20th CRISP Team teleconference held on Thursday, May 27th 2015 (13:00 UTC)

**CRISP members present:**

**AFRINIC**

Janvier Ngnoulayem, JN

**APNIC**

Izumi Okutani, IO

**ARIN**

Bill Woodcock

John Sweeting

**LACNIC**

Andres Piazza, AP

Esteban Lescano

**RIPE NCC**

Andrei Robachevsky

Nurani Nimpuno

GV - Apologies

LP - Scribe

----

1. Agenda Review

2. Actions Review

a. Notes from the last meeting

b. Submission of comment to the CWG proposal

3. Community discussions

a. RIPE, LACNIC meetings

b. Others regions

c. Global list

d. Reconfirm the CRISP role in SLA discussions

4. SLA Review as the CRISP Team

a. Feedback to the draft

b. Confirm steps and time-line before submission

5. Follow up on CWG proposal

a. Analysis of SLA exchange with ICANN/PTI

b. Coordination on IPR

6. Agenda for NRO EC-CRISP meeting

7. Next Meeting

8. AOB

----

The meeting began at 13.04 UTC

**1. Agenda Review**

**2. Actions Review**

**a. Notes from the last meeting**

The Secretariat is working on these notes.

**b. Submission of comment to the CWG proposal**

DONE. Will follow up on further actions as needed.

**3. Community discussions**

**a. RIPE, LACNIC meetings**

Will be shared on NRO website, especially aspects relating to the SLA.

**b. Others regions**

LACNIC board passed a resolution about the CRISP process similar to AFRINIC and RIPE NCC.

**c. Global list**

There has been a lot of discussion; AR has incorporated the key feedback on the SLA.

There was a question from Vint Cerf about whether there is capability within the NRO or the collective RIRs to perform the functions now provided by the IANA function within ICANN.

This will be covered at the meeting with the NRO EC this Friday.

**d. Reconfirm the CRISP role in SLA discussions**

IO reconfirmed CRISP team’s role in SLA discussions:

- CRISP will not be evaluating individual comments, but will rather incorporate those considered relevant in terms of consistency with the numbers proposal and then submit them to the NRO EC.

- NRO EC agreed that they will post a table on the mailing list so everyone can confirm how their comments have been considered.

- After Friday, will communicate this to the IANA XFER mailing list.

**4. SLA Review as the CRISP Team**

**a. Feedback to the draft**

AR gave a brief summary of his analysis, which he had sent earlier to the CRISP mailing list.

He also described the approach he had used when preparing the review.

It was established that some parts might need further clarification (what happens if only the numbers need to change operator, scope of coordination). It was noted that the numbers and protocols are very clear that a structure that allows different operators is mandatory.

The fact that the SLA includes an automatic renewal clause which was included without CRISP input was brought up.

As a member of the legal team, MA explained both sides of the issue: it’s an automatic renewal (if everyone is happy, it will renew), but there is also the opportunity to terminate the contract and chose not to renew. The legal team felt it was consistent with the numbers principles,

Discussion on Article 10.1 continued, and was later summarized by IO as follows:

At this stage, most CRISP Team members at the call supported that Article 10.1 is consistent with the numbers proposal, but we still need to continue discussions on this mailing list to:

- Confirm if there are further points to be made on the position that it is not consistent with the proposal

- Seek if there are points that the CRISP Team members from both positions consider as agreeable

We are going to share the review of the SLA by the CRISP Team on 3rd June to the global mailing list, so let's continue the discussions on the CRISP Team mailing list and seek for a position we can come up as the CRISP Team.

Way forward:

CRISP will continue the discussions on the CRISP mailing list and make sure that both sides of the argument are heard. If CRISP Team can reach an agreement, this will be reflected it in our comments to the global community; if not, we will share points from both sides of the argument on the global list and hear what the community says.

**b. Confirm steps and timeline before submission**

After a brief discussion, the following timeline was agreed:

Tue 2nd June Close comments from the CRISP Team on the SLA1.0 review

Wed 3rd June Share the CRISP review on the IANAXFER list and request comments

Tue 9th June Close comments on the global list

Thu 11th June Discuss handling of comments at the 21st CRISP call (in addition to ML discussions)

Fri 12th June Finalize the CRISP comment by UTC13:00, submission by UTC15:00

Sun 14th June Deadline of the submission (UTC23:59)

Action: IO to share this timeline on the CRISP mailing list.

**5. Follow up on CWG proposal**

**a. Analysis of SLA exchange with ICANN/PTI**

CRISP would the RIRs to make this analysis, will suggest this to the NRO EC (include this as an agenda item for the meeting with the NRO EC).

**b. Coordination on IPR**

IO and NN would like to go back to the IETF and discuss with them this issue. IETF has already expressed their willingness to accept IPR to the IETF Trust. We’d also like to discuss with the names chars.

Next steps: Summon a call with the IETF, then maybe a joint meeting between the chairs of the three operational communities or a meeting with the names chairs to follow up on IPR.

**6. Agenda for NRO EC-CRISP meeting**

Will confirm the agenda online. IO will circulate a draft agenda on the mailing list for comments.

**7. Next Meeting**

Thursday 11th June.

**8. AOB**

BW provided an update from the congressional hearings.

The meeting ended at 14.20 UTC