16th CRISP Team teleconference held on Friday, March 13th 2015 (13:00 UTC)

CRISP members present:

AFRINIC
Alan P. Barrett, AB
Mwendwa Kivuva, MK
Ernest Byaruhanga, EB

APNIC
Izumi Okutani, IO

ARIN
Michael Abejuala, MA
John Sweeting, JS

LACNIC
Andres Piazza, AP

RIPE NCC
Nurani Nimpuno, NN
Paul Rendek, PR

----

1. Agenda Review
2. Actions Review
   a. Agenda for 15th Meeting
   b. Response to the ICG on incompatibilities
   c. Questions from the ICG
3. Key updates
   a. Update from ICG discussions (if any)
   b. Discussions at APNIC39 Conference
4. Next steps: Preparing Implementation
   a. SLA and Review Committee
   b. the role of the CRISP Team
5. Handling of comments for the proposal
   a. From the ICG
   b. Informal feedback from others
   c. FAQ
6. Other operational communities
   a. Names discussions

b. Handling of IPR
7. Future Call
    a. Needs basis/pre-plan monthly
8. AOB

----

1. Agenda Review
No items were added to the agenda.

2. Actions Review
a. Agenda for 15th Meeting - DONE
b. Response to the ICG on incompatibilities - DONE, no further action required from CRISP
c. Questions from the ICG - IO drafted a response, feedback was provided on the CRISP mailing list, will now share this response on the IANA XFER list with 2-3 days for comments, then AB will submit the response to the ICG.

3. Key updates
a. Update from ICG discussions (if any)
AB said there hadn't been anything notable related to the CRISP proposal during the Wednesday meeting. He reported that there had been an informal request from an ICG member asking CRISP to prepare some sort of FAQ or diagram of how the existing accountability mechanisms work.
IO said they would discuss this further under agenda item 5.c.

b. Discussions at APNIC39 Conference
IO noted there was a session on the IANA stewardship translation. IO and NN shared some of its key points (next steps, drafting of the SLA, APNIC support of the principles contained in the CRISP proposal). NN added that she will be sharing some of the key points at the RIPE meeting. It was clarified at the AGM in APNIC39 that the community should be given the choice of changing the IANA operator, based on the numbers proposal. If other parties or communities believe otherwise in the course of developing SLA, this should be communicated in open and transparent manner. Based on this, RIRs will continue to work on SLA text and update of the progress and adequate consultation will be made at future RIR meetings, building on APNIC39 discussions.

4. Next steps: Preparing Implementation
a. SLA and Review Committee
IO noted that the idea is that the RIRs take the initiative in developing the details of the SLA text and the Review Committee.

b. The role of the CRISP Team
IO added that the EC feels that, if any feedback is received from the community regarding the SLA text or the composition of the Review Committee, it would be helpful if a CRISP team member can report

this to the NRO EC with an observation of whether this is in line with the CRISP proposal or not to serve as reference in their decisions. All agreed with this suggested role for the CRISP team.

Action Item: IO suggested explaining the future steps and role of the CRISP team on the IANA XFER mailing list and forwarding this information to the regional mailing lists.

5. Handling of comments for the proposal
a. From the ICG
IO noted that comments from the ICG received on the IANA XFER list will be dealt with on the list itself, adding that relevant or useful informal comments could be communicated by AB or PR to the CRISP team mailing list.

AB agreed. He added that comments might also be received through the ICG Forum mailing and that the ICG would forward those comments to the CRISP team.

b. Informal feedback from others
IO shared about an informal feedback from one of the CWG-Name member on IPR, forwarded to the CRISP Team mailing list. IO highlighted two points, additional responsibilities come with IPR and question was raised on whether IETF Trust is willing to take such responsibilities, and IETF Trust may not be eligible, not being a legal entity.

More and moreinformal feedback from others can be expected. IO asked how far CRISP Team wants to reply to informal feedback (e.g., from the ICG), some of which might be useful to consider at this stage in advance, rather than leaving feedback to the very last minute.

AB said if there are concerns about letting the IPR being held by the IETF trust, then CRISP team can go back to their original position (if there´s a future change of operators, then the IPR must be able to move).

IO said that some of the ICG members seem to expect the CRISP team to be more precise. She said that at some point perhaps CRISP could be a little bit more specific (e.g., in relation to IPR, what other alternatives other than the IETF Trust the numbers community would be willing to consider).

On the specific points raised on IPR informally from a member of CWG-Names, AB said that it should be up to the Trust to decide whether they'd be willing to take the responsibilities which come with the IPR. It was also noted that IETF is a legal entity.

As another informal feedback, AB shared that an ICG member is asking CRISP to prepare a diagram of how the existing accountability mechanisms work before and after the transition and possibly also a diagram of the proposal development process. Discussed more in agenda 5c. FAQ.

c. FAQ

IO noted that a FAQ document had been circulated by GV.

At IO's suggestion, GV clarified that the CRISP team could add any relevant comments or questions. It was agreed that the CRISP Team would like to add all questions from the ICG and their responses to such questions.

Action Item: CRISP team to review the document and provide feedback by Thursday 19 March. GV to add the questions from the ICG and CRISP Team's responses, receive any additional feedback from the team and, based on that, come back with a second version of the FAQ document for review.

GV noted that there is another document for CRISP Team to review – a slide deck to be used to present the proposal which is in draft version.

Action Item: Next Tuesday 17 March, GV to send the slide deck to the CRISP mailing list for feedback; feedback to be provided by Thursday 19 March.

The team agreed that it would be most appropriate if the CRISP team takes ownership for the FAQ document and the slide deck.

NN asked whether the RIRs would be responding to the proposal in an official way (separate from this FAQ document), i.e. public statement of support for the proposal, future steps, etc.

Action Item: GV would consult this with the NRO EC.

Regarding the diagram mentioned earlier by AB (an ICG member is asking CRISP to prepare a diagram of how the existing accountability mechanisms work before and after the transition and possibly also a diagram of the proposal development process), IO agreed that this diagram would be helpful. She suggested that this type of diagram might be incorporated in the slide deck that is being prepared by the NRO.

Action Item: GV to see that a diagram of accountability mechanisms before and after the transition be included in the slide deck prepared by the NRO on the Internet Numbers Community Proposal, as well as information about the proposal development process.

At PR's request, deliverables were summarized as follows:
- FAQ: The NRO is already working on this and is planning to publish soon.
- Presentation (slide deck): GV will send this to the CRISP team next Tuesday for feedback.
- Accountability mechanisms diagram: To be incorporated into the slide deck.

GV said he would make sure that CRISP team has enough time to review the FAQ and presentation, as both documents must be endorsed by the team before being made public.

IO asked whether the FAQ and presentation would be linked from the NRO CRISP team page. GV replied that his first assumption would be that these documents would indeed be on the CRISP team page.

NN stressed once again that the author of the responses to the ICG as well as the sender of the FAQ that clarify the proposal needs to be CRISP team, not the NRO.

Action Item: IO to summarize the things the CRISP team is working on with the NRO (FAQ, slides) and send them to the CRISP mailing list.

6. Other operational communities
a. Names discussions
IO asked how they should handle names discussions that may have an impact on the numbers community and how do we effectively keep track of these discussions.

She mentioned the following options:
- Having someone commit to following the CWG discussions and sharing new developments.
- CRISP team requests someone from the ICG to share any notable updates relevant to the numbers community.

NN noted that it's not possible to follow the discussions of the CWG as an observer without submitting SOI – the only way to do so is to read the archive. She added that, to follow the right process, if the proposal they are going to present to the ICG is going to affect the numbers community, then the focus is on the CWG to reach out to CRISP team and try to get an official response from the whole team, not from a single CRISP team member that might be participating on the mailing list. NN suggested making a formal request in this sense.

IO agreed. PR noted that he hadn't seen any kind of formal outreach from the numbers community to the other communities.

After further discussion, the following action item was decided:

Action Item: AB to send a message to the ICG saying that, if there are any notable developments within the names community that would affect the other operational communities, they should reach out to the numbers community to conduct appropriate liaison.

b. Handling of IPR
This item was already covered as part of agenda item 2.c (this is something that the IETF Trust should handle).

7. Future Call
a. Needs basis/pre-plan monthly
After discussing both options, it was decided to define a tentative conference call schedule so that if

something comes up CRISP team can react quickly and appropriately. At PR´s suggestion, it was decided to schedule two conferences a month; if there´s no agenda, the team can pass on the call.

Action Item: GV to set up a doodle poll to decide the best day to schedule the conferences (first Monday, first Wednesday, etc. with a strong preference for avoiding Fridays).

It was also decided to schedule one monthly teleconference at the usual time (13.00 UTC) and a second teleconference at a time that is friendlier for those in the Asia Pacific region, with a preference for the morning hours, Asia Pacific time).

8. AOB
No further items were brought up for discussion.

The meeting was closed at 14.15 UTC.