Vice Chair*	
LACNIC		
	Juan Alejo Peirano (JP)	Ernesto Majó (EM)
	Glenn Peace (GP)	
RIPE NCC		
	Nurani Nimpuno (NN) - *Chair*	-

Secretariat
German Valdez (GV) - Executive Secretary

Apologies
Omo Oaiya (OO) (*AFRINIC Community Representative*)
Bertrand Cherrier (BC) (*APNIC Community Representative*)
Syam Zulfadly (SZ) (*APNIC Community Representative*)
Felipe Silveira (FS) (*RIPE NCC Staff Representative*)
Filiz Yilmaz (FY) (*RIPE Community Representative*)

Scribe:
Susannah Gray (SG)

New Action Items

- NEW ACTION ITEM 190320-1: GV to implement proposed changes to the IANA RC Operating Procedures and publish on the new procedures on the NRO Website.

- NEW ACTION ITEM 190320-2: GV to send out a Doodle Poll at the end of October 2019 to find a date for the next IANA RC meeting, to be held at the end of November/beginning of December 2019.

Agenda

0. Welcome & Roll Call
1. Agenda Review
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Review of Open Action Items
4. Proposed changes to the IANA RC Operating Procedures (Action Item 181219-04)
5. IANA RC Report Post Mortem (lessons learnt and improvement suggestions)
6. Next meeting
7. AOB
8. Adjourn

---

0. Welcome & Roll Call

NN welcomed the IANA RC members. GV performed the roll call and declared quorum.

1. Agenda Review

No items were added to the agenda.

2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the 5 March 2019 IANA RC Meeting were approved. NN asked the Secretariat to publish the minutes on the NRO website.

3. Review of Open Action Items

- **ACTION ITEM 190305-1: NN to draft an announcement about the final IANA RC Report to be sent out via the RIR mailing lists and published on the NRO website > CLOSED.**

- **ACTION ITEM 190305-2: GV to send a Doodle poll to the IANA RC members to find a time for the final IANA RC Meeting > CLOSED.**

- **ACTION ITEM 181219-04: JS to propose changes to the RC Operating Procedures once the RC Report has been completed > CLOSED.**

This action item was discussed during agenda item 4: *Proposed Changes to the IANA RC Operating Procedures*

4. Proposed Changes to the IANA RC Operating Procedures

- **ACTION ITEM 181219-04: JS to propose changes to the RC Operating Procedures once the RC Report has been completed**

JS explained that two proposed changes had been made to the IANA RC Operating Procedures, details of which had been sent to the mailing list:

- *Section 5. Review Process:*

- o The second part of section 5 was reorganized and some parts were moved into 5.2.
- o 5.1 outlined the Expedited Performance Report process, whereby the NRO EC could request an out of cycle review as necessary.

- • *Section 0: Preamble*:
  - o Text that the IANA RC had previously agreed upon was added. This text was not added to the Operating Procedures previously, as the IANA RC did not think it was an operating procedure. The text was displayed on the NRO website for some time. However, part of the text had now been removed due to reorganization of the website.

RJ noted that he had read the proposed changes outlined by JS and had no issues.

NN noted that a process for performing an out of cycle review was discussed during the previous year. She added that she had no objections to the proposed changes and asked if the IANA RC had any objections or further comments.

There were no objections.

NN proposed that the IANA RC accepts the changes to the IANA RC Operating Procedures as proposed by JS and asked the Secretariat to implement the changes and publish the updated document on the NRO website. She thanked JS for his efforts.

NEW ACTION ITEM 190320-1: GV to implement proposed changes to the IANA RC Operating Procedures and publish on the new procedures on the NRO Website.

5. IANA RC Report Post Mortem

- • **Community Comments and Feedback**

NN noted that two comments from the community had been received *after* the public comment period had closed, both of which could be considered to help improve the RC's work on the 2019 report.

- • *Comment [summarized]: The matrix summary is a screenshot from the IANA website and includes 'more info' buttons, which caused some confusion because the links were not active.*

NN suggested that this could be fixed in the 2019 report by removing such buttons or making sure active links are in place.

RJ noted that JS had raised this before the report was published. He added that the screenshot could be shown with the 'more info' buttons fully expanded on the page or the link to the information could be added into the document.

NN noted that at APRICOT 2019 and at ICANN 64, IANA/PTI presented on the improvements being made to its website, which would result in a new dashboard and improvements to how reports will be displayed. The IANA RC might need to make further changes on how the information would be displayed in the 2019 report depending on how the IANA/PTI website changes.

JS asked if the RIRs had any influence on how IANA/PTI provides its reporting. If so, the IANA RC could ask the RIRs to suggest that IANA/PTI presents the summary report in a way that makes it easy for the IANA RC to copy and paste it into the RC report.

NN noted that she believed that IANA/PTI was open to feedback. A note could be sent Kim Davies (KD), Vice President IANA Services, asking him to consider making the information on its website easier to export.

JS agreed. He added that the information should be more easily exported and available in a text format that is readable by applications for the visually impaired rather than in a graphic.

NN asked the RIR staff representatives to consider the discussion regarding the IANA/PTI website and whether they wanted to approach IANA/PTI about this. She added that the RIR staff are not bound by how the IANA/PTI presents information and could build the matrix differently. However, if the information on the IANA/PTI website was more easily exportable then it would be better.

JS agreed.

RJ noted that the RIR staff could approach KD regarding this. He added that the RC should ensure that the information presented in future reports was accessible to those with disabilities. Using text rather than graphics would enable those with visual impairments to use screen readers in order to read it, for example.

- *Comment [summarized]: The report should be made more accessible for those with disabilities.*

NN noted that a comment had been received regarding the accessibility of the report for those with disabilities and multiple impairments. She added that she had responded that the public comment period had closed but that she would raise the concerns during the next IANA RC meeting.

NN continued that the RIR staff and the NRO Secretariat should consider this comment. The report was published on the NRO website and there might be accessibility considerations that need to be taken into account or there might need to be changes in the way the report was displayed on the website. NN noted that LL had attended a course on accessibility and UI and asked him to talk further on this point.

LL noted the following:

- For screen readers:
    - Text should be formatted using bullets and auto numbering (rather than typing numbers in by hand).
    - Headings and captions should be used appropriately as they will be read out and a person can jump through the different headings to get to the right part of the text.
    - '0' and 'o' should be used correctly, as should en dash and em dashes.
- Graphs should use highly contrasting colours or textures (such as patterns) for data differentiation.

He noted that there are many more considerations that should be taken into account when ensuring accessibility but these are the basic ones to keep in mind.

JS agreed with NN that accessibility/readability should be the RIRs' or the NRO's responsibility but noted that the RC should be fully supportive of this work and should facilitate this any way it can should the RIRs and/or the NRO decide to take this task on.

NN agreed.

- **Process**

JP noted that, as two comments had been received off list and past the deadline, perhaps there was room for improvement in how the community provides its comments.

NN noted that it was not surprising that no comments had been received on the 2017 report or the 2018 report: the reports are simple and state only that no issues had been found so there's not much that the community could say about that. She added that the communication about the report could be improved to ensure that it is robust enough. Talking about the IANA RC at the RIR meetings could be one way to make the community more aware of its work. She noted that she had given a report during the RIPE Meeting after the 2017 report was published and LL had also done so at an ARIN meeting. She added that the RIPE Community did not make many comments because there were no issues with IANA/PTIs performance.

NN continued that the IANA RC Operating Procedures state that the RC should perform outreach and suggested that the other IANA RC members could report to the community in their regions. She noted that one reminder had been sent during the comment period, and perhaps more reminders should be sent next year.

JS noted that the RC had just agreed to change its Operating Procedures. The previous text made it sound it like the RC's responsibility was to simply make sure that community was aware that there was an open comment period and that the comments would be collected and reviewed. The new procedures now narrows the scope, noting that the RC is only interested in feedback from the community that is relevant to the IANA number services operations, but otherwise generally opens the responsibility, clarifying that the RC should be continuously engaged with the community

JS continued that the new text notes that the IANA RC should communicate relevant developments to the community and collect feedback outside of the 30-day comment period. He continued that it has always been the RC's intention to interact more with the community. In the ARIN region, the RC representatives present any relevant updates and ask for feedback or concerns on the performance of IANA/PTI during the ARIN meetings. There was not much feedback from the ARIN community because everything was going well with the service provided.

RJ noted that if the report did not note any failures, it was unlikely that comments would be received from the community. He continued that if there was something in a future report that pointed out an error or slip in IANA/PTI's performance, then the community would be likely to respond, would ask for details and discussion would occur. In a year where the performance was flawless, silence from the community was to be expected.

NN agreed: part of the RC's objectives was to facilitate such community discussion if it occurs.

JS noted that two comments were received but neither was received through the official comment channel nor within the comment period. He asked whether it should be documented that these two comments were received or whether the comments should be made be available somewhere. He also asked whether the comments should be included in the 2019 report.

NN noted that she did not believe the two comments received should be publicly recorded. The first comment was in regard to a minor formatting issue and the second was a general comment regarding accessibility. She added that she had responded to both and discussion on them during this meeting would be recorded in the minutes.

NN continued that she didn't think there was an appropriate place to document the comments. If the comments had been made during the official comment period then that would be a different matter.

RJ agreed that noting the comments and discussion in the meeting minutes would be sufficient. However, he suggested that when communicating about the 2019 report, it could be noted that two comments were received outside of the official comment period and that they were discussed and had been

addressed in the upcoming report. This would show that the people submitting the comments that we discussed the issues and others could see that the RC was being responsive to community input.

EM noted that as the comments were made outside of the official channels and a response was given to the commenters, no official record of them should be necessary. The RC will take action on the things it considers relevant and which would help to improve future reports.

LL suggested that the RC could also mention this in verbal reports to the community at upcoming RIR meetings, noting the RC had received comments and had responded.

NN noted that the she thought the process went very smoothly this year. A lot was learned from the work in the first year so the RC understood exactly what it needed to do and when. She added that, in terms of process, there were no issues to note.

NN continued that, while not an issue, there could be improvement in communication on the various mailing lists. When announcements need to go out via the RIR mailing lists, 2-3 extra days might need to be added after the announcement as, in the LACNIC and AFRINIC regions, translations need to be made so a few extra days would help to ensure that a globally coordinated message is distributed.

JS asked if a template for the announcement could be created and the necessary fields updated each year. If the text was pre-formatted, it might help streamline the translation process.

NN noted that there was a draft, which was updated as necessary: future RC Chairs could use this text and update the relevant parts. She added that it was the RIRs' decision on how translations were made and didn't think that pre-translation would be a good idea in case changes need to be made. It was more feasible to add a few days to the announcement process to allow for translations.

NN noted that the writing of the report went smoothly and thanked people for volunteering themselves: there were a few minor issues to be improved for next time but nothing major.

JS asked the RC if there were other areas in the Operating Procedures that needed to be addressed, if any of the procedures are unclear or problematic or if any other changes to the procedures might be needed.

NN noted that there was a procedure for changing the Operating Procedures so if there were issues in the way the RC is operating in the future, this could be addressed.

There were no further comments.

6. Next Meeting

The RC agreed that the next RC meeting would take place at the end of November/beginning of December 2019.

NEW ACTION ITEM 190320-2: GV to send out a Doodle Poll at the end of October 2019 to find a date for the next IANA RC meeting, to be held at the end of November/beginning of December 2019.

JS asked the Secretariat to ensure that any new incoming RC members were included in the Doodle Poll.

7. AOB

There was no AOB.

8. Adjourn

NN thanked the RC for its efforts and hard work and for producing a successful report for 2017. She looked forward to working on the 2018 report in the coming months.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:58 PM UTC.