

CRISP teleconference held on Tuesday, December 9th 2014 (13:00 UTC)

Draft Agenda for CRISP teleconference 1

1. Working method (changes to initial charter)
 - Chair, Vice-Chair of the CRISP team
 - ianaxfer@nro.net mailing list
 - Teleconferences
 - Quorum
 - Timeline for teleconferences
 - Decision-making mechanism
 - Appeals process
 - Drafting tools
2. Scope of activity
3. Producing an RFP
 - Survey of current drafting activity
 - ARIN, RIPE
 - Other communities (IETF, CWG)
 - Process for making progress
 - Divide into sections, sub-teams
 - Existing arrangements, IANA stewardship process description
 - Proposed arrangements
 - Timeline for drafting

=====

CRISP Members present during roll call:

AFRINIC

Alan P. Barrett, AB

Mwendwa Kivuva, MK

Ernest Byaruhanga, EB (Appointed RIR staff) – Was not on the call during roll call

APNIC

Dr Govind, DG

Izumi Okutani, IO

Craig Ng, CN (Appointed RIR staff)

ARIN

Bill Woodcock, BW

John Sweeting, JS

Michael Abejuala, MA (Appointed RIR staff)

LACNIC

Esteban Lescano, EL

Nico Scheper, NS

Andres Piazza AP (Appointed RIR staff) - Was not on the call during roll call

RIPE NCC

Nurani Nimpuno, NN

Andrei Robachevsky, AR

Paul Rendek, PR (Appointed RIR staff)

EB and AP joined the teleconference after the roll call.

German Valdez (GV) explained that the agenda was proposed by PR. No items were added to the agenda at this time.

Chair, Vice-Chair of the CRISP team:

GV read the names nominated for CRISP chair and vice chair through the mailing list: JS (ARIN), EL (LACNIC), AB (AFRINIC), and IO (APNIC). All candidates accepted their nominations.

AR proposed a roll call vote, NN and NS supported this motion, no objections were heard so GV proceeded to conduct the roll call in order to record the votes.

The results were

IO: 5 votes

AB: 2 votes

EL: 1 vote

Abstentions: 2

GV moved to accept IO as a chair and AB as vice chair of the CRISP team. No opposition was heard and IO and AB were congratulated.

GV gave the floor to IO.

IO asked for suggestions on which items needed clarification or discussion.

GV suggested they decide on whether quorum would be required for teleconferences and agreeing on the conference timeline so that the Secretariat can provide proper support given that it is holiday season. He noted that this year LACNIC is providing secretariat support to the NRO and helping him provide support to the CRISP team. He suggested that the Secretariat could take notes that could be shared on the ianaxfer list after each teleconferences.

After various possibilities were proposed regarding quorum, PR said that the advice of the NRO EC was that there shouldn't be a number limit to establish quorum because of the tight timeline and the fact that it might hold up the process. He said it would be better to look at the decision-making process instead of focusing on the quorum.

IO said each region should encourage participation of at least one member (instead of defining quorum).

BW suggested having a 24 hour window associated with each call, so that anyone who participated online within those 24 hours could also be counted towards quorum.

EB noted that the CRISP charter does not define quorum for the decision-making process, so that would require changing the charter.

Decision-making mechanism:

IO said that the idea was to try to work on consensus as much as possible, and that if voting is needed the numbers are already decided (8 out of 10). She asked what kind of things would require voting.

GV said that the expectation was that the super-majority criteria would only be used to approve the final draft and that everything else could be decided through consensus.

ianaxfer@nro.net mailing list:

IO noted that transparency and openness are extremely important.

AR noted that the ianaxfer list is open for posting to everyone, not only to CRISP members, so it might be difficult to separate between deliberations of the CRISP team members and community feedback. In the interest of efficiency AR proposed to create an internal closed mailing list to allow quick editing iterations on the proposed response and use the ianaxfer list as intended for engaging with the community, and soliciting and discussing their feedback.

BW and NN agreed. No further comments were heard, so it was decided to create a separate, closed mailing list for internal purposes and to use the ianaxfer list to communicate with the community.

Action: GV to create a private, closed mailing list for CRISP members as soon as possible

Timeline for teleconferences:

IO said the proposed timeline seemed realistic and asked for comments.

BW proposed retaining the same meeting time for all meetings.

IO said they could discuss this further online, creating a poll with GV's help.

AR said they need to have a few volunteers who can draft the first text to be submitted to the community and volunteered himself.

Because the first teleconference had taken place almost a week later than originally planned, PR suggested pushing back the date for sharing the first draft with the community from the 15th to the 18th. He proposed splitting the material and starting to work on items 1 and 2, where there will probably not be much disagreement. Items 3 and 4 might need further debate and reaching agreements.

Action: GV to update draft CRISP timeline (addition of December 15th teleconference, first draft to be submitted to the community on December 18th).

IO asked for volunteers to prepare the first draft proposal.

CN made a brief summary of the informal discussions CRISP members had held in Mauritius, noting they had discussed the similarities and differences among the three proposals that were on the table (APNIC, RIPE NCC, and LACNIC). He said he would draft something and check with the other regions to see whether he had properly captured the three regions' ideas.

EL and MA offered to help CN draft the comparison between the three proposals.

AB asked that each RIR post their proposals on the NRO website. In reply to a request for its translation into English, AP noted that the English version of LACNIC's proposal was available online at

<http://www.lacnic.net/en/web/transicion/inicio>.

After a brief discussion regarding the date of the next teleconference and the lightning speed required for drafting the texts, it was decided to stick to the current time for the next meeting (11 November, 13.00 UTC) and to have the team of four volunteers discuss among themselves how to best share the workload.

Action: Craig, Andrei, Michael, and Esteban to prepare and share a first draft of the document before the next teleconference.

GV said he'd have the CRISP mailing list ready and use that to send the information for the next teleconference.

After apologizing for having run a bit late, IO adjourned the meeting at 14.19 UTC.