

## **CRISP 5<sup>th</sup> Teleconference held on Monday, December 22nd 2014 (13:00 UTC)**

### **CRISP Members present**

#### **AFRINIC**

Alan Barrett – AB

Mwendwa Kivuva- MK

Ernest Byaruhanga- EB

#### **APNIC**

Izumi Okutani- IO

#### **ARIN**

John Sweeting – JS

Michael Abejuala- MA

#### **LACNIC**

Esteban Lescano EL

Andrés Piazza- AP

#### **RIPE NCC**

Nurani Nimpuno- NN

Andrei Robachevsky- AR

Paul Rendek- PR

Draft Agenda for CRISP 5<sup>th</sup> Teleconference

### **1. Agenda Review**

### **2. Actions Review**

- a. Minutes from the last meeting
- b. Draft of edited version based on the order of questions by RFP (Alan, Michael, Izumi)

### **3. Confirming comments for far**

- a. On [ianaxfer@nro.net](mailto:ianaxfer@nro.net)
- b. From regional lists

### **4. Update on editorial version**

- a. Draft by Alan, Michael and Izumi
- b. Next steps for this draft

### **5. How we work to incorporate comments**

- a. Keeping records of new issue & our consideration status
- b. How we communicate to comments on the global ML
- c. Version control and avoiding confusion with the community
- d. Common Understanding

### **6. AOB**

IO: Review the agenda presented.

### **2. Actions review**

- a. Minutes from the last meeting

IO Confirmed the status of minutes from 4th Teleconference.

GV apologized and underlined that he will send the meeting notes in the next 12 hours.

IO Thanked German for all the effort and remarked on tracking all the key points from the meeting, summarized the information of the 4th Teleconference and asked for any questions or comments.

- No comments-

b. Draft of edited version based on the order of questions by RFP

IO Highlighted that the basic idea was not to change the content from the proposal but make sure that we are clearly answering all the questions from the RFP and asked AB and MA to share comments of the new editing

AB: Pointed out some editing changes: (AB covered editing for Sections V and VI)

**Section 5** was added a new paragraph remarking that we are not proposing any new organization except from the Review Committee.

**Section 6** were made several changes in order to reorganize the parts (headings, paragraphs order) He remarked on the two RIRs internal processes missing (ARIN and LACNIC).

AR asked for a time period to review all this information published.

IO agreed and confirmed that all the CRISP members have 24 hours to review and give feedback about all these editing changes.

MA clarified that the intention of this task was just to clarify what was already written in the document.

(MA covered editing for Sections III and IV)

**Section 3** MA added a paragraph about changes: This proposal is replacing the NTIA as the contract in party with the IANA functions operator with the 5 RIRs and also changed some paragraphs order.

He also outlined that they were not proposing new technical or operational methods but highlighted the Review Committee as a tool to assist the NRO in evaluating performance.

AR asked if the changes explained before were based on the community feedback or if we were running this in parallel with community

IO explained that we were working on for editorial improvements, not incorporating feedback from the community. This edited version will be posted on the NRO website clarifying that these are just editorial changes with no changes in contents and then we will continue with the community feedback.

AB added that the motivation of these changes were to respond in the same order as the RFP requested.

IO moved on to explain the editing she covered.

IO pointed out that she didn't add any new information but she changed the order of the paragraphs. (IO covered editing for Sections I and II)

**Section 1.** IO described that there were no IANA services related to the Internet Number Resources Registries were affected by NTIA Stewardship transition as well as the Reverse DNS.

**Section 2.** IO changed NTIA instead of ICANN in one specific paragraph and asked the others members to review that changed.

AB underlined that in section 1 it says in what registries were involved in providing our services and pointed out that he believes that the answer is **the IANA registries** for IPv4, IPv6 and AS numbers.

IO agreed to incorporate the suggestion by AB.

IO confirmed that there were 24 hours to review all changes suggested. (Until December 23rd) in addition 12 hours window to incorporate that feedback. IO encouraged to provide feedback as soon as possible.

### **3. Confirming comments for far**

#### **a. On ianaxfer@nro.net**

IO pointed out some comments concerns published on the global mailing list such as intellectual property Rights.

AR pointed out that there was the same discussion in the IETF proposal, as well as the IANA.org. (Trademarks)

IO Asked AR to briefly summarize all those identified issues discuss at the IETF proposal.

AB Commented that all the rights to the IANA trade mark, domain name, databases, and related intellectual property rights, should be associated with the IANA function, not with ICANN. He suggested that we should highlight this issue but leave the details up to legal staff involved with drafting contracts..

MA Supported it and underlined that this issue should be consider but can be handled in the specific contractual provisions in the contemplated agreement.

IO requested AR to send summary of this to the CRISP Team mailing list, so members who are not at the call can give feedback on IPR issue, with summary of IETF's considerations. AR agreed.

IO proposed to capture the different issues and comment published on the mailing list in order to track what is happening and asked for volunteers.

JS and MK Volunteered.

AR Explained that it's really important to do so in order to communicate the changes that we are introducing in the new version of the proposal. (NN, PR agreed)

#### **b. Regional list**

MK confirmed that there is no feedback from the AFRINIC list

IO confirmed there is no feedback from the APNIC and added that there will be a WebEx teleconference in order to provide a space to give comments

JS confirmed there is no feedback from the ARIN list

AP confirmed there is no feedback from the LACNIC list

AR confirmed that there is no feedback from the RIPE list and added that they are encouraging the community to provide feedback.

## **5. How we work to incorporate comments**

### **b. How we communicate to comments on the global ML**

IO suggested defining a consolidated reply after confirmation within the team, she will clarified this in the list.

### **c. Version control and avoiding confusion with the community**

IO pointed out that old versions posted can cause confusion on the community.

NN agreed to IO

AB Agreed and asked to separate and reorganize the CRISP Team webpage and separate the meetings website and the documents (internal or external)

NN +1 the website is there for the community to get a clear picture of what is happening and to help them give input.

IO Asked GV to help them and update the website.

AR suggested to keep version control of proposal drafts, as in the IETF.

AR Pointed out this link <https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-ianaplan-icg-response>

IO agreed and no objections observed.

GV accepted to do those changes and explained that he already updated <https://www.nro.net/nro-and-internet-governance/iana-oversight/consolidated-rir-iana-stewardship-proposal-team-crisp-team>

### **d. Common Understanding**

IO explained that she received feedback from AP and MK that agreed.

MK pointed out to share all the content from the crisp mailing list with all the respective communities.

IO suggested waiting 24 hours in order to receive feedback from all the CRISP Team Members

Next call: Monday December 29th at 13 UTC

