CRISP Team teleconference held on Tuesday, January 13th 2015 (13:00 UTC)

CRISP members present:

AFRINIC
Alan P. Barrett, AB

APNIC
Izumi Okutani, IO
Craig Ng, CN
Dr Govind

ARIN
Michael Abejuala, MA
John Sweeting

LACNIC
Andres Piazza, AP

RIPE NCC
Nurani Nimpuno, NN
Paul Rendek, PR

Agenda
1. Agenda Review
2. Actions Review
   a. Minutes
   b. NRO CRISP Website improvement
   c. HTML and text versions
   d. Metadata in docx file
3. Confirm discussions status
   a. each RIR region
   b. global list
4. Editorial suggestions
   a. Confirm status
   b. Paul Wilson's suggested changes
   c. Timeline to work
5. Confirm status of editorial suggestions
   a. Community review SLA

b. Review Committee

c. Contract Fee

6. CRISP Team positions per issue

  a. Continue discussions in RIR meetings

  b. Consistence in IPR description

    IIIA2 and IIIA3iii

  c. Comment from Pindar Wong

  d. Further input about cost

7. Timeline and how we work for the final submission

  a. Schedule

  b. Who does what

8. Next Meeting

9. AOB

1. Agenda review

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

2. Actions Review

a. Minutes

The Secretariat noted that the minutes from the 10th teleconference would be published shortly and that they were working on the minutes from the 9th and 11th.

b. NRO CRISP Website improvement

IO: I've listed all the improvements suggested on the CRISP mailing list and I'm leaving it to the Secretariat to discuss which suggestions to incorporate based on the resources available. I'd like to highlight two points: 1) revise the phrase "closed mailing list" (don't use the word "closed"); 2) the Excel file of the issues doesn't seem to be up to date. I would appreciate it if someone from the Secretariat can check this.

c. HTML and text versions

IO: These have already been incorporated.

d. Metadata in docx file

IO: This issue was addressed by MA.

3. Confirm discussions status

a. Each RIR region

IO: No need to share unless there's anything notable.

No comments were heard.

b. Global list

IO: I've captured the issues brought up on the global list so we can discuss them under agenda item 6.

4. Editorial suggestions

a. Confirm status

MA: Quick status update: AB did a good job of incorporating the comments. I took the ones I'd made as well as the list of items provided by AR, Pindar, NN, Niall, Paul Wilson. After, Bill Woodcock incorporated some comments to clean up the draft a little bit. You've probably seen email traffic during the last hour. AB has done a good job. If anybody has specific questions about any specific changes, please let me know.

AB: I want to mention that in the edits I submitted to MA I didn't include some of the changes I'd talked about on the mailing list, specifically changing "NRO" to "RIRs,"as I thought this was a substantial change, not an editorial change.

b. Paul Wilson's suggested changes

It was been discussed under the following agenda items:

"4. c. Timeline to work" and

"7. Timeline and how we work for the final submission a. Schedule".

c. Timeline to work

IO: I sent to the mailing list the tentative timeline I have. It's not fixed or anything. I'd like to confirm if you'd like to publish this editorial version separately from the final version (e.g., 1 day before the final version, saying this is the editorial version of the 2nd draft as we did for the 1st).

AB: It would be useful to publish this draft. We think we'll be using this draft for making substantive changes, though I don't think it's quite ready for publishing. We could have it ready in the next few hours. The have been some comments. We could say "don't assume this is final, there can still be some changes." But we need to make a decision on the numbering style. I prefer Woody's idea (decimal numbering). We should at least decide on the numbering style and decide if we will make any more changes before publishing, which should be as early as possible.

MA (via chat): Agreed, based on comments, I believe it needs a bit more work in the next few hours.

IO: I agree that we're not quite ready to publish. We also need to see what we'll do about Paul Wilson's changes.

NN: Quick comments: I would not be particularly comfortable publishing anything right now as we've just received a new document which I'd like to review to see what has been incorporated and what hasn't. I'm not sure what's going on with Paul Wilson's latest comments. The editorial, non-controversial changes can be incorporated without problem. But some of the changes might be controversial. I'll be

happy to go through them.

AB (via chat): Let's review Paul's substantive changes now, and agree on whether to keep or revert.

MA (via chat): To the extent with regard to Paul Wilson's changes that people see what is not controversial, we can keep and I can revert the other changes.

CN: I wonder that publishing two documents could cause confusion. I think we're trying to let the community know the changes made since publishing the second draft. Perhaps what we could do is publish a redline document only and then a second redline that shows substantive changes.

IO: Your observation makes sense to me.

AB: I think I understood CN as saying we could publish a document with only editorial changes. I agree and would like to do that. However, it's difficult, as on this editing process which was supposed to be editorial we will need to add/revert some changes.

IO: Are you referring to Paul Wilson's changes? Let's stick to our original idea: show the community first what changes are merely editorial, then show substantive changes so that people will be able to identify them quickly.

AB (via chat): I am not sure whether all substantive changes were from Paul.

IO: Do you mean the language or in terms of what's been described?

AB: It took me an hour or two to go through the changes and when doing so it struck me that not all of them were editorial. So it would be difficult to publish a document clearly separating editorial vs. substantive changes. Perhaps we should skip publishing the editorial version.

CN (via chat): Perhaps there is no point in separating "substantive" and "editorial." If all the changes are marked, then it will be clear in any event.

PR (via chat): + 1 @ Craig

AP (via chat): @Craig, agree

MA (via chat): I was thinking the same thing as Craig suggested. Maybe it's better to just release one like we have been in past practice.

JS (via chat): Agree with Craig

IO: To summarize: We initially agreed to first publish an editorial version and then the final version to be submitted to the ICG. The observation from AB is that it's difficult to distinguish editorial vs. substantive, so we could decide not make the distinction and simply publish the final version with all changes.

PR (via chat): I think time is short to do two versions, I think if we agree with the changes we can just accept them and continue moving forward.

NN (via chat): Agree that it might be best to not publish a temporary draft in between if that was the conclusion.

JS, AB, CN and NN agreed via chat.

Conclusion: We will not have two versions. We won't publish a temporary draft; we'll simply publish all changes to be submitted to the ICG

IO: I would like to confirm about Paul Wilson's changes. Some may be substantive. Shall we simply include the suggestions and people can simply comment?

NN: My list is a list of changes that I think are simply editorial and don't need any discussion. If people are comfortable with that, we can simply incorporate them.

NN (via chat): Quickly: So I sent a list of PW's suggestions that I think are merely editorial. I think they can be incorporated without discussion. That doesn't mean that I don't think any other of PW's suggestions are controversial, but I think they cannot be incorporated without discussion or agreement first.

AB (via chat): I agree with Nurani's assessment of which points were editorial and which need discussion. Let's discuss them now.

NN (via chat): So the question is what we want to do with the "rest of PW's suggestion". If we feel we have time to consider them. If some of them are easy enough to review and agree on, or if we don't have the time.

IO: My next question: what about the other suggestions made by Paul Wilson?

NN (via chat): I'd be happy to quickly review them. If there is quick agreement on a suggestion we accept it. If we don't agree, we don't have time to discuss it further, and then we revert back to the original text. That is my suggested way forward.

AB, PR, IO and JS agreed with Nurani's suggested way forward.

5. Confirm status of editorial suggestions

a. Community review SLA

IO: AR is not here yet, I'd like to come back when he is. I did observe general agreement on his text on the mailing list. If there are no concerns, we can incorporate this.

b. Review Committee

IO: I think there is general agreement on the text I sent.

c. Contract Fee

IO: I want to discuss this when AR is here. I sent a text suggestion and he shared a simplified version about how the contract fee should be based on cost recovery. I just want to double check that the contract fee should be decided between the IANA operator and the RIRs or if it's obvious and doesn't need to be included. Comments? Does anybody feel that it is important to explicitly state that this is a decision to be made between the operator and the RIRs?

PR (via chat): I like the way Andrei stated it.

AB and JS also agreed (via chat).

Conclusion: Reflect AR's text in Section IIIA3xi.

6. CRISP Team positions per issue

IO: I'm not seeing any new substantive issues, but I'd like to quickly confirm our general position.

IO: I'm not seeing any new substantive issues for comments posted on IANAXFER list, but I'd like to quickly confirm our general position.

a. Continue discussions in RIR meetings

IO: I don't think this is suggested to incorporate in the proposal, just a comment. I think it's a natural assumption that each RIR will facilitate discussions on this topic.

JS (via chat): Yes, agree

NN (via chat): I agree. The RIRs will naturally continue to discuss this with their communities.

b. Consistence in IPR description IIIA2 and IIIA3iii

IO: Inconsistencies have been observed in the two sections (IPR should be delegated to IETF trust / the RIRs). It might look as contradictory and may be worth clarifying.

AB: I think they are two separate issues. For the IETF trademark and iana.org, the rights to the data should be in the public domain. I'm not sure what the inconsistency is. Perhaps we just need to clarify

the wording.

IO: I suggest comparing the texts in parallel on the mailing list and confirming among us if they contradict and if any clarification is necessary.

PR, AB and NN agreed (via chat).

c. Comment from Pindar Wong

IO: I'm not sure what he means. Perhaps he may not be comfortable with the form of the contract. Does someone have a better understanding of his comment?

CN (via chat): I sense that Pindar is just "thinking aloud." Not sure if he is seeking a response.

NN (via chat): My sense too Craig. He did give his support for the proposal.

AB (via chat): I agree. No text changes needed.

d. Further input about cost

IO: I think we've addressed this – we don't specify the specific amount but we specify that it will be cost-recovery based. I think there's a comment from Nick Hilliard which I already replied to based on what we've already discussed on the CRISP Team.

NN (via chat): I thought your response to Nick was very good, Izumi.

PR (via chat): I liked the response, Izumi.

e. Summary of the issues discussed

I'd like to confirm that, except for 6b which might require some text changes, nothing else requires changes.

IO asked for volunteers to help her work on updating the issues list. As nobody volunteered, she said they would take it to the mailing list.

7. Timeline and how we work for the final submission

a. Schedule

IO: We already assigned a person to work on each section. I suggest keeping the same people for the second draft. The basic idea is that anybody is able to make text suggestions, then we ask for feedback from CRISP members, then the person in charge of each section incorporates the changes. But I might be complicating things excessively, as we don't have that many changes to make.

AB: I suggest that anyone can send suggestions to the list and then MA can incorporate them and

update the draft.

MA (via chat): Agreed

IO: There's no specific time listed for submission deadline, but I would like to give a few hours of buffer time for this. We could try to target, e.g., UTC 18.00 so we would have any unexpected changes.

MA (via chat): Yes let's give at least three-five hours buffer time to accommodate for last minute issues.

IO: I'll send a simpler timeline based on this.

AB (via chat): Can we get another draft early tomorrow? We're making text suggestions that will be incorporated. My concern is that we'll need at least a day to read the full document. Perhaps then tomorrow we can have a second version to review.

NN (via chat): MA's suggestion makes sense. It would also allow us to have a teleconference on the 15th to make sure we also agree and then have a few hours of buffer after the call in case we need it. Hopefully the last teleconference will simply be a matter of all verbally approving the final document.

AP agreed with AB (via chat).

AB: We finished what we set up to do. The version sent to the list was an email from Bill which I forwarded to the list. It contains the latest version from each of us. I think we should use it as the basis for discussions and for discussing Paul Wilson's suggestions.

MA (via chat): Are there any other changes the group wants incorporated from this call before reviewing?

NN: In the latest version that was bounced to the list by AB I cannot see any track changes, so I'm not sure what changes have been incorporated or not. Also the numbering has changed. To me, it's not entirely clear what status this document has.

MA (via chat): Yes, I noticed no track changes as well. I can ask Bill if he has a track changes version or I can endeavor in the next few hours to create one.

NN (via chat): That would be very helpful. Thank you.

MA: We've agreed about the numbering. I'll do my best on that.

IO: About the numbering, we agreed that we should be consistent with the RFP.

AB (via chat): Let's add the other things later.

MA (via chat): Alan, would you agree with me making the changes you had suggested to Bill's draft that appears to have agreement from the group?

NN (via chat): Let's work from this base document. I would like to suggest to also include the list of editorial comments by Paul Wilson, including consistent use of terms. Could that be done now?

AB (via chat): Nurani, which parts of Pauls' changes are not already included?

MA (via chat): Nurani, I believe Paul Wilson's comments are included in the current draft, does that suffice?

NN: Michael, ok. Understood. That is fine then. Thanks!

MA: As the draft stands now, it does include Paul Wilson's suggestions. Some suggestions are conflicting (e.g., one of Paul Wilson's changes made some of my changes moot). What it has now is all of Paul Wilson's suggestions. We can decide what we want to keep and what we don't.

AB (via chat): So it's not "incorporate non-controversial changes from Paul Wilson." It's "maybe revert controversial changes from PW."

NN: Because we are at the end of the process, I appreciate Bill trying to help. Since we don't have that many changes to make now, would it be acceptable to MA (and to others as well) that we give him the pen so that we can see what changes are made and make sure that we have enough time to review the final document?

PR, MA, CN and JS agreed via chat

[AR joined the meeting at this time and apologized for being late.]

IO proceeded to recap the discussions so far for AR's benefit.

NN: I realize I misinterpreted the status of the document before. The one sent out by Bill includes all the changes. I'm not sure I agree with that (he's changing language we've already agreed on, e.g. regarding .arpa). I'm not sure all those changes should just be accepted without us making a conscious decision about it. I'm not saying any of Paul Wilson's changes are controversial or wrong, but some of them do imply changes in substance. To change wording / text that we've talked back and forth... I'd be happy if we keep the text we had and consciously make the decision to change it. I want to tread carefully here at the very end of the process.

IO: The current document we have has incorporated all of Paul Wilson's changes. Your points are very

valid – if Paul has suggested changes to text we'd agreed on, we should revert those. That's what's being suggested (review current text and if any CRISP member is uncomfortable with any of the suggested changes, if there's a disagreement, we don't have time to discuss it so we simply don't incorporate it). Do you disagree with this and would like for us to simply consciously add the ones we find agreeable?

NN: Perhaps it will be clearer when we see the redline doc. I hope we can see which are changes based on Paul Wilson's suggestions, not changes we've already agreed on. I want to make sure we treat comments appropriately. We haven't treated the other inputs this way (we've discussed them and then consciously added). I want to make sure we follow proper process. Maybe when I see the redline document the fog will lift for me.

IO: Your point about equal treatment of comments is an important one. I'm not sure Paul Wilson is making any new changes to the proposal. If that is the case, I agree with NN that we should agree among the CRISP Team before we incorporate anything.

AB (via chat): Yes, we need to discuss them.

PR (via chat): Isn't it easier to look and see what you don't like and then discuss those?

AR (via chat): I suppose the introduced changes are visible in the document, right? As long as it is clear what changes have been introduced, I am fine.

AB (via chat): Can we get a redline version of Woody's document soon?

PR (via chat): Did Bill add anything outside of Paul's stuff? I mean a submission without redline at this process is a little reckless

AB (via chat): Bill made hundreds of changes.

MA (via chat): If someone perhaps could review Paul's comments found in a redline and maybe make a separate list of Paul's items he suggested for discussion by the group? Would that help?

NN (via chat): Well that's what I mean. If we get a redline document with lots of different changes whose source is not easy to track, it will be very hard to evaluate what to accept or reject.

NN: This is my concern. We have a new document, it's not clear what changes have been made or not. Even with a redline document, if it's not clear where these changes come from (Bill, Paul, changes we've agreed on), it makes it hard to decide whether to accept or reject a change.

PR (via chat): So Michael will send a new version now??

AB (via chat): It's all mixed up and very hard to review.

NN: Changes should be based on decisions made within the group, not based on personal preferences. Substantial changes should be agreed on by the group.

AB: I think the changes Bill made were all mostly copy editing and formatting. It's hard to review the document with hundreds of copyediting changes and several changes arising from the community . I suggest we try to review a document prior to that, one only shared between me and Michael, which doesn't include Bill's copyediting

IO: That sounds reasonable.

PR (via chat): I'd like Bill to confirm that

JS agreed via chat.

MA: There was a document I created that had AB's edits and mine. I made a clean version and a redline version on which Bill made many changes. If I circulate the document (clean and redline) before Bill's copyedited version, that would be a good starting point. With that version it's much easier for me to reject edits made based on Paul's suggestions. We can then confirm with Bill on the other changes he's included.

NN (via chat): That sounds reasonable.

JS agreed (via chat).

Conclusion: CRISP Team will work on MA's version without Bill's changes (i.e., a version that does not include Bill's changes).

AR (via chat): All editorial + Paul Wilson's + all substantive?

MA (via chat): Yes, minus BIll's copy/edit and clean up.

AB (via chat): Michael can send with or without Paul Wilson's changes. Which one do we want?

NN (via chat): I would be most comfortable to look at a version pre-Bill, but with all PW's editorial changes. (Not his substantive changes).

PR (via chat): i can live with that… and will look through and see what I think needs to be discussed from Paul's stuff.

NN (via chat): That way, we have to make an active decision about all PW's substantive changes.

AB (via chat): Michael, can you do what Nurani wants? I agree that would be useful.

MA (via chat): I can back out the substantive (at least try to, I might miss something but hopefully not).

Conclusion: The version MA will send (redline) will include suggested changes from the community and AB (i.e., no changes suggested by Bill Woodcock, which are mostly formatting changes).

NN (via chat): Can I please hear others' view on how to handle PW's substantive changes? If I'm alone in my concern, I will fold. But I would like to know how others feel about it.

AB: For me, the most important thing is that we discuss each of Paul Wilson's suggestions and make a decision. I don't care when we incorporate them, as long as we discuss and make a decision.

MA (via chat): Yes. I just want clarity on whether to back those out with some additional time or circulate the redline now.

MK (via chat): Yes, we can discuss on email the changes. We should appreciate effort, and if the changes get consensus, we adopt them.

PR (via chat): We need a list of the substantive changes.

IO: I will send a list of the substantive changes included in Paul Wilson's draft so it's easy to spot which changes were made and raise objections to their inclusion. Any concerns about this suggested approach? The draft will include the substantive changes by Paul Wilson, but if there are any concerns we will not discuss them – we will simply revert back to the prior version. I will list Paul Wilson's substantive changes on the mailing list so people can comment and not miss any of the changes.

MA (via chat): Ok. I will send the draft redline asap.

b. Who does what
IO: This has already been discussed.

8. Next Meeting
Tomorrow, Wednesday, January 14th 2015 at 13:00 UTC.

9. AOB
No further business was brought up for discussion, so the meeting was adjourned at 14.40 UTC.