
COPENHAGEN – IANA Numbering Services Review Committee Meeting
Wednesday, March 15, 2017 – 11:00 to 12:45 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It is March 15th, 2017 at 11 a.m. This is the IANA Numbering Service Review Committee Meeting in Hall B42.

It is March 15th, 2017 in Hall B42 at 11 a.m. This is the IANA Numbering Service Review Committee Meeting.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Good morning, everyone, and welcome to the IANA Numbering Services Review Committee. I might just give it a few more minutes to see if we get a few more people joining. Thank you.

Good morning again, everybody. I think we are ready to start. So, welcome to the IANA Numbering Services Review Committee. My name is Nurani Nimpuno. I'm the Chair of the Review Committee and next to me is Jason Schiller, the Vice Chair.

First of all, although we look very physical, I'd like to point out that this is actually not a face-to-face meeting. This is a working session of the Review Committee. We are actually only meant to meet virtually but since several of us happened to be in the same city, we said we'll get a room for this.

But this is a telephone conference as much as it doesn't look like it. And it is an open one, so I'm glad to see that we've got so many

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

observers in the room. We might start by looking at the agenda if [Hermann] could put that up, please. Thank you.

Thank you for making that bigger for those of us who are over 30. And with that, could I actually ask [Hermann] to start with the roll call? Actually, while he gets up, because we do have so many observers in the room, I might just give a quick description of what this group actually is and what we do.

This is the second meeting of the Review Committee. The Review Committee was something that came out of the numbering community's proposal for the IANA Stewardship Transition. And, it was acknowledged that it would be useful to have a community-run Review Committee that assists the RIRs in their review of the IANA Numbering Services.

So, we are simply a community group that's represented by the five RIR regions and are mandated to provide recommendations to the RIRs, namely the NRO EC in their review of the IANA Numbering Services.

This is our second meeting and this is the agenda for today, and it's very much a working session when we try to organize ourselves to perform our duties. Thank you.

So, if you start with the roll call, [Hermann]. Thank you.

[HERMANN]: Thank you, Nurani.

I will start with AfriNIC representative, Omo Oaiya? No? Douglas Onyango? Not present. Madhvi Gokool?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Douglas sent an e-mail saying he's having trouble getting in and I want to check on that now.

[HERMANN]: I will check that first after this. Madhvi Gokool?
APNIC representatives – Brajesh Jain?

BRAJESH JAIN: Present here.

[HERMANN]: Thank you Brajesh. Tomohiro Fujisaki?

TOMOHIRO FUJISAKI: Yes, I'm here.

[HERMANN]: Thank you, Tomohiro. George Kuo? I can see George – so, remote participant.
ARIN representatives – Louie Lee?

LOUIE LEE: Present.

[HERMANN]: Thank you, Louie. Jason Schiller?

JASON SCHILLER: Present.

[HERMANN]: Thank you, Jason. Nate Davis?

NATE DAVIS: Present.

[HERMANN]: Thank you, Nate.

LACNIC representatives – Nicolas Antoniello? He’s participating remotely. Edmundo Cazares is present and also participating remotely. Ernesto Majó?

ERNESTO MAJÓ: Present.

[HERMANN]: Thank you, Ernesto.

RIPE NCC representatives – Filiz Yilmaz?

FILIZ YILMAZ: Present.

[HERMANN]: Thank you, Filiz. Nurani Nimpuno?

NURANI NIMPUNO: Present.

[HERMANN]: Thank you, Nurani. And Andrew de la Haye?

ANDREW DE LA HAYE: Present.

[HERMANN]: Thank you, Andrew.

Back to you.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you. And I'll repeat since there's a few more people enter the room. This is a working session of the Review Committee but it's open for anyone to observe and listen in.

I was actually also going to ask the room because I see we have previous CRISP members on the – both participating remotely I think

and also [inaudible] calling in and a few others. I do hope we can keep this informal.

This is a working session for this group but I would appreciate if we can be a little bit flexible, if maybe people from the RIRs or from a CRISP team if they feel that they have information that could help the group that we keep an open mind and let them contribute as well.

If anyone has an objection to that, please let me know.

All right, well, shall we start with the review of the open action items? And, as we're doing that –

[HERMANN]: Yes, sorry, I'm having problem with the document.

NURANI NIMPUNO: It's fine. I just want to note that Omo has joined the group as well, so thank you for that.

[HERMANN]: I will help running with the development but if you're okay, I would read the action and review it. But I cannot display it right now.

We touched on from last meeting for all the Review Committee, the staff members to prepare a presentation by ICANN58 meeting for the rest of the Review Committee community members about what the IANA performance review would look like. That was for the staff representatives and I think they were working on that.

Nate, if you can maybe update on that action.

NATE DAVIS: I'm sorry. I didn't hear the question.

[HERMANN]: It's about to update about the action of the staff members of the Review Committee to prepare a presentation for this meeting about how the IANA performance review would look like.

NATE DAVIS: So that's the major [that I] delivered. I think it was last, last week. Yeah.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you. So, yes, I think we can note that that action has been taken care of and we'll get back to that later this and I think that under item 5, IANA performance report. Thanks.

[HERMANN]: Second action of [fourth] that we have for this meeting, yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can we check if the remote participants are able to speak because we don't hear nothing from them?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, Nicolas [inaudible] said that he has no option to speak that I just asked the tech in the back to see if he can turn that on, I don't have a reply yet but maybe until then, one of us relay his comments from the chat.

Is it possible to turn a remote mic? Not at all? We'll need to keep that in mind for next time I guess.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, we had some back and forth about whether this meeting was closed or opened. Had we received a little more clarity from the beginning, we could have accommodated that. So, in the future, if you conduct meetings here again, just being a little more clear about requirements, we can ensure that we have the proper setup in the room.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you with that [Carlos] and I recognize that. And to be clear, that's also why I was trying to set the scene at the start of this meeting that we are actually not meant to meet physically and we just happened to all be at the ICANN meeting. But I recognize it does actually have implications also both in terms of the signals he send about the meeting but also I noted that it was made part of the public ICANN schedule and this is actually not an ICANN meeting as such. It is open for anyone to listen into but it's not part of the official ICANN schedule.

I also think that normally when we do remote participation, we use the RIPE NCC Webex remote participation, which all of us are familiar with as well and that allows for a bit more interaction but thank you for your help in this.

So, I will try to keep an eye on the chat and try relay the comments but please also, let me know if I miss anything. And maybe Jason can help out a little bit more.

JASON SCHILLER: I'm trying to join the chat right now.

NURANI NIMPUNO: All right.

[HERMANN]: Sorry, can I continue?

NURANI NIMPUNO: Please.

[HERMANN]: Second action of [fourth] that we have for this meeting is how for Nurani and Jason to prepare in advance of this meeting, the content for the initial discussion of the Review Committee internal procedures.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Yes, and that was something we sent out to the list. I had some problems sending it out and I've ended up sending a link to the Google document but we'll be looking at that also later in the agenda, actually, under agenda item 4.

[HERMANN]: Action number three for me to coordinate with RIR communication group the regional announcements of the IANA Review Committee Meeting started with the face-to-face meeting in ICANN 58, which has been coordinated and discussed in their RIR communications group meeting here in ICANN, so they were providing the support of the public announcements for this already done and for the future meetings.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Excellent. Thank you. And I did see it on the right [inaudible] and I think they would distributed it throughout the various regional lists already. Excellent.

[HERMANN]: All right. And, the last action for me to prepare a list of our IANA Review Committee members participating of the committee face-to-face meeting in ICANN 58, which is already done in preparation with this meeting.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you very much.

And then I think we are ready to move on to Agenda Item #3. And, we wanted to put the scope discussion at the very start because it sets the scene for our work. And I just wanted to make sure that we are all in agreement on the scope of this on the Review Committee's work and maybe to assist us in that, we can bring up the – sorry to throw this at you, [Hermann], but maybe we can bring up the charter. I'll give you a little bit of time.

I can read out the first three items in the charter just to set the scene a little bit. So, it says the IANA Numbering Services Review Committee's function is to advise and assist the NRO EC in its periodic review of the service level of the IANA Numbering Services provided to the Internet number community.

In carrying out this function, the Review Committee will report to the NRO EC any concerns regarding the performance of the IANA Numbering Services operator including any observed failure or near failure by the IANA Numbering Services operator to meet its obligations under the Service Level Agreement.

The Review Committee must submit such a report to the NRO EC at least once every calendar year by the date specified by the NRO EC from time to time. I'm not entirely sure what that from time to time means but I'll go with the – by the date specified by the NRO EC.

And finally, the Review Committee has an advisory role to assist the NRO EC in relation to things referred to in the previous paragraphs. The Review Committee does not have any power to commit the NRO EC to any recommendation or decision made by it except where and

to the extent that it has expressed delegated authority from the NRO EC.

Just to be clear, when we're talking about the IANA Numbering Services operator, that is now the entity that is called the PTI now. So, the IANA functions operator within ICANN that provides IP addresses and ACE numbers, and a few other little things to the RIRs.

So, with that, I will actually open the mic for a little bit to the room to see if we have any comments or reflections on that and how we see the scope and the boundaries of this group.

All crystal-clear? All right, fantastic.

Maybe I'll say a few words about my interpretation on this and if anyone has any other thoughts, please feel free to say them. It's very clear that we are here to assist the RIRs. It is the RIRs who are the contractual party, so they and ICANN have a contract and SLA for the IANA Numbering Services that PTI performs.

It is up to them to actually review the performance but we are here to provide an avenue for the community to broad input and to give recommendations to the RIRs through the NRO EC.

Please, Filiz.

FILIZ YILMAZ:

I do agree with that interpretation of the previous [inaudible] and we can adapt that. I see, in my opinion, our role is advisory and more like community side of watch dog position. Rather than doing it, they will

be doing the work and having the experience, we are asking them to inform us if they feel they are having issues and they would need our support so we can advise accordingly and make the linkages as necessary as well.

So, in my opinion, the scope is clear enough to be reflected immediately for implementation among us. Thank you.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you, Filiz. Jason.

JASON SCHILLER: So, certainly, I think we all agree that it is clear that we're going to produce a report that where going to lean heavily on the RIR staff members of the Review Committee for that. And we're going to oversee that report to make sure that it is legitimate and that all the metrics are measured appropriately and they're being met. We're also going to provide that report to the community for their input and their concerns, and certainly, we're going to provide that advice to the NRO EC. It's very clear that the output of this group is advised to the NRO EC and nothing binding.

What I think is a little bit less clear is how we do community engagement. That's not really defined in this charter so much, so there's some confusion as to whether simply a comment period on the document is efficient or if there should be more community outreach, and I think that's really where there are some difference of opinions.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you, Brajesh and then Filiz.

BRAJESH JAIN: Thank you Jason for APNIC or ARIN staff to provide inputs but I just wanted [other point], will there be a report exception or will there be periodically report, for example quarterly or six-monthly as a normal report or they will report only the exception? Thank you.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you. I will let Filiz come in and give her comment, and I think we will actually come back to the review that the RIRs will be doing and I'll be looking to some of the RIR staff members to expand on that if that's okay later. Thank you.

FILIZ YILMAZ: Thank you. I understand where Jason is coming from and I empathize or sympathize with it. But we have to remember that this mechanism is put in place for a future that is not in reality yet.

So, all these things we're told of as a mechanism just in case something happens, we can have some mechanism to respond to that. So, we don't know what is going to happen and we all have opinions what may happen. In that context, what I feel what may happen also based on the past, we all know that RIRs always were very happy with the service we are receiving anyways from IANA now with that new name, which will be part of this review context as well.

In the post transition period and for the near future, I think our role will be the community input will be only required if things go bad. So, we will only be seek for help or from the RIR side if things are not working well and they will ask our help to make an endorsement maybe with the community power and the voice if the services are not provided well.

So, in that context, everything, our involvement really starts after that report comes into our plate. So, that is not a committee engagement in my opinion before that report comes in and even if the report comes in, if it is all happy and it's all good, we are fine, we are getting services, our members are happy, there is no business case for us to put ourselves from the community side to endorse any improvement. Thank you.

NURANI NIMPUNO:

Thank you for that, Filiz. Any other comments? Please.

JASON SCHILLER:

So, just a follow-up to what Filiz said, I wholeheartedly agree. The IANA has been providing a fantastic service. It has never had an issue. The community is happy with the service that they're providing. So long as that continues to be the case, this is a very simple process. We produce a report, it shows that the IANA services are meeting all the metrics that we think are important, we declare success, we let the community provide any comments if they have any, which they won't because they're happy with the service and we move along.

What I'm suggesting though is that we should spend sometime now to set up a mechanism to allow the community to provide us with information if that is ever not the case. And I think once we do that work, our task here will be very simple moving forward so long as the community is happy and the IANA service is good.

NURANI NIMPUNO:

Thank you for that. And I agree. I think we seemed to be sharing the same views of what this group is meant to do and that we're really here to assist the RIRs, and that we suppose to – we are here to channel community concerns if there are any. Like Filiz said, there might very well not be any and also as long as the RIRs are happy with the service, then we – and the community are probably happy as well.

I do also think that there's value in this group and in the report even when everyone is happy and the services are running smoothly simply and that it's publicly noted that this is running well. And that we have a history that is public, so people can go back and look at these reports and see where there are issues but also actually where there are not issues. And I think that is actually very valuable to the broader community as well.

Okay. Great. Well, that was a very useful discussion. Thank you.

With that, I will throw us back to the agenda and move on to Item #4, internal operational procedures. So, at our very telephone conference, I believe it was seven months ago, also, Jason and I were tasked with putting together an internal operational procedures document and we

share that to the list, and I would like to open the floor for any comments on that if the group feels that these operational procedures are sensible.

We have Jason – as a bit of background information, I might say that Jason and I, we had some discussions back and forth about how loose or how strict we should be with the operational procedures.

And, I should maybe say that we – I guess, we landed in and trying to actually keep this fairly informal to be clear about where the boundaries are but to not overprescribe how this group should work. And that we have trust in this community’s experience in reaching consensus and making decisions in an efficient matter without overprescribing how to deal with every single detailed challenge so to speak.

So, I’ll open it up and I’ll be happy to hear comments on it. We can put it up perhaps on the screen if people want to go into detail but also if you’re happy with what has been circulated, then please say so as well.

Andrew.

ANDREW DE LA HAYE:

Yes, I’d like to thank you both for giving a good step at this and I’m very happy to see consensus on a lightweight process. I think that that is very, very important to us, that is lightweight, easy to implement. And on top of that, the transparency, which was just discussed I think is of utmost importance, so thank you very much.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you. That's useful input. Please, Tomohiro.

TOMOHIRO FUJISAKI: Yes. Just a quick question, is the process are published or not?

NURANI NIMPUNO: It has not been published on the website yet because we haven't agreed on it but it has been circulated. It is in a public Google document, so anyone can see it but because we haven't agreed on it yet, it is not on the NRO website.

Please, go ahead, Nate.

NATE DAVIS: Yeah, thank you. I just wanted to echo Andrew's comments as well, which is from an RIR staff perspective, the lightweight process I think is very good. I would ask this body to keep in mind that the number of transactions we're talking about each year are four or five transactions a year. So, having a lightweight process actually is appropriate for the number of transactions that we're talking about. Thank you.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you for that, Nate. And just to clarify, we're talking about four to five transactions for all five RIRs, so that's in total per year.

NATE DAVIS: Yes, that's about right.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you. That is a very useful data point to keep in mind when we're looking to define our work here.

Please.

JASON SCHILLER: So, there's some discussion about production of the report. Initially, when we wrote the procedures, we thought that we would do a report annually at a regular timeline. Initially, we suggested September. There were some discussion on the list to move it to January, that way we can look at the year in total January through December, take that data, roll it up in January and publish it in February.

There's now also a suggestion that maybe January is vacation time for some and perhaps maybe middle of the year, July, might be better. So, I suggest maybe we can take a minute to lock down if we want to do the report regularly and annually, and when we want to do that.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you for that, Jason. I will actually put this to the RIR staff because you're the ones who will have to work in January. And, without putting too much pressure on you, I am also hoping because we're talking about three, four, five requests per year that not all the

work will necessarily be done in January, so maybe it is still feasible. But please, those of you who represent the RIRs can you please – let us note that it seems workable for you or not.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Thank you again, Nurani. I think that as we don't have a regular process during the year, we can choose in any date, so we can analyze a whole year but basing it on the date that we choose. We're only learning – yes, it's all right that in [inaudible], the end of December and part of January is complicated times, not only for the staff but also about for the community. So, maybe another date could be better for us.

NURANI NIMPUNO:

Thank you. Personally and this is me not as Chair but expressing my personal opinion. I liked the suggestion by Filiz of keeping calendar years. I personally don't think it matters that much if we publish that report then in February or in March as long as we can say that the report is for that calendar year but I'm happy to hear comments from you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I think from our perspective, that could be very much manageable. The calendar years would make a lot of sense. We can align it with the PTI's processing as well, so I think that would be a good step forward.

NURANI NIMPUNO: That's useful. And, it doesn't necessarily mean that you need to do it in January. We could shift it a month if that works better.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Another comment is related to the outreach community, maybe the year or the work within our communities starts in February. APNIC meetings is in February normally. So, maybe if we have this information before that is good to make [notice] with our community, our meetings.

NURANI NIMPUNO: And actually, I will also remind myself of the charter, which does say that the report is to come up by date set by NRO EC. So maybe we can simply bring this to the NRO EC and suggest this, and if they are happy with that, we will work according to that plan.

Fantastic. And, we've got technology where I can force not against this. Isn't that wonderful?

[HERMANN]: Yes, I have a comment from Nicolas from the chat. Nicolas Antonello said that only the RIR staff cause the Review Committee for 30 days to analyze the report, so mostly the Review Committee, the RIRs will help to do it in December. That is the reason I suggested going from July to July or at least late January to March 3.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Well, what if we do the following? If that is acceptable by the group, we put an action point on Jason and me to talk to some of these NRO EC members that we believe we might have seen around and see what is workable to them, and we can set a timeline including to that and then bring that back to the group. Does that make sense?

NATE DAVIS: Sounds great. Thank you very much. Do you want a motion for this? How formal would you like this to be?

NURANI NIMPUNO: I would prefer again because we're in lightweight group, I would prefer – and because our charter says that we should operate by consensus, I'd prefer to not necessarily become that formal but to make sure that everyone in the group is heard if that is okay to everyone as if you're not around the room. And, please, Brajesh.

BRAJESH JAIN: I would just like to repeat what I said that exception reporting for [inaudible] or there will be annual report whatever date is chosen, that point should be clarified.

NURANI NIMPUNO: To comment on that from a Chair perspective, I think we need to separate the reporting that is done perhaps between the PTI and the RIRs, and the report that we will publish. And I think it is clear [inaudible] to our charter that we will publish a report annually.

And then, I simply think it is up to the RIRs to work out the reporting between them and PTI if they want to have daily telephone calls if they want reporting in a certain format or not. But again, please let us hear from the RIR staff members.

NATE DAVIS:

So, I think when we get to the evaluation matrix, I'll address the point at least from my perspective that's open to input from my colleagues as well at the other RIRs but I'll certainly address the reporting aspect of that.

NURANI NIMPUNO:

Fantastic. Thank you. And, I would like to suggest and ask [Hermann] to put up the operating procedure on here. I would like to suggest that we don't necessarily do a group reading of it. You have all been sent it. Maybe we can explain some of our thinking behind it and then I would actually like to give ourselves perhaps two weeks to look at this and for everyone to say they're comfortable with this will take back to the mailing list if that's okay with everyone.

Actually, Jason, do you want to walk us through some ideas?

JASON SCHILLER:

No, go ahead.

NURANI NIMPUNO:

I'll do it. You'll be tired of my voice at the end of this session.

So, the members, that simply actually reflects the charter. We did put in a member term there of three years. We're very open to suggestions of changes there. We also try to put in a member removal process, so that might have actually been in the charter even.

And, if we move down, that simply talks about how the Chair and the Vice Chair is selected. Again, we try to keep this very lightweight and trusting that the group is capable of selecting Chairs and replacement Chairs if we need to.

And we will move further down. And, yes, this all covers how to manage the vacancy of a Chair and the reelection of a Chair and a Vice Chair.

Next.

JASON SCHILLER: One comment if I could.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Yes, please, Jason.

JASON SCHILLER: One thing that's worth point out is term. We chose a term of one year for the Chair and Vice Chair, that's not specifically from our charter but that seems to be standard operations, so it's just worth pointing out.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you for that, Jason.

And if we move further down, we've simply put in some text there about transparency. The essence of this comes from the charter as well. And also, how we are meeting that we're meeting via telephone conferences at least twice each year, that's also from the charter.

And, we will move further down.

JASON SCHILLER: [Inaudible] the quorum?

NURANI NIMPUNO: Yes, please.

JASON SCHILLER: So, quorum was not something that was addressed in our charter, so this is some new text that we created. We simply set it at eight Review Committee members of whom there must be at least one member from each region and at least five voting members.

NURANI NIMPUNO: And again, just to clarify, this comes under the – if we go back up to... Go a little bit further back up. Yup, thank you. This comes on the proceedings. Yeah, thank you.

And, the review process, that's one that we've actually – the timing of that – I suggest that we leave that for now because we've already

discussed changes to the timing and the text there actually doesn't reflect the discussion we've had so far. So, I suggest that we leave that and once we have the [ACE] with the NRO EC and we suggest we come back and suggest new timing to the group. And, once we agree on that, we can put that in the document.

The rules of order again, we've tried to keep very lightweight sticking to the charter of working via rough consensus and the voting procedures are really just in the event that we cannot reach consensus on certain things. But we hope that this is a group that can – as we always have in the RIR communities operated by rough consensus. And then, simply that these operating procedures can be amended.

So, we'll put this to the list. If there are any other direct comments, we'll take them now. Please, Brajesh.

BRAJESH JAIN: My only comment was from the case of I can see a Chair and Vice Chair that their appointment term will be the balanced term only.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Sorry, what was that? Can you please repeat it?

BRAJESH JAIN: That the Chair and Vice Chair position becomes vacant, a new one is appointed, the term of the new appointed would be the balanced period of the year –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The remaining –

BRAJESH JAIN: The remaining period of the year – 216.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: 2.16.

NURANI NIMPUNO: I think that sounds reasonable.

I do have a comment from one of the RIR staff members and I did say at the start of this session that it is open to observers but suggesting that we could be a little bit open to – if there's valid important comments from the RIRs. So please, I know that Craig Ng from APNIC wants to comment.

CRAIG NG: Thanks for your endurance. Just actually a clarification in relation to the quorum, it just occurred to me, it says five voting members. Did

you intend to mean at least one from each or five in total it doesn't matter wherever you come from? Okay.

JASON SCHILLER:

No, the intention there was to make sure that there was at least one member of the Review Committee from each region. That could be either the appointed or the staff member and that there are at least five voting members. So those two things are independent, so it's not necessarily one voting member from each region. It could be two voting members from two regions, a voting member from a third region and then the balance of the regions being covered only by staff.

NURANI NIMPUNO:

So with that, actually, Brajesh, could I ask you to simply propose a paragraph for your proposal just so we can incorporate that and –

BRAJESH JAIN:

Yeah, and I would do that for 2.1.5 and 2.1.6.

NURANI NIMPUNO:

Perfect. And, Jason and I will look at the process and the timing of the reports, and propose a new text for that. And then, I hope that we can... How long do people feel they need, is a week enough, two weeks to review then the final operating procedures, comments?

Please, Louie.

LOUIE LEE: I'll go for one week because we've had this on the list for a while and we're just making minor changes. Of course pending, that one did a change for the report timing. But other than that, it's all good.

NURANI NIMPUNO: That sounds sensible. Any objections? None? I see a few thumbs up. Please, Hermann.

[HERMANN]: A comment from Nicolas Antonielli, "Two weeks is okay," from the chat.

NURANI NIMPUNO: And let's see that he's typing, so give him a little bit more time to say if he's... Nicolas, do you think would one week also be acceptable to you? "Two weeks is okay. Yes, there's no hurry. This is true as well. We don't need to rush through it. I'm happy to give it two weeks. Let's do that. Thank you."

Okay. Great. Well, if we go back to the agenda, I believe that takes us to the meat of this discussion. So this is the IANA performance report. And so, at our very first telephone conference, we asked the RIRs to start this work and to prepare something for this meeting, and Nate also circulated this on our mailing list.

Do you want to speak to that, Nate?

NATE DAVIS: Yes, I'd be happy to. [Hermann], are you able to bring up that matrix that I sent on the eighth?

[HERMANN]: Yes, that will take a couple of minutes.

NATE DAVIS: So, while [Hermann] is doing that, let me give some background. During our first Review Committee Meeting, what I offered to the Review Committee was putting together a structure for the RIRs to actually evaluate IANA's performance and that's based solely on the Service Level Agreement.

What I have done and you'll see momentarily is to go through the Service Level Agreement that the RIR CEOs have signed with ICANN. And through a critical read, extract all the operational performance items for which IANA is responsible to the RIRs with regards to performance.

It is limited. You'll see the matrix is limited just to operational performance items, it does not include any items in cases where there's non-performance. And the reason I want to mention that is that that would actually need another step as far as engagement of our legal teams, respective RIR legal teams if there was a non-performance item because there are certain conditions that in terms and so forth that actually need to be handled outside of this group if you will.

So, what I've collected is actually the specific evaluation points that I believe – and again, this is subject to agreement with my RIR colleagues – they have specific evaluation points by which we hold IANA accountable for performance back to the RIRs.

I've listed those in this matrix and the reason for that is I like things crisp and clear where I can go line by line in order to on an annual basis prepare the report along with my colleagues and evaluate those on a case by case basis. And, in doing so, it also allows us to identify the reports that IANA is putting together now. They're putting together a set of monthly performance standard reports that will be published beginning in April, and the drafts are under review and circulation now by the NRO EC.

But those reports will serve as the reporting mechanism by which IANA is reporting back against each of these Service Level Agreements evaluation points identified in that agreement between the RIRs and ICANN.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you, Nate. That was very helpful.

NATE DAVIS: Sure.

NURANI NIMPUNO: And while we're waiting for the matrix to come up, I just wanted to say first of all that I think I fully agree with the starting point. We cannot

review anything that is not in the SLA. We might – we or you or other people might have all sorts of opinions about all sorts of things but it really comes down to the agreement that you have with the IANA Numbering Services operator. So, simply starting with extracting that from the SLA is very helpful I think in framing the discussion.

I would like to actually suggest just as a way of moving us forward in the agenda as well, that maybe we can – I think Jason and I when we put together the agenda, we had a bit of a discussion about these parts of the agenda. And, we agreed that we need to as a group look at doing a gap review of the performance matrix, discuss metrics and measurements, the current measurements and a gap review of that, and then the contents of the actual performance review document.

But I would actually and I'm sorry to spring this on you, I would like to suggest that maybe as a next step, we can ask the RIRs to start with the document that you've put together and come up with the review mechanisms for each and every one of those, and that will actually be the basis of our performance matrix.

I think you're in the best position to understand what you need to review in the SLA and I think you're also the ones who need to measure this, and come up with measurements that are sensible but also practical.

So, would that be a good next step and could I throw that at you?

NATE DAVIS: So, it sounds like you have agreement but I want to ask for clarity. I guess what you're asking for each of the evaluation points that are in the matrix that I identified is to go ahead and start flushing that out based on IANA's reporting of performance against those matrix, correct? Because I agree, that's the next step is to flush that out and that will serve as the basis for the annual reporting that we provide back to you on IANA's performance, so I think we're in concert with that.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Fantastic. Comments from any of the other RIRs?

Jason, please.

JASON SCHILLER: [Hermann], can we take an action item to track the status of the production of that document that I guess records the performance standard metrics and provide regular updates on progress?

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you. I might actually even ask you for when do you think it would be reasonable to expect the next version of this document from you.

I will let you get back to the group about that if you need to.

NATE DAVIS: Let me work with Andrew and George, and Ernesto and others and get back with you on that one. Thanks.

NURANI NIMPUNO: That's fine.

NATE DAVIS: Since we have these things like everyone else have day jobs.

NURANI NIMPUNO: There's nothing worse than having someone sitting on a committee and commit the whole organization to a timeline that is not realistically, right. Fully understood. Thank you.

Any other comments on this document that Nate has provided or the next step forward? If there are no other comments, I think I would like to actually propose that we then for now put on hold the next 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, so basically the review of the performance matrix and now we put that on hold until we get the performance matrix from the RIRs.

Fantastic. And if so, you're doing very well [Hermann] in switching between documents very seamlessly. If so, I would like however though to suggest that we still have a general discussion about the contents of the report that we will then be publishing.

I might even ask... Can I put you on the spot, Jason, because I know you have some thoughts on this? Thank you.

JASON SCHILLER:

So, I imagine we would look at the next version of Nate's matrix that we would have some performance standards metrics, we would have some vehicle for measuring that performance and probably a checkbox and meets or doesn't meet, and maybe some notes if necessary saying we've seen an interesting trend here.

That's really the meat of the report but I actually see that as being in the appendix. I think the report should be some sparse text. I think that we should summarize at a high level. Is it meeting the standards or not? Have we seen any interesting trends?

We should also try to categorize and roll up any concerns that we have heard from the community or any concerns that we have, and put that all encapsulated into text and then we can add the matrix as data as the first attachment, and then maybe a second attachment with any concerns that have been brought up to us. We can verbatim attach them if we believe they're in scope and perhaps even attach all the comments and concerns that were provided that we believe are out of scope as well.

So, really I think the discussion here is assuming we have the matrix and we have it filled out, we're all in agreement on it, what sort of wrapping goes around that?

NURANI NIMPUNO:

That was incredibly constructive. Thank you, Jason.

I would like to reflect a bit on that but I would like to give others the chance to comment on that. Does that sound like a sensible way to approach the report?

Please, [Hermann].

[HERMANN]: From the chat, I have a question from Edmundo Cazares. He said, “Jason, I think you referred to give context to the info in the matrix?”

JASON SCHILLER: Yes, I meant to say attachment. Yeah. So, I think the matrix will be in the attachment. Any concerns or comments that have been passed to us will be in the attachment but the body of the report will be short, maybe one page, a paragraph on whether they’re meeting the objectives, a paragraph on any interesting trends that we’ve seen, a paragraph or two summarizing the types of concerns that have been voiced to us, and then leave all of the data and all of the raw comments as attachments.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you, Jason. Filiz, you wanted to comment?

FILIZ YILMAZ: Yes, I would retain trying to prescribe the format of the report at this point. I think the main thing is it captures what we want to relay. It needs to be simple. It needs to be concise and readable. Can just work

within those principles, so I think depending on what we want to actually say, we can decide at the time what format will be the best. Would that be a great way forward at this point instead of trying to prescribe something now, which may or may not work later on?

NURANI NIMPUNO:

That sounds all very sensible. I can't see anyone frowning in the room. If I want to summarize that then... and I will add my own comment not as Chair but as a member of this group. I'll add my own comment first and I very much agree with Jason.

I think it is our role to collate and gather comments from the community but not necessarily to comment on the comment, so to speak. It's not for us to evaluate the comments or to say what we think are sensible comments or not.

So, I very much like the suggestion of simply keeping the comments from the community in its original raw format, so to speak, as an appendix to our report. And, I also like the general suggestion of keeping in this very lightweight and simple, and also not try to overprescribe anything at this point.

Please, Jason.

JASON SCHILLER:

Yeah, I certainly didn't mean for that format to be prescriptive or a template. That was in my mind, the sorts of things that would be in there and it would be lightweight and kind of more high level.

With respect to the comments from the community, I do think that there is one thing that we should do with the comments and that is we should at the very least sort them into ones that are within the domain that is the number of services performance and the SLAs or I shouldn't call them SLAs. They're performance standard metrics and the measurements thereof. And then, presumably, we could get comments about other things like some top-level country code domain name is not working and you should go fix that. That's certainly not within our scope.

So, I think the light touch here is let's try to figure out which of the comments are applicable within our scope. But other than that, I would not try to interpret the value of the comments.

NURANI NIMPUNO:

Thank you. I do think it is helpful not to necessarily define every single element of our report now. But it is helpful to have the discussion because it frames our work. So, if we have very different ideas about what the outcome will be, we will not work together as a group. So, I found that it's very useful, Jason. Thank you for that.

Any other comments? Does that approach seem sensible to people in the group? Please.

NATE DAVIS:

So, from an ARIN staff perspective supporting this team, I've heard nothing that concerns me right now. The one clarification I would add is in addition to inner reporting those things that have met or comply

with the SLA and to Brajesh's point is that we would highlight any exceptions certainly in any reporting that we provided along, and we do that objectively with I think no opinion, which is basically whether the SLA was met or not in an appropriate amount of text for that particular deliverable or evaluation point. Thank you.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you. That was also helpful.

Any other? Please, Brajesh.

BRAJESH JAIN: [Inaudible] of repeating myself. We should not wait for one year in case some exception is found in the first quarter of the year, so there should be some mechanism that we able to report maybe six-monthly if it is there saying not a formal report but say [inaudible] some search checkpoint and then go to the annual. At the end of the year saying that something happened in ten months ago, it will be a difficult situation. Thank you.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you for that. Jason?

JASON SCHILLER: Yeah, just I wanted to read something from our charter under functions objections number two. It says, "The Review Committee

must submit such a report to NRO EC at least once every calendar year by the date specified by the NRO EC from time to time.”

So, it’s not entirely clear to me that the NRO EC couldn’t ask us to produce an additional report by a specific date. I don’t know if that would suffice to address your concerns or not but it doesn’t seem like it’s in our purview to decide to do additional reports.

BRAJESH JAIN:

Yes, it says at least once, so there is a scope for any additional input to come.

NURANI NIMPUNO:

Thank you. I certainly understand that concern. I should say though again, I’d like to remind the group that this is not a new service. The RIRs have been receiving this service for many, many years.

And, actually and again, I’m going to put the RIRs on the spot again. Maybe you can give us a bit of – I don’t need to figure out, I need the report but can you give us a sense of how often that’s been a major incident that you felt that you needed to bring to the community and where the community or your members have had strong opinions on that incident. Is this something that happens just against the sense of the scope of the problem?

I think I have a sense of the answer but please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Let me try to look at the RIPE NCC side. I've been around for 10 years and I've never felt the need to revert back on any issues we had with IANA at the time. So, from that perspective, we don't have any issues so far.

One thing I do like to notice that we have to be careful that we're not becoming an operational body reporting on anything that might go wrong in the future. I want to keep this lightweight, report back to you on a yearly basis but prevent being an operational body because that's not the intent of this group. Thank you.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you. Filiz.

FILIZ YILMAZ: I'll try to say something that I think the intention behind that in some extent unclear wording is to give room if there happens to be a need or exceptional case and immediate issue, then we will have a way to respond it within the charter element. So, they can issue a report, we can respond to the report and accordingly we can escalate from there or not.

So, I guess if we can agree to say irregularity is one calendar year on this that happens to be an immediate issue, then RIRs will coordinate to issue and expedite. [Inaudible] will correct me. They know what I mean. A report that requires emergency issues, required for emergency issues. Yeah.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you for that, Filiz.

FILIZ YILMAZ: I found the word, expedite. Expedite report, is that correct?

NURANI NIMPUNO: We will leave that there. Thank you very much.

Now, I think that might be a practical way of managing that. Maybe I can offer to the group that we keep one year reporting, maybe as a way of making it possible for the community to provide comments at any time during the year, we can perhaps make sure that there is a mail address where people can provide comments whether it's June or February or May.

Again, I agree that we are here to support the RIRs, so maybe we can leave it open for the RIRs to initiate should there be a need to initiate a report midyear. The RIRs, the NRO EC would initiate that process and come back to contact the Review Committee to do that in a coordinated manner.

Would that be a practical solution that people could work with? Let's see if you're nods – please, Brajesh.

BRAJESH JAIN: [Inaudible].

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you. Please, [Hermann].

[HERMANN]: Just to give clean records now or the comments I have for George Kuo in the chat. He said, “I agree with Andrew. APNIC has not had any issues with the past interactions with IANA.”

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you. That’s also helpful. Please, Ernesto.

ERNESTO MAJÓ: I wasn’t asking then the [learning] staff from [inaudible] and they confirmed that we never had any incident with IANA.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you. That’s helpful. Please, Nate.

NATE DAVIS: So, during my brief tenure with ARIN in 1999, we saw no issues at all with IANA’s services. And since I’ve been back since 2004, similarly, we’ve never seen an issue. But I don’t want to sort of rest on our laurels if you will and I think something that Andrew mentioned is critical, which is the operational nature. If there is an event, the first thing I know that I’ll do at ARIN is to notify my CEO, John Curran, of an event. And, I expect that he will also liaise with the other RIR CEOs to

determine if there is a pattern of behavior or broader issue among the RIRs with regards to their interaction with IANA.

So, I just mentioned that as part of the operational responsibility that we have not only to our clients but the broader community and making sure we resolve issues as soon as possible whether or not that subsequently reported to the Review Committee is really as you suggested up to the NRO EC. So, thank you.

NURANI NIMPUNO:

Thank you. And, I would also like to emphasize that again, that we are an additional avenue. We're not the only avenue. And, in the past as well, if you're a community member or a member of an RIR has issues, then we very much have structures in the RIR systems for communicating that and for having discussions about that. So, the Review Committee is not replacing any of that. We're just simply an additional avenue.

Please, [Hermann].

[HERMANN]:

Thank you, Nurani. I have two comments. First one from Madhvi Gokool from AfriNIC. She said that the same for AfriNIC, no issues with IANA. And I have some comments from Nicolas Antonello. He said, "Is there any, as I'm not sure, way for the RIRs to state any issue out of the report let's say in the middle of the calendar year? If that is a yes, then it might be good procedure to have an open channel for the Review Committee to rise those eventual issues to the RIRs."

He continues, he said, “I believe it really does not mean that the fact of not having any issues with the past, there will be no issues in the future.”

NURANI NIMPUNO:

Thank you for that, Nicolas. Any other comments in this? No? Going, going, gone. Okay.

Well, thank you. I thought that was very useful discussion and I think that has helped frame our work. And I don't sense that there are any conflicts in this group on the way forward. I think we're very much in agreement on our work and our scope, and how to move forward.

Actually, I think that we have quite conveniently actually almost moved into the next agenda point, the review process and the review process internal to the Review Committee.

Jason, did you want to speak a little bit to that?

JASON SCHILLER:

I think it's probably premature to have this conversation without having the matrix in front of us. My hope is that we can look at that matrix and it will be very obvious and very clear how easy it is to judge compliance or noncompliance, and it will be very easy for us to have a lightweight procedure for us to determine compliance or noncompliance, and for us to come to agreement on the content of that document.

That is my hope. That is my expectation. If people have other expectations, I love to hear concerns and comments about that. If people share that expectation, it would be great to hear that as well. But I don't think we can actually make much more progress than that on this issue without having that matrix in front of us.

NURANI NIMPUNO:

Thank you, Jason. I agree with that as well. We might need to postpone that discussion until we know a little bit more what we're talking about.

So that takes us to 6.2 process for community feedback for performance review report. And we've actually touched upon this a little bit already. And so, in the operational procedures – well, the process of the Review Committee, I shared a suggested process. I'm very open to comments on that. Just to put something out there, I said we can have a public comment period of 30 days. If people have other opinions, I think it should be shorter or longer, then please share your thoughts on that or on anything else in the community feedback. Well, I think we also touched upon giving the opportunity of the community to provide their input at any point.

I would also like to propose to the group that we make it possible for all the community to comment at any time of the year and then it is our task to collate that together with any other comments we get in the public comments period, and include that in a non-filtered way in our report, so I like to hear your thoughts on that.

Yes, no, maybe, coffee?

NATE DAVIS:

So, I have a comment and I think I had mentioned this perhaps to you Nurani, as well as Jason and that is I know we have the IANA NRO EC mailing list, which is our internal – well, for now, our internal Working Group mailing list and I think it’s appropriate to keep that.

What I wanted to know is do we have any formal – not necessarily mailing list to engage dialogue but how are we informing the community of our transparent open meetings here, as well as what’s the suggested mechanism to collect input from the community at any given time? Is that via mailing list or how will that be done?

NURANI NIMPUNO:

Thank you, Nate. I think that’s very relevant question. I’ll share my thoughts and I’m happy hear what others think.

So, if we separate out the different elements, one is our internal mailing list that is publicly archived, so anyone can see the discussions. We also talked a little bit about the importance of transparency and that we need to be open about communicating when we meet and where people can find minutes, etc. So, that was an action point that we put on [Hermann] to coordinate with the RIRs and the communication staff with the RIRs, which I believe he has done.

And maybe I can ask everyone to actually look at their region and see if we feel that the appropriate communication channels were used there if that reached the wide enough audience. And if we don't feel that, we can report that back to the group.

But then your second question was a very interesting one because that was about how we collate the channel that we create for seeking input from the community. And, again, I will propose something to the group and I'm very happy to hear your thoughts on it.

I don't think there is a scope for a mailing list as such because this is what the Review Committee's task with collating this input but I do think it's important that there is a mail address, and maybe one that is publicly archived where people can provide their comments and they can verify that their comments have been received. And that will also make it possible for us to make sure that all the comments that we have received, we are aware of them and we take them and we make them part of our report.

Would that answer your question and would you be happy with such a solution?

NATE DAVIS:

Yeah. Actually, my thought process of bringing this up was actually to invoke some discussion here. That sounds fine to me.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Does anyone want to come up with a creative solution or other comments on my suggested approach? Please go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think that we can start with a very simple way like we use in different or the NRO process when we publish our document for comments during that period, 30, 45 days, 50, whatever. And, of course, I think it is very important to have a formal mechanism to send comments in every time. So, despite the comment period we can receive but the comments to other's e-mail but I think we need to have a formal mechanism for that.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you. And I completely agree. I think it's also important for transparency reasons not just to have something but to have something formal that we can communicate to people that this is where you get in. If you have concerns, this is where you should raise them. Thank you.

And, [Hermann].

[HERMANN]: From the chat, Nicolas Antonello said, "Why not each RIR managing his own comment list because worldwide list might lead to a nightmare if let's say 100,000 people make comments?"

NURANI NIMPUNO:

Thank you, Nicolas. And while I share that concern, I would like to say two things. So one is I agree that we shouldn't necessarily have a mailing list, a discussion list. This is why we have the Review Committee and we also have in each RIR community. We've got communication channels. So, I completely agree with that.

But I do think that because we have the Review Committee, there should be one avenue. And then, with that, maybe I should just say that I trust the sanity of our community to not flood that mailbox with all sorts of irrelevant comments but I do think it's good to have one single channel and I think it makes it easier to communicate to people as well whether you're from this region or this region, this is where you provide your comments.

Anyone else? Please, Jason.

JASON SCHILLER:

I just wanted to follow that up. Again, this is in addition to pursuing these concerns directly through your RIRs as well with whom you have likely a legal relationship, as well as a Board that has legal backing. So, this is really meant to be kind of a sixth channel, which is why I think keeping it all together in one place also makes sense.

NURANI NIMPUNO:

That was a very nice way of putting it. Thank you, Jason. Filiz.

FILIZ YILMAZ: I do actually like your suggestion, Nurani. I think we can set the right permissions on posting so that it will be only for observation for some people and we still get the information on the mailing list in one place. So, I would rather go with one place, one mailing list and opening it arranging the permissions in a way that we hear from community but we also trying to keep the communication among us as one.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Okay. Any other thoughts on that? I might actually put it to Nicolas as well. Would it be acceptable to him if we keep it in one channel, not in five different channels? Because like Jason said, it is an additional channel to the other ones.

Please, Brajesh. And we'll also leave it to [Hermann] to listen to Nicolas's comments or [Kaveh's] comments. Brajesh.

BRAJESH JAIN: This is in the context of the Review Committee meetings happening regularly or telephonically that is the charter. And it was supposed to be open to the public. Now, will it be listen-only mode or would it be open participation by the public in that [RC]? So, I thought the listen-only mode, so I just –

NURANI NIMPUNO: Yes, indeed. This is a working group that it's supposed to carry out work but we do want to be transparent in ICANN, so people can listen

in. But I think the question we were discussing was... and I'm trying to read Nicolas's comments here.

Well, so, if we go back to the channel we're talking about the mail address that anyone from the community can use to provide comments.

We're talking about whether or not to have five different ones or to have one and our suggesting simply having one based on Jason's comments that you can participate in your respective RIR communities if you want to do that. But for this Review Committee since it is the global one that represents the five regions to simply have one mail address. And that is also open and publicly archived.

Please, [Hermann].

[HERMANN]:

So, I'll read Nicolas's contribution here. He said, "If we keep the channel closed that is only to read, there will be people from the community that won't be able to make comments. So that list should be open to anyone to comment." And he said, "Okay, I would agree then with only one list."

NURANI NIMPUNO:

Fantastic. If I look around the room, I think that is consensus.

All right, if we continue like this, we won't fill our timeslot, so God help us. But that's very constructive. Thank you very much.

So, I think that means that we can move on to our next agenda point. We have [inaudible] review process in turn to the NRO EC process for community feedback, discussion on operating procedures for section five. So that was really the timeline discussion that we've already had and we will come back with the suggested, updated timeline there after I've been spoken to the NRO EC.

And that brings us to agenda point number seven, any other community engagement. Again, I think this agenda point was a suggestion from you. Yes, please, Jason.

JASON SCHILLER:

Yeah. I think it's probably appropriate to reframe this agenda point at this point because we've talked about some additional community engagement having this open e-mail list, having it archived, align the community past concerns. There was this idea that maybe the NRO EC could reach out to the Review Committee and advise us that an out of cycle review was needed. There was also a suggestion on the chat that maybe the channel should also be open the other way so that we can pass concerns in case we think there's information we can provide to the NRO EC to help them in deciding whether or not we need to do something out of cycle.

So, I think we've already had quite a bit discussion on other community engagement outside of the report and comments. I think the question that I like to ask generically is, are we all comfortable with the level of community engagement that we've discussed or does anyone think that we need more at this point?

NURANI NIMPUNO: Any comments from the group?

Well, I also don't think this is something we need to settle here and now. I think it's useful to bring it up and like Jason said, we have had a discussion about this. So, maybe I can just task everyone to think a little bit more about that and if people have thoughts on any other community engagement, we can certainly bring that to our next meeting.

Yeah. Please, Filiz.

FILIZ YILMAZ:

Sorry, we are cross thinking. Yeah, I think by being part of the Review Committee is also part of... To me, it comes with the package anyways. You have to be in touch with your community that's why we are already sitting here or as we were discussing how we ended up here, we may have come through SO/AC linkage or we may have been elected by our community specifically for this position but that's why individually we are the name sitting here.

So, I think that comes naturally and there are meetings we are all involved with our communities. We can do lightning talks. We can talk to the ground. I wouldn't again prescribe it because every RIR meeting or the facilitation has its own formats or their review panels, it can be a panel or a short talk or a [inaudible] even.

So, yeah, each committee has its own way of dealing with that kind of engagement, so I think each region, each rep should be just doing their engagement in accordance to the needs of their community.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you, Filiz. Jason.

JASON SCHILLER: I think that's fantastic and I echo with that 100%. The only question I have for you Filiz is, do we need some text in our procedures that says that loosely? I mean, do we need to make it clear that that's work that we're going to be doing that that's the expectation? And if so, would you take a stab at maybe writing it?

NURANI NIMPUNO: Nicely played, Jason. Filiz.

FILIZ YILMAZ: I'm being voluntold again. Yes, sure, I can go through – you can put that action on me. I can go through our scope document and that we have been discussing here and try to see where it can be mentioned lightly enough that it is not an operating procedure but an expectation from us that will come naturally out of being a member here of this committee. Yeah.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you. And I must say I like this discussion and I like the suggestion actually of putting that lightly in the operating procedure simply because I don't think we need to overprescribe it but like you said, it is nice as well to actually state that we are here – that there is an expectation on us, these community representatives to be engaged in our community simply and to make ourselves available.

And, I certainly do not think that hurts having that in our document. Thank you. Brajesh.

BRAJESH JAIN: I just like to recommend in the APNIC, the RIR has already been decided that RC will be one of the reporting mechanism back to the community in their formal meetings. And first it will happen in Ho Chi Minh in formal.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Fantastic. Please, [Hermann].

[HERMANN]: I have a comment from Nicolas. He said, "Sorry for going back in the agenda but I do not recall the end conclusions to the issue of whether or not the Review Committee might rise to the RIRs, an issue out of the reports during any time of the year."

NURANI NIMPUNO: So, I'll explain my understanding of the outcome of that discussion and I believe we said that it will be possible for people in the community to provide comments to the Review Committee at any time. The Review Committee will only publish a report once a year, however, should the NRO EC at some point feel that there is an issue that needs to be taken to the community through the Review Committee, they can then call, they can liaise with their Review Committee and call for let's call it an extraordinary report or communication. But such an event would be initiated by the NRO EC.

Jason.

JASON SCHILLER: If I can interpret Nicolas's question, I think the question is, in the event that we receive some concerns and we become aware of them, and we believe that they are serious and can help inform the NRO EC with their discussion of the idea of having – what was the term for that review out of cycle? Expeditious? Extraordinary? Whatever.

If we need to do an early review, wouldn't there be a line of communication open from the Review Committee to the EC to provide them advice about these concerns. [Hermann].

[HERMANN]: Again from Nicolas Antonello, he said, "Then, I believe I might not agree with the outcome. I believe the fact that Review Committee might rise an issue to the NRO EC, give this whole process more meaning."

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you for that, Nicolas.

I'm certainly open to hear comments from the group. Personally, I find it a little bit difficult to imagine what event that would be because if there would be a serious failure in the IANA Numbering Services, I would hope that the RIRs would be very much aware of it.

JASON SCHILLER: At least, you're one of them.

NURANI NIMPUNO: And, I would find it difficult to imagine what type of scenario we're talking about where the Review Committee would see an incident that the RIRs wouldn't or where the RIRs would not want to that to be made public.

But Nicolas, did you want to expand on that?

[HERMANN]: He's writing in the chat though.

NURANI NIMPUNO: And again, we're not talking about not allowing the Review Committee to raise an issues. We're talking about an extraordinary incident that would happen midyear if I'm understanding Nicolas's comment.

[HERMANN]: Well, he'll continue writing but he started with it. He said, "As difficult as imagining that IANA would ever change to PTI. I mean, that something are out of our imagination future events. I'm giving the Review Committee a possibility to rise any issue without the report is what they are a Review Committee is meant to, as an advisory group for the NRO EC."

NURANI NIMPUNO: Point taken. Any comments? Any thoughts? Please.

JASON SCHILLER: I just want to make sure I clearly understand this. The suggestion is that the Review Committee should be able to provide advice at any time to the NRO EC and that information might be useful to the NRO EC to decide to do an early review. Is that everyone else's understanding as well?

NURANI NIMPUNO: That is my understanding of the issue that Nicolas is raising.

ERNESTO MAJÓ: I try to imagine the situation but it's really, really difficult at least. But two things, one is I think that opening this possibility is almost outside of the scope of the Review Committee because we have to perform a periodical review in every time. Just once per year is our job.

And the second one, I think that we can establish our mechanism of communication between the NRO EC and the Review Committee Chair, and I must [inaudible]. So, maybe there is some information that we needed to change between us. This isn't the [mechanism].

NURANI NIMPUNO: Please, Filiz.

FILIZ YILMAZ: Now, thank you, Ernesto. That was helpful. And I think this is already in the documentation. We are still going to be cross-checking and meeting at certain points to see if there's any immediate issue. And if you receive a report, a flag from RIRs, we will have that mechanism. I think this is [inaudible] as part of –

NURANI NIMPUNO: It's [inaudible] of direction.

FILIZ YILMAZ: That we have an issue.

NURANI NIMPUNO: If the community or we see an issue that we think the NRO EC might find useful and – I'm sorry. I'm not using the microphone.

JASON SCHILLER: I think what Nicolas is talking about is the other direction is, can we just decide to give advice to the NRO EC saying, “We’ve heard this concern or we have this concern,” with the understanding that we think that advice might be helpful to them in deciding whether or not to do in early review.

NURANI NIMPUNO: I’ll let Filiz respond and then I’ll put myself in the queue.

FILIZ YILMAZ: Yes. I think again, within this whole system, I do not rule out continuous conversation. I mean, that’s why we have RIR staff sitting the committee to bring that linkage. And so, we will be talking to each other and depending on the issue, of course, we can flag it like this, “We hear this. Are you doing something about that?” And they can come back saying, “Yes, we are doing something about it,” or, “this is why we don’t want to do something about it at this stage, etc. etc.” And then, we can also still engage with the community because we have a mechanism for that, too.

So, what is in place for me is already both ways. Yeah.

JASON SCHILLER: So you’re going to –

FILIZ YILMAZ: I do agree but I don't see the need of making a drastic change in any of the procedures and the documentation we came up with so far. Yeah.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Well, then just to comment on that. I think we agreed that our mandate was to review or evaluate the review that the RIRs are doing of going out on the IANA Numbering Services. So, any incident that would come up at any point would actually be an incident that the RIRs are reporting already.

If we're talking about anything else raised in the community, which is not about the performance of the IANA Numbering Services, then that is clearly outside the scope of this group. And I think that was a little bit what Ernesto was trying to get at as well.

So, our work is really guided by the review that the RIRs are carrying out. But maybe I can offer a suggestion. So, one is – and again, I will voluntell you, Filiz, as part of that text where you said that the expectations of the Review Committee members are to engage with the community, etc. That we make sure that that covers listening to any community concerns at any point.

I don't know if one way of having it would be to put in the option of us having under extraordinary circumstances for the committee to have an extraordinary meeting called outside of our regular meeting schedule. I do find it very hard to see how we could do any of this out and not communicate with the RIRs about this. And I see any of these incidents would come from the RIRs.

Please, [Hermann].

[HERMANN]:

From Nicolas Antonello, he said, “That’s it. That makes more sense if the NRO EC might rise any special issue out of the report.”

NURANI NIMPUNO:

I’m wary of the time and we’re coming up to the end of our meeting time. Can I suggest that we take this to the list? And maybe I also apologize, Nicolas, that it makes very hard for you to participate in an effective manner when you can’t speak. So, maybe it’s a little bit easier to actually resolve this if we allow people to write up their thoughts a little bit more.

So, I’ll suggest that we take this to the list and I’m also happy to speak directly with you, Nicolas, to understand because I’m not sure if I completely understand the concern. So, I’m happy to have a separate chat with you just to really understand it and to see how we can solve it as a group. Will that be an acceptable way for one?

I see a few nods in the room. I see an okay from Nicolas but I don’t know if that was now or before but I think it’s a yes. Okay, great. Thank you.

All right, interesting discussion. Yeah, thank you for that.

I see that I can see that Akinori Maemura from the ICANN Board would like to make a comment. We’ve said we’ll be open to that, so please go ahead.

AKINORI MAEMURA:

I'm not sure if it is appropriate to make input for the Review Committee because I'm outside. And then please don't take it – my intervention is from the ICANN Board but I am talking from my personal capacity.

I was wondering in the discussion of the community engagement. It's very strange to me then I found that the Review Committee is for the review of the IANA Numbering Services to the RIR and then that's basically how RIR is satisfied with the service from the IANA. Then, the Review Committee – in my view right now – the Review Committee only can evaluate the performance of the IANA from the input from the RIR, not the community.

Then, maybe the flow of the information is from the RIR to the Review Committee and then for the Review Committee to evaluate the performance and then make an inputs in the NRO EC.

Then, I was really confused in the time with the community engagement, that's information – through the information is really different. Maybe if the Review Committee engaging the community, maybe they'll be – we are doing this kind of thing that this [inaudible] evaluation is that kind of result. How do you feel about that? Not really to have community input this and that to the Review Committee.

So, having that open meeting [raise this] another engagement [inaudible], then it's not really – again, having that input for the IANA performance but maybe to hear the committee voices is very great. It's

really important. But don't do too much kind of thing. That's my feeling. So, I hope this input is valuable for you.

NURANI NIMPUNO:

Thank you so much Akinori and I think that echoes some of the other comments we've had.

We have come to the end of our meeting time and I do want to be respectful of people's times. So, I would like to propose that the next meeting, we will simply handle that through the mailing list in the Doodle poll.

It is lovely to see all of your faces. But having face-to-face meetings actually has other implications. In this case, the fact that we had it at the ICANN meeting actually made it difficult for people to remotely participate and it is of essence I think especially since we have been chartered with the meeting through telephone conferences that we make it possible for people to participate, so I suggest that we stick to that in the future as well.

That takes us up to the very end. If you have one very short comment or anything else you want to raise, then please do so now. Please, Jason.

JASON SCHILLER:

So, I just wanted to make a quick announcement. The SO/AC has some meeting space, the workroom in B46 from 3:00 to 5:00. And they have graciously offered the Review Committee the first portion of that time

if we wanted to get together and try and collect our thoughts on what we discussed here, and try and put some words down on paper. I will happily show up at 3:00 and we'll try to do as much as I can, and I would certainly like as many of you to join me as you can.

NURANI NIMPUNO:

Thank you for that, Jason. And I think it's fine with all of us who tasked with action points to go off and do that work but of course, we need to bring that back to the group in a transparent manner. Thank you.

Any other comments? No. And no comments on the chat as well? Nope.

With that, I will thank you all for a very good discussion. I thought that was very constructive first, well, second meeting. And with that, we adjourn. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]