

21st CRISP Team teleconference held on Thursday, June 11th 2015 (13:00 UTC)

CRISP members present:

AFRINIC

Mwendwa Kivuva, MK
Janvier Ngnoulayem, JN

APNIC

Izumi Okutani, IO

ARIN

Michael Abejuala, MA

LACNIC

Andres Piazza, AP

RIPE NCC

Paul Rendek

Apologies:

Nurani Nimpuno, NN

Germán Valdez, GV - NRO

Laureana Pavón, LP - Scribe

Observers:

Chris Buckridge

Pindar

Alan Durand

Ernest Byaruhanga, EB

1. Agenda Review
2. Actions Review
 - a. Minutes
 - b. Follow up to the from NRO EC-CRISP call
3. Confirm discussions status
 - a. Each RIR region
 - b. Global list
4. CRISP SLA Review

- a. Confirm the need of revision
 - b. Confirm next steps
5. Submission of Timelines to the ICG
- a. Clarifying the roles of CRISP/RIRs
 - b. Next Steps
6. CWG-Stewardship proposal 3rd version
- a. Observations
 - b. How to communicate questions/possible inconsistencies (if any)
7. ICANN53
- a. ICG Meeting
 - b. Face to face meetings
8. AOB
-

The meeting began at 13.08 UTC, with three CRISP team members present (MA, PR, IO). Three other CRISP Team members (MK, JN and AP) joined a few minutes later.

For future meetings, IO suggested trying to get some confirmation of attendance beforehand.

1. Agenda Review

No items were added to the proposed draft agenda.

2. Actions Review

a. Minutes

IO thanked GV for sending the minutes for the past 3 meetings, just minor suggestions, will send them to the list.

Action: The Secretariat to circulate the minutes for the NRO EC/ CRISP TEAM meeting.

b. Follow up to the from NRO EC-CRISP call

IO said she didn't know whether the NRO EC had expectations for CRISP Team to take a role in the review team and asked GV if he could provide an update on this.

GV said he didn't have any further information but that the NRO EC recognized this as an action and discussions were underway.

Conclusion: Will confirm this on the next NRO EC / CRISP face-to-face meeting.

IO asked whether the table of comments on the SLA would be published before the period for comments closed. GV replied that there was a preliminary table of comments that had already been published and circulated on the IANA XFER mailing list.

GV shared the following link:

https://www.nro.net/wp-content/uploads/Draft-SLA-comments_17May2015.pdf

3. Confirm discussions status

a. Each RIR region

IO asked for a status update from each region.

PR said most discussions were up on line and that all that was missing were the two last RIR meetings to be held (LACNIC and AFRINIC). He added that having those updates published as fast as possible was very important.

MK provided a brief update for the CRISP team and said the report would be published briefly.

IO thanked MK, noting that it would be very useful to share this report with the community and the NRO EC before the closing of the comments period, if possible.

Action: MK to make sure that the AFRINIC update is shared on the NRO website.

PR asked AP when LACNIC was planning to publish their report. No answer was heard.

b. Global list

IO noted that the RIRs were being responsive and that some of the RIR CEOs had been responding. She noted that, in her opinion, there was nothing that needed action from CRISP team.

4. CRISP SLA Review

a. Confirm the need of revision

IO gave a recap of the current status. CRISP has already shared a review on the SLA on the mailing list and are now receiving feedback (none so far on the SLA review).

PR said there had been some comments regarding factors for implementation that might affect the timeline.

IO made the following comment: If we're not clear and are unable to ensure the NTIA that we have sufficient fallback mechanism in case of changing IANA operator for whatever reason, the NTIA might not feel comfortable enough to complete the transition. It is important that we make this point very clear.

PR asked whether IO was suggesting that this should be included in the SLA. IO replied that they could suggest to the NRO EC that this actually be incorporated in the SLA.

Conclusion: Will continue this discussion on line due to the low number of participants on the call.

Action: PR will begin the discussion (suggestion to incorporate this in the SLA) on the CRISP mailing list today. His proposal will be circulated on the CRISP list for 24 hrs, for feedback, after which the comment will be sent to the NRO EC.

Action: GV to make a note for the EC saying that this discussion is taking place on the CRISP team (CRISP review of the SLA).

b. Confirm next steps

IO said she and NN and IO had posted their expectations on the global mailing list.

1. The revised version of the SLA incorporating community feedback will be published.
2. If there are any substantial changes likely to affect the numbers proposal, these should be shared with the community by the RIRs.

Action: IO will summarize next steps regarding CRISP SLA Review.

5. Submission of Timelines to the ICG

a. Clarifying the roles of CRISP/RIRs

IO clarified that they'd listed possible factors that might affect the timeline and that, beyond this point, they're not really the experts and it's the responsibility of the RIRs to see if all things are covered. She added that she and NN had had a discussion with Alan Barret and Paul Wilson as ICG members about their expectations and that they'd agreed that the RIRs would be responsible and come up with the timelines.

b. Next Steps

EB asked whether Alan Barret and Paul Wilson had suggested that the RIRs would be collectively communicating the timeline or whether each RIR would do so separately.

IO replied that the submission to the ICG would be a joint timeline, coordinated by the 5 RIRs.

PR said he knew the RIRs were preparing a report on IPR issues and asked where those would be located. IO noted they wanted to incorporate this in the implementation timeline, so it would be good to include it in the joint RIR timeline.

PR asked who had ownership of this. IO replied that the RIRs had said they would be responsible for listing the implementation factors and timeline.

Conclusion: This is now on the RIRs, Paul Wilson or Alan Barret will submit to the ICG when the timelines are ready.

6. CWG-Stewardship proposal 3rd version

a. Observations

IO noted the 3rd version had not been officially announced, just circulated on the mailing list. She said

they'd already submitted their comment to the CWG, but she wanted to know if there was anything they'd like to bring up with the CWG in Buenos Aires.

IO then summarized CRISP's observations to the CWG.

Way forward: IO will share the link quoting the parts of the CWG-Stewardship proposal that are relevant and call for comments from CRISP Team. They can then compile the observations so that Paul Wilson can raise them at the face-to-face meeting in Bs As.

MA offered to help IO in analyzing consistency with regard to IPR.

b. How to communicate questions/possible inconsistencies (if any)

IO suggested that, once they identify inconsistencies, the best way is to communicate their observations to the EC. Then Paul Wilson or Alan Barrett could share them with the ICG.

All agreed.

7. ICANN53

a. ICG Meeting

b. Face to face meetings

Actions:

- GV to coordinate the time for the CRISP team meeting with the members who will be in Buenos Aires.
- IO to circulate a list of meetings relevant to the CRISP team during ICANN Buenos Aires.

8. AOB

AP provided an update from the LACNIC meeting on the discussions on the SLA (the discussion of the details of the SLA does not seem to be of interest to the LACNIC community; perhaps they should provide a report saying this).

PR said it would be useful to publish something just to say there had been no objections.

The meeting closed at 14.10 UTC.