

18<sup>th</sup> CRISP Team teleconference held on Friday, April 24<sup>th</sup> 2015 (13:00 UTC)

**CRISP members present:**

**AFRINIC**

Mwendwa Kivuva, MK

Janvier Ngnoulaye, JN

**APNIC**

Izumi Okutani, IO

**ARIN**

Michael Abejuala, MA

John Sweeting, JS

**LACNIC**

Andres Piazza, AP

**RIPE NCC**

Nurani Nimpuno, NN

Andrei Robachevsky

**Observers:**

Alain Durand

Pindar Wong, PW

Chris Buckridge, CB

Grace Abuhamad

GV - NRO Executive Secretary

LP - Scribe

----

1. Agenda Review
2. Update on the CRISP Team Composition
  - a. Welcome new member: Janvier Ngnoulayea
3. Action Items
  - a. Minutes from the last call
  - b. Share future steps with the community
  - c. Confirm about IPR and the IETF Trust with the IETF
  - d. Arrange a call with CWG-Stewardship Chairs
  - e. Doodle poll on future call schedule (have some regularity)
4. Confirm community feedback

- a. ARIN35
- b. Other RIR regions
- c. Global list
5. Update on GAO interview
6. Update on the call with NRO EC
  - a. Overview: What was confirmed, follow up items
  - b. The role (if any) of the CRISP Team in community consultation
  - c. The role (if any) of the CRISP Team in NRO website of discussions at RIR meetings
7. Preparation for ICANN Board panel
  - a. Jurisdiction
  - b. Country of the IANA function operator
  - c. Implications for delay in submission of the proposal
  - d. Ability for RIR community to chose the IANA operator
  - e. IPR
  - f. Gap between traditional negotiations and open community process
8. Next Meeting
9. AOB

IO chaired the meeting and moved through the various agenda items following a brief summary she had shared on the mailing list earlier. This summary is included below (identified by the use of a different font), with additional comments as needed.

1. Agenda Review
- No items were added.

IO welcomed new CRISP team member, Janvier Ngnoulaye.

### **3. Action Items**

#### **a. Minutes from the 17th CRISP call**

Action item: The Secretariat to post the notes from the 17th CRISP meeting.

#### **b. Share future steps with the community**

Done. <https://www.nro.net/pipermail/ianaxfer/2015-April/000433.html>

#### **c. Confirm about IPR and the IETF Trust with the IETF**

Follow up e-mail sent by Izumi. No response from the IETF.

Action item: IO to send a new follow up email.

#### **d. Arrange a call with CWG-Stewardship Chairs**

Request made by Izumi, waiting for CWG-Stewardship Chairs to share the availability. The CWG-Names proposal is out now, so need to reconsider what we request for.

It was mentioned that the purpose of this was to get early warning from the CWG if there were any implications for CRISP. The purpose remains to assess those implications, perhaps we CRISP need to do some evaluation before we request a call.

#### **e. Doodle poll on future call schedule (have some regularity)**

Done. Waiting for the dates to be fixed.

### **4. Confirm community feedback**

#### **a. ARIN35**

JS and MA provided an update on the CRISP team presentation and the update on the SLA drafting at ARIN 35.

#### **b. Other RIR regions**

MK shared that his region would be having a IANA stewardship meeting at AFRINIC 22 (Tunisia, May 29 to 5). He added they would also be having a IANA transition month and a conference that will be held in Nairobi to discuss the IANA transition.

#### **c. Global list**

Request has been made to share SLA Text. A comment made about 7f.  
<https://www.nro.net/pipermail/ianaxfer/2015-April/000448.html>

IO: Would anyone from RIRs please be able to share the latest status on the [ianaxfer@nro.net](mailto:ianaxfer@nro.net) list? (rough timeline when this can be shared on the iana xfer list). I don't want to give the wrong impression that RIRs are holding something back and not transparent.

Conclusion: The CRISP team will wait for RIRs to share progress as soon as possible.

### **5. Update on GAO interview**

GAO has been asked by the Chairs of the House Energy and Commerce Committee and its Communications and Technology Subcommittee to review the NTIA's planned transition.

Nurani and I joined the interview, based on the questions circulated on the CRISP Team mailing list.

There were two additional questions are reported on the CRISP Team ML:  
<https://www.nro.net/pipermail/crisp/2015-April/001785.html>

Action item: Based on the interview and to have identified additional information needed, NN and IO will share the updated written response with the CRISP Team before submission so CRISP Team has the chance to review it.

Action item: It was agreed to share the response with the numbers community, after polishing the text somewhat.

The suggestion was made to discuss the possibility of adding background information on the CRISP website.

Way forward: Consult with CRISP team members who are RIR staff and other RIR staff who are willing to help with this and prepare some good information to have on the NRO CRISP team website.

## **6. Update on the call with NRO EC**

### **a. Overview: What was confirmed, follow up items**

- The NRO EC will make an announcement as RIRs that acknowledges the crisp team proposal and will work consistently with this proposal
- Will publish a rough expected timeline (SLA and review committee)
- There's already an SLA draft available. Expect this to happen very soon.

See <https://www.nro.net/pipermail/crisp/2015-April/001774.html>

### **b. The role (if any) of the CRISP Team in community consultation**

The process should be led by the RIRs. The CRISP Team give observation on whether community input is in line with the intention of the proposal

it was considered helpful if CRISP would share community feedback/observations regarding consistency with the proposal.

The concern was raised that, as the SLA is released, they need to be very careful that it's not reopening the proposal and that the main issue is determining whether anybody feels there's an inconsistency between the proposal and the SLA/the work of the RIRs.

All agreed that the CRISP team, as writers of the proposal, can judge whether a comment is within the spirit of the proposal and that this will add clarity and transparency.

The question was raised of whether there might be SLAs being developed that are not in line with the CRISP proposal and whether or not the CRISP team is expected to go through the SLAs.

It was agreed that CRISP should double-check with the NRO in writing, but that this should be included as a role.

### **c. The role (if any) of the CRISP Team in NRO website of discussions at RIR meetings**

IO's suggestion:

The draft report can be developed by RIR staff, but before publishing it, the CRISP Team members from that region (and any other member who attended the meeting) reviews it.

It will then be endorsed by the NRO EC. This should be shared on the regional and global MLs.

In parallel, it would be desirable to share broader discussions on the IANA stewardship transition which took place at the RIR meetings, not just on SLA realtime as possible on the global regional MLs.

Therefore, make sure to post before each RIR meetings on the global MLs, and may be good to have a quick unofficial update of the general discussions at the meeting on IANA from a CRISP Team member from that region.

## **7. Preparation for ICANN Board panel**

The panel will discuss the issues that need to be highlighted by each operational community when discussing the IANA stewardship transition. All discussions will be published.

### **a. Jurisdiction**

Do we have an opinion on this more than the discussions we have had?

It should be fair to all parties involved in the IANA Numbering services

### **b. Country of the IANA function operator**

No need to change.

As separate topic there are some discussions in ICANN Accountability CCWG about incorporating in the Bylaws for ICANN to have its headquarters in the US.

The group reflected on what jurisdiction actually means and what this discussion is about. The conclusion was that the only opinion CRISP has is what is written in their proposal.

### **c. Implications for delay in submission of the proposal**

While NTIA states that there is no deadline, one could argue that ambiguity may increase on whether the proposal will be accepted.

It was noted that there had been some comments by one head of NTIA that the deadline was not cast in stone

**d. Ability for RIR community to choose the IANA operator**

This is a possibility, not concrete plan. We have clearly stated the numbers community is satisfied with the current IANA operator (ICANN). However having this ability is important.

It was mentioned today that we are not prepared to change the operator unless there are issues with the service levels, but service level is not the only condition for termination

Conclusion: If the chairs hear any comments related to this they will update the CRISP team.

**e. IPR**

We consider the IETF Trust as an acceptable option. We are not saying this is the only option and are open to coordination with the three operational communities.

It is important it will be lightweight and to be based on existing mechanisms as much as possible.

**f. Gap between traditional negotiations and open community process**

We would expect gaps but strong support for open community process. This is based on NTIA's requirements.

**8. Next Meeting**

The exact date of the next call has not been set yet (doodle poll in progress).

Action: GV to help set the exact date of the next call and confirm meeting regularity (e.g., the first Tuesday and third Thursday of each month, etc.).

It was decided to continue this discussion on the mailing list.

**9. AOB**

It was decided to continue the meeting 15 minutes over the scheduled time.

IO suggested discussing the way forward as regards meetings with CWG Chairs.

Conclusion: IO and NN will go ahead and schedule a meeting with the CWG Chairs and update CRISP once the agenda is decided and report back after the meeting.

It was noted that it would be very good if someone could do a quick initial analysis of where do we think the CWG proposal is consistent / inconsistent with the CRISP proposal, as this analysis is needed before deciding how we proceed.

NN volunteered to work on this comparison, analysis and write up. MA and JS volunteered to help NN prepare this analysis and check on the mailing list for other volunteers.

The meeting closed at 14.21 UTC