CRISP Teleconference held on Wednesday, January 14th 2015(13:00 UTC)
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Michael Abejuela, MA

John Sweeting, JS

Bill  Woodcock, BW
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**Agenda**

1. Agenda Review

2. Actions Review

a. Minutes

b. NRO CRISP Website improvement

3. Confirm texts to be incorporated

a. Suggested edits

b. Consulting the community about SLA

c. Review Committee selection

d. Contract Fee

e. Move description of RIRs, NRO, NRO EC

f. reconfirm numbering scheme

g. II.B.3.i. NTIA

h. IIIA3 SLA

i. I.D.

j. VI. description of APNIC region process

4. What to revert back

5.Agree on a common term

a. Internet number community

b. the IANA Number Services Operator

c. singular/plural

6. Confirm Timeline

7. Next Meeting

8. AOB

---

**1. Agenda Review**

IO reviewed  the  proposed  agenda.  No  agenda  items  were  added.

**2. Actions Review**

**a. Minutes**

IO asked to the NRO Secretariat to give an update on the minutes of the past meetings.

Laureana( NRO Secretariat): I will send monday´s minutes today and tuesday´s meeting tomorrow.

**b. NRO CRISP Website improvement**

IO: NRO Secretariat has done some changes at the NRO website (definition of CRISP team mailing list and the PDF of some old discussion) and asked the NRO Secretariat if they have something to add.

Laureana(NRO Secretariat): Nothing to add at this point.

**3. Confirm texts to be incorporated**

**b. Consulting the community about SLA**

**c. Review Committee selection**

**d. Contract Fee**

IO: I have send a compilation of the text suggested on the mailing list and requested for feedback. I see that there is a general agreement on 3.b/3.c./ 3.d , are there any comments at this point?

- No comments-

IO: So there is an agreement on these 3 points.

**e. Move description of RIRs, NRO, NRO EC to section 1**

IO: This aspect is based on Alan´s suggestion. Unless I hear any comments, let´s adopt this suggestion.

- No comments-

IO: There is another agreement on this point.

**f. reconfirm numbering scheme**

IO: In order to be consistent, do we want to use the roman numbering system or the arabic one(supported by BW)? (asked the CRISP Team)

CN: It might generate problems, and it´s a lot of work. I suggest to be focus on the big issues.

AB(via chat): I don't mind. I personally prefer 1.2.3, but I am OK with I.A.iii

JS (via chat): I think it might confuse the community

AR (via chat): I agree with CN.

JS (via chat): Change in midstream is probably not wise especially so close to end. Let´s use the previous scheme because it´s too late, so I would say no change.

AR: Agrees with JS.

PR: I am with John on this one. It´s important that the ICG is also familiar with it.

IO: As all the work has done based on the roman numbering system and the community is used to it, let´s continue with it. I think there is consensus on this!

AB (via chat): ok. We need to ask bill to go back to the I.B.3 style.

**g. II.B.3.i. NTIA**

IO: This is AR suggestion. AR do you want to add anything else from your suggestion?

AR: I think that NTIA exercises the oversight role through the IANA functions contract and that is the change we are proposing. At the same time I am equally not sure that currently the RIRs have any oversight role in this regard.

IO: Thank you Andrei. I support this suggestion too, so if there are no other comments, let´s go with this suggestion.

AP(via chat): I also support AR.

PR (via chat): I agree

NN (via chat): I have already supported on the list.

AB (via chat): I have supported on mailing list.

**h. IIIA3 SLA**

IO: The suggestion is from AR and consists in moving paragraphe from 3a into 3.a.III. Unless there are other comments let´s incorporate it in our draft.

- No comments-

**i. 1.D.**

AR: I suggested to include in this section some statements that have dissappeared with the editing.

IO: If there are no comments, let´s incorporate AR suggestion to 1D.

AB (via chat): Yes I support

PR (via chat): I supported it.

JS (via chat): I agree

NN (via chat): I agree

MA (via chat) : Acknowledged and agree

**j. VI. description of APNIC region process**

IO: This suggestion is based in adding the description of APNIC region process to be consistent with others. I haven´t heard anything from Dr. Govind so let´s incorporate it. Thank you MK for suggesting this change. I think we have covered all the major suggestions and comments from the CRISP team members.

**4. What to revert back**

IO: I think that has been an agreement in revert back these three points:

1) III.A.2.- RIR communities --> Internet community (suggested by Paul Wilson)

2) the IANA --> the IANA operator (and substitute with agreed common phrase)

3) In I.D restore the statement that the IANA Number Registries are generally accessed via references based on the IANA.ORG domain name.

IO: We have already agreed on this point last point.

AB(via chat): IANA Service Operator we mean the Organization … the operator useful for the RIR. We should agree which of the sense

NN (via chat): Alan, thanks for that point. I agree. The three senses are different and should be considered individually!

MA (via chat): very clear delineation Alan, thanks and helpful in editing

AR: Distinguish between IANA function operator and when it´s IANA Number Service Operator.

AB (via chat): RIR community, singular not plural.

AB: Underlined the different Concepts: IANA (as a concept), IANA Operator (as the organization which provides all the IANA functions) and the IANA services Operator ( as the operator that provides the functions that are useful to the RIR´s ). So we should decide which of the 3 senses should be mentioned.

IO: It´s important to decide which os these points should be used and how.

AB: I would like to suggest sth at point 3 but I belive we should finish this point first so NN can give her comment.

Nurani: I suggest to change a sentence in 2B2 -Instead of no impact—will be no significant impact.

Izumi: Summarizes NN suggestion. Let´s incorporate it!

AR (via chat): I agree

AB (via chat): I support Nurani's suggestion as on the mailing list.

IO: So let´s go to AB.

-----Back to agenda item 3-------

**3.** **Confirm texts to be incorporated**

AB: Thank you. Back to agenda item number 3, I would like to suggest: in section 4a- no changes – to no significant changes.

NN (via chat): I agree

AR (via chat): I support AB suggestion

JS(via chat): I agree

NN: I have already supported Alan's comment on the list

IO: I supported too. Summarizes AB idea. I think should incorporate it unless there are any comments to add.

PR: I did support, but I just want to make sure that we are all aware. We want to be careful, we probably want to keep as much continuity as we can and not expecting any surprises or any new structures or any kind of new development. I am confortable with this and I could see that there will come these small operational changes. I just want to make sure that we are not over emphasizing.

IO: Thank you PR, I agree as well.

NN (via chat): "there are no significant changes to existing service levels or reporting that are being proposed, only a change in contracting party to align with the delegated policy authority." - to me this is pretty clear (This was AB´s proposed text)

IO: We have an agreement to incorporate AB´s text. Are we agree with agenda item 3 and 4?

- No comments-

**5. Agree on a common term**

Internet number community

- IANA functions operator" as a general term, and "IANA Numbering Services Operator" as more specific term

- date

- singular/plural (RIR community/RIR communities, Internet number community/ Internet numbers community)

1. **Internet number community**

IO: I think it was NN suggestion. Are we agree to use this word?

AB: Iam not sure to say Internet number community, I will be happier to say RIR Community in singular not in plural.

NN: I believe that singular and plural have different meanings. Depends on what we talk about- Global should be in singular. Iam confortable to change Internet numbers Community to RIR community in that case we need to explain that.

IO: We need to check the context and explain why we use RIR Community. It might be better to leave Internet number Community instead of RIR Community.

AB(via chat): Plural RIR communities sometimes makes sense, but singular probably more often.

PR (via chat):I have a feeling that the ICG has used Internet Number Community, that is where I have seen it but I am on the fence so I want to hear others.

AB (via chat): ok to use the ICG's term

BW (via chat): Yes, be consistent, but ideally define clearly up at the top.

JS (via chat): I support IO, we need to check the context always

MA (via chat): Yes I think it is based on the context

PR (via chat): I agree with Michael

NN (via chat): Thanks Izumi. That was what I was trying to say. It's context based.

AB: So, summarizing it will depend on context (to use Internet Number or Numbers Community and sometime we will use RIR Community or Communities)

NN: We might want to put an explanation to distinguish the different concepts.

IO: I think it´s important to make sure that we don´t confuse people or give them the impression that we talk about different communities.

BW (via chat): I wouldn't go back and forth between "community" and "communities." I worked to resolve that by referring to the regions of the RIR community.

BW (via chat):Yes, don't confuse people. Yes, use one uniform term.

IO: We might use Internet number community based on the existing text. Are we agree?

AB (via chat): ok. then we need a definition that explains that the RIRs are part of the Internet number[s] community.

BW (via chat): Originating with different authors. The editorial process is, in large part, about hammering out these ambiguities which is admittedly a compromise for everyone involved.

NN (via chat): Alan- that was what I was trying to say. A minor addition at the start of the doc, explaning this.

AB (via chat): Document title becomes "Proposal from the Internet number community to the ICG RFP on the IANA Transition" (or something like that)

Paul: We should define and use one concept so our audience doesn´t get confused. As this document is going to ICG and there are a lot of people not familiar with “RIR community” concept we should make it easier. If we want to interchange both concepts there need to be an definition in the front so it will be clear to the audience.

NN: thank you PR and AB, that is what I wanted to say befote!… Let´s define it so it´s clear!

BW (via chat): "Internet number community" is probably better than "RIR community" but it's not as obviously a "proper noun." This is why lawyers capitalize defined terms, to make it explicit that the phrase is a keyword, rather that subject to interpretation in each context.

PR (via chat): Yes, I trust the person with the pen on this.

BW (via chat):We might be able to solve that by saying "Internet Number Community" after explicitly defining that up top.

JS (via chat): I support PR

NN(via chat): I support PR

IO: Iam happy with this, so let´s leave it to MA and BW. Is that ok with you two?

MA (via chat): I agree

BW(via chat): agree

**b. IANA functions operator" as a general term, and "IANA Numbering Services Operator" as more specific term**

IO: Is everybody agree with this suggestion?

AB (via chat): I have supported on mailing list

AR(via chat): I support

JS (via chat): I support

NN (via chat): I have supported on mailing list

IO: So we can move to another item.

1. **date**

IO: I think there was another comment on how we express date? So unless sb has issues with the current draft and feel that we have to change, we can leave it to whoever has the pen.

NN (via chat): I have no strong position on date format, as long as we are consistent. Happy to trust whoever has the pen.

BW (via chat): Either is fine. FOrmer is more European, latter more North American.

AB (via chat): consistency is most important

AR (via chat): whatever, as long as we meet the deadline ;)

JS (via chat): consistency matters

PR(via chat): let it to the pen, but yes consistent

MM(via chat): in reviewing, will ensure consistency on this

1. **Singular/Plural**

IO: So let´s define if it´s singular or plural :Internet Number/s Community and RIR Community/Communities. As we have seen before people prefers singular unless there is an specific place where we have to explain about our different RIR´s and we will use Internet number Community as ICG. Is that ok?

BW(via chat):Singular.

PR(via chat):agree with Bill

JS (via chat):singular

BW(via chat): We're being asked to respond as a singluar community.

Yes, I'm saying that we're responding to an RFP, and the RFP is asking us to respond as a singular, not as a bunch of separate communities.

PR(via chat):agree Bill

AB(via chat): agree with Bill

IO: Let´s go with singular then when referring to RIR Community.

NN (via chat): But I thought Izumi's second question was number vs numbers community?

BW (via chat): Yes, that was also a separate question, and I'd argue in favor of singular there too.

JS: I want to point out that BW send an email with several points that he needs to clarify.

AB: We have talked about creating a new section of definitions somewhere. One option could be to invent a new section or another could be to put all definitions at the beginning of 1b.

BW (via chat):Start with definition of the customer, then proceed to other useful definitions. Yeah, I like Alan's suggestion.

IO: I agree agreement on Alan suggestion. So unless there is any comment, let´s incorporate it!

AB (via chat); support all those

NN (via chat): I support

JS (via chat): I support

PR (via chat): I agree too

IO: Reviewing all the changes suggested:

**I.B.** "A description of the customer" not-for-profit membership-based organizations (as description of RIRs) has been suggested by Alan but wil be replace by Andrei's text? [needs to confirm with Alan]

---

**II. B.1.** would not have significant impact --> no impact

---

**II.B.3.i.** NTIA (suggested by Andrei) While the IANA functions operator escalation and reporting mechanisms are public in nature, the NTIA has an oversight role in the provision of the services through the contract with ICANN. The ultimate consequence of failing to meet the performance standards or reporting requirements is understood to be a decision by the contracting party (the NTIA) to terminate or not renew the IANA functions agreement with the current contractor (ICANN).

---

**III.A** (suggested by Andrei) (1) ICANN to continue as the IANA functions operator for the IANA Numbering Services, further referred to as the “IANA Numbering Services Operator”; (Andrei's suggetion and reflects Alan's feeedback)

IO: If there are no comments related to this, let´s incorporate it.

AB (via chat); support all those

NN (via chat): I support

JS (via chat): I support

PR (via chat): I agree too

---

**III. A.2.** (Paul's suggestion reflecting Alan's edit) "It is the preference of the RIR communities that all relevant parties acknowledge agrees to these expectations as part of the transition." make this the last sentence from the paragraph above.

AB(via chat):"agrees to these expectations"

AB(via chat): change facts -> expectations

NN(via chat): This was in response to PW's comment about the paragraph not being clear. In my view, Alan's suggestion makes it clear. Have supported Alan's suggestion on the list.

CN(via chat): I agree

PR(via chat): We supported on the list

---

**III.A.3.** Service Level Agreement with the IANA Numbering Services Operator (suggested by Andrei) (First paragraph to move from III.A.1) A decision by the NTIA to discontinue its stewardship of the IANA functions, and therefore its contractual relationship with the IANA functions operator, would not have any significant impact on the continuity of IANA Numbering Services currently provided by ICANN. However, it would remove a significant element of oversight from the current system. The Internet numbering community proposes that a new contract be established between the IANA Numbering Services Operator and the five RIRs. The following is a proposal to replace the current NTIA IANA agreement with a new contract that more directly reflects and enforces the IANA functions operator's accountability to the open, bottom-up numbers community. [...]

---

**IV.A** no change --> no significant change (for the second part which describes service level and its review)

IO: We have already talked about this. If there is any other point that you will like to raise please do it now. As there are no comment BW will talk to clarify his questions.

- BW Questions-

BW: So I need to clarify the following aspects:

* RIR Community/ Internet number Community
* Numbering Services Language
* Numbering

AB: We should explain this again to make it clear.

NN: I have to requests, I want to clarify who is holding the pen; BW or MA

IO: Do we want to have a single pen? (She asked BW and MA what Works better for both of them). Maybe we could decide it later with the timeline.

MA(via chat): I can work either way with what the group decides and will make sure to be on the call tomorrow.

BW: So let´s see define these aspects:

1. **RIR Community/ Internet number Community**

AB(via chat):put both terms in the definitions, mention that they may be used interchangeably

CN (via chat):I thought we agreed earlier that the preference is to use Internet number community

IO: We decided to use Internet number Community unless there is an specific part where we should write RIR Community.

1. **Numbering Services Language**

AB (via chat):"IANA functions [operator]" as generic, and "IANA number services [operator]" when it's specific to numbers

AB(via chat):we agreed on this earlier in the call

IO(via chat): Agrees with AB

1. **TOC or not**

AB (via chat): yes, whacky numbers.

CN(via chat): Yes - "wacky" numbering

AB (via chat):with TOC

CN (via chat): Yes to TOC

PR(via chat): Yes TOC

NN (via chat): ToC

JS(via chat):TOC yes

1. **Cover Letter or not?**

BW:Cover letter? I would suggest that someone draft one. Doesn't need to be more than a paragraph, or say anything substantive.

CN (via chat): That can come from the Chair

PR(via chat):Yes, that is enough - simple cover letter

AB (via chat): ok to add a cover letter

NN(via chat): Agreed - chair

CN(via chat): Chair can draft

PR(via chat):from Chair

JS(via chat):cover letter from Izumi

IO(via chat):I can do that

1. **Is the editor charged with removing duplicative text?**

BW: (Askes the rest of the team) That is, if the same thing is being said twice, should the two instances be consolidated? If there are words in one place, and words elsewhere that have the same meaning, should one instance be removed in favor of the other? Is the editor charged with removing text that no longer has a clear meaning, refers to things no longer present, or is otherwise meaningless or unintelligible to a lay reader?

NN: Iam confortable with editorial changes by whoever holds the pen, I think that person can make a decision.

AP(via chat):I like the suggestion made by Bill

AB(via chat):Before removing, go back to the record to see why it was added

NN(via chat): Thanks Alan

PR(via chat): yes, but I must reiterate Craig, a bit of mess is better than noses out of joint

AB(via chat):or just keep detailed notes and confirm afterwards

JS(via chat):Unless very clear that it is duplicative and not needed then leave it

IO(via chat): I agree with CN and PR. Go for safe than try to go for perfect editing.

6**. Who holds the pen? MA or BW?**

BW: One person has to hold the pen.

MA: As Iam is in a more reasonable time-zone right now, I could incorporate all the changes that have been agreed on this call and then pass it to BW to do all the clean up changes and then send back to me so I can work with IO and make sure we have all ready. After the call tomorrow we could incorporate all the changes as well.

NN(via chat): Fantastic. Thanks! Much appreciated both Bill and Michael!

PR(via chat):yes, I like this path

BW(via chat): So Iam happy to produce a redline. In terms of the schedule I suggest that MA takes the next 3 and ½ hours (10pm my time)and I take 6 hours and then wherever you need until the next call. Is that reasonable?

MA: I can do it within 4 hours, so 10.30 my time.

PR: Iam so happy that you are both agree and I am giving you my vote.

CN: I would prefer to have a redline version to see what you both have done. It would be easier to track what each of you has done.

IO(via chat): same for me Craig

NN: It´s really important that we show in this document that we have listened the community so it´s important that we all see the changes and keeps the track of where we are.

PR(via chat): yeah, Nurani is right, but I give my vote to Bill to be wise! and he is, so I think he understands that

BW(via chat):Yeah, it's not an all-or-nothing thing, it's a question of which end of a spectrum of choices we tend toward.

BW: Could you say from 1-10 (1conservative)to make editing changes?

PR (via chat):4-5

CN(via chat):3

AB(via chat):4

JS(via chat):4-5

IO(via chat):3-4

NN(via chat): 3 - although I'm reluctant to give a number. It's a matter of using good judgement

MA (via chat): Bill and I can be conservative and use our best judgment on editing. Thank you for everyone's feedback

1. **Confirm Timeline**

IO: Asked for volunteers fixed inconsistences in IPR.

AB: I can volunteer. I can do it in 3 hours from now!

BW (via chat): Is someone going to try to summarize the edits to be applied, and hand that off to Michael?

MA(via chat): Izumi and I have worked together on listing the changes agreed upon so Izumi, will we do the same on this as well I assume?

AB(via chat): I can be quicker than 3 hours

MA (via chat): excellent, I can incorporate Alan's text then

BW(via chat): The problem is race condition in edits.

NN(via chat):I agree. Happy to trust Alan's text and for it to go straight in.

IO: I would like to know whether to include Bill suggested edits in step 3 or 5?

PR (via chat): I am not expecting a round of feedback unless I see something earth shattering

MA : I suggest that Bill wouldn´t have to wait for feedback.

NN(via chat):Good suggestion. Agree! (Bill shouldn't wait for confirmation before continuing)

IO: BW and MA how much time do you think you will need in terms of UTC?

AB: I have to propose sth on agenda item 3. I would like to changing the title of the document : From the Internet Numbers community instead of the RIR Community. I would like to add an abstract as well and explain what the proposal is about.

BW(via chat):yes to alan

NN(via chat): Yup. it's reasonable

BW(via chat): tite, abstract

AB (via chat): I sent text in the mailing list

PR(via chat): fine with me

IO: So let´s confirm the draft timeline.

MA(via chat):I anticipate being able to make 19:00 UTC for my version to then go to Bill and then 0:00 UTC for handback to me and Izumi.

BW(via chat): Michael to me at 19:00, me to Michael at 0:00...

BW(via chat);Right.

MA(via chat): Step 4, deadline of UTC 6:00

MA (via chat):Final draft with any last minute edits UTC 10:00 to CRISP team before call

BW(via chat):Okay, so I'm sending to Michael and Michael posts to the list, or do I post to the list at 0:00?

CN(via chat): Bill - see tap "Draft timeline" on Webex

BW(via chat): Who has pen on any last-minute changes at that point, 6:00?

MA(via chat): I can incorporate any last minute changes at that point

-----Draft timeline --------------

**1. Volunteers to send text suggestions**

- Andrei: Dispute resolution (Done)

- Izumi : Review Committee (Done)

Contract Fee (Done)

- Alan: Move description of RIRs, NRO, NRO EC to Section I.A (Done)

- Alan : Fixing inconsistencies in IPR [to be circulated]

**2. Confirmation on text suggestions in 1**.

Discuss at 13th call UTC13:00 14th Jan. [Fix at UTC15:00 14th Jan:Completed] **3. Michael to share the update proposal ver. 3.1**

- Incorporating feedback on the proposal version shared after the 12th call ver.3.0

- Reflect text suggestions confirmed in Step 2.

- Bill's edits

- Izumi will also share the draft announcement & issues list [UTC0:00 15th Jan] **4. Comments from CRISP Team for ver.3.1** - CRISP Team members to give comments before: (including the draft announcement) [UTC6:00 15th Jan] **5. Michael to share the update proposal ver. 3.2**

- Reflect feedback in step 4.

- Izumi will also share the updated announcement & issues list [UTC10:00 15th Jan] 6. Final comments from CRISP Team for the draft shared in Step 5 (ver.3.2) - including the draft announcement & issues list [Before UTC13:00 15th Jan]

**7. Final confirmation for ver.3.3**

- Discuss at 14th Call at UTC13:00 15th Jan for outstanding issues

8. **Michael to share the update proposal ver.3.3** [Before UTC16:00 15th Jan]

9. **Fix the proposal to be submitted to the ICG** (ver.3.4)

- If no further comments [until 17:30], fix the proposal

10. **Website preparation and reflect URLs in announcement**

- NRO Secretariat to share the URLs (for the announcement)[Before UTC18:00 ] 15th Jan

11**. Submission to the ICG & announcement**

a. Sent to ["icg-proposal@icann.org"](mailto:icg-proposal@icann.org) from Izumi [at UTC18:30 15th Jan]

b. Make announcement to the IANAXFER list [Around UTC18:30 15th Jan] # This gives us buffer in case of unexpected issues before 23:59

-----

**7. Next Meeting**

IO: Tomorrow 15th January, at 13.00 UTC

**8. AOB**