

14th CRISP Team teleconference held on Thursday, January 15th 2015 (13:00 UTC)

CRISP members present:

AFRINIC

Alan P. Barrett, AB
Mwendwa Kivuva, MK

APNIC

Izumi Okutani, IO
Craig Ng, CN
Dr Govind

ARIN

Michael Abejuala, MA
John Sweeting, JS
Bill Woodcock, BW

LACNIC

Andres Piazza, AP
Nico Scheper, NS

RIPE NCC

Nurani Nimpuno, NN
Paul Rendek, PR
Andrei Robachevsky, AR

Agenda

1. Agenda Review
2. Actions Review
 - a. Minutes
 - b. Header of the proposal
3. Summary of the comments status
4. Outstanding issues
5. Definitions
6. Announcement
7. Cover Letter
8. Issues list
9. Next Steps

- a. Reconfirm the pen
 - b. Reconfirm Timeline
10. AOB

1. Agenda review

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

2. Actions Review

a. Minutes

IO: Laureana Pavon (on behalf of the NRO Secretariat) has sent me the notes from the 13th meeting. They're still waiting for my approval.

b. Header of the proposal (cover letter)

IO: I added this as a separate agenda item which we'll cover later.

3. Summary of the comments status

IO proceeded to go through the summary of comments status (Summary-14th-meeting.pdf, included below as Annex A).

IO: Let's confirm what comments have been incorporated and which have not (in version 7). Quick recap: My understanding is that Bill's version (No. 7) incorporates all of Paul's comments. I did list outstanding issues here and I highlighted the ones that need confirmation. We also want to incorporate AR's and AB's comments and definitions should be added (see Annex A below).

These are the things that in my understanding have not been incorporated in Bill's version 7. Bill, can you give us further update?

[Bill was not on the call at that time.]

PR: I wanted to let you know that those are some outstanding items and that if they can be incorporated if everyone agrees. Then I would be fine and move to freeze the document. I will not provide any further edits because I believe we really need to move on to produce the final copy.

IO: Has everyone had a chance to look at Paul and Nurani's version?

AR: Yes I have and I support Paul and Nurani's suggested changes. Just to make it clear about the possible inconsistency regarding IPR, in fact the suggested amendments affect section IIIA2 and IIIA3. So the idea is to move substance into IIIa2 where we will specify all different aspects of IPR and data rights and also specify the destinations. In fact the principle can be very simple, referring to section IIIA2 which has all the substance.

IO: Are there no suggested changes to the text in IIIA2?

AR: There is one. It was suggested that the ownership of non-public data related to registries is transferred to the RIRs. That suggestion is for IIIA2.

IO: Thanks for the clarification. We want to avoid confusion at the last moment. It would be helpful for the person holding the pen if AR could resend this including changes to IIIA2 and IIIA3 principles.

AR: I will do that.

NN: A general comment. I think most of the comments made by me and AB were not about introducing new changes, new text into the latest version but about existing, agreed text that had been changed. For those things it's really important to know that they've been changed. I'd like to apply the principle that we revert to the existing, agreed text. Maybe that can help guide us forward, as I'm actually not quite sure what the status of the current version is so I would like to get clarification on this.

IO: I think the basic agreement is that we stick to the version that we've agreed – basically, MA's version. I think all changes have already been incorporated in Bill's version 7 and then you have additional comments which you sent a couple of minutes ago.

NN: Yes to both of those. I agree that MA's version is all agreed text. That is my understanding. If anyone brings up any discussion then we revert to MA's version. I also believe my previous comments have been dealt with. In the latest version which we got from Bill earlier today... I don't know what the status is between Bill's version 7 and where we are now.

IO: I think it's very important that in case of doubt we all agree that we revert to the wording that we've all agreed (MA's version).

AB: About the document in general, I've reviewed the comments from almost everybody except PR's definitions and I agree with almost all of the text I've seen going through the mailing list. I'm happy with the way things are going. I'm happy with almost all the work that Bill has done. I made comments on things I thought needed changes. I think most of my comments were about terminology (consistent use of terms). I can see BW is commenting in the chat window.

BW (via chat): Really basic status: one outstanding set of changes from Alan, in redlines, not yet applied, and one consolidated Nurani/Paul set of changes in redline, not yet applied. I thought Michael said he hadn't forked 7? What is "Michael's version"?

BW (via chat): Can someone clarify whether you've forked 7 or not? Michael said in email that he had not. But you're all talking about some version other than 7 or 8, that you're referring to as "Michael's version."

AR (via chat): BTW, I just sent the proposed changes re the IRP/data rights.

AB: About the IPR, I think there's a substantive change suggested which we need to agree on. We previously said that some of the IPR would be transferred to a successor operator if it ever gets transferred from ICANN. Then in AR's proposal that won't happen. In AR's version, possible destinations for IPR are the public domain, a neutral organization such as the IETF trust, or the RIRs, whereas in earlier versions there was also the case where some of it would remain with the operator and transferred to a successor operator. I just want to confirm that we no longer need any IPR to remain with the operator.

BW (via chat): I think it would be much more useful if people would discuss changes relative to version 7, rather than relative to previous versions. That way lies madness.

NN (via chat): I think Andrei's text sent to the mailing list a few minutes ago is good.

AB (via chat): That text is OK.

PR (via chat): I used the version that was sent this morning from Bill to make all edits.

BW (via chat): Yes, that was my understanding. (Paul)

AB (via chat): Yes, my comments are relative to BW7.

NN (via chat): Hand (regarding versions - want to clarify why we are talking about Michael's text).

BW (via chat): There is no "Bill's version" and "Michael's version." We're not _competing for your approval_, we're _applying your changes_. There are version _numbers_.

A few more comments were heard/read regarding the various existing versions.

IO: To recap, as a next step we want to build on Bill's version 7. Some changes I wasn't sure if they had been incorporated into Bill's version 5 (Paul's comments in Annex A below). Maybe some points have already been incorporated, but I'd like to double check to see if they've all been incorporated in the latest version. I've highlighted those that seemed to need confirmation by CRISP Team. We also need to add AR's text suggestion. AR will send the text for sections IIIA 2 and IIIA3 once again to the CRISP mailing list. Then AB's latest feedback shared here in the 4th version of the document. Whoever has the pen simply has to work on Bill's version and then add AB's changes displayed in this document. Thanks PR for working on the glossary. In addition, NN sent some suggestions that are not listed in this summary so it's not on the list but also needs to be updated. NN has worked on version 7, so whoever has the pen simply has to add her comments on this point. I hope this doesn't contradict anybody's understanding.

NN: I think your way forward is very reasonable. Of course there's no Bill's version and Michael's version. What we're saying is that there were changes made by Bill that were actual changes to agreed text that we'd been discussing for a long time. Changing that text doesn't introduce any new text; if in doubt, we reverting back to what was agreed text. For example, there was wording on how the RIRs

should consult their communities when drafting the agreement – that was something we discussed at length. The other thing was arbitration in a neutral venue and agreed on the text. This is not personal. It's just a matter of being very careful where we've already got agreed text.

AB (via chat): Revert only the sentence or paragraph in question, only if somebody notices and brings it up.

IO: To clarify: My assumption was that people have already commented on the parts that need to be reverted. Are you saying that some people haven't done so? Should we have to go over and recheck what has been checked and agreed?

NN (via chat): No, I agree that those comments have been made. Thanks.

BW (via chat): Are we going to have a conversation, or just say the same things over and over without actually exchanging views?

NN (via chat): Just trying to explain what happened and why we are reverting. Happy to freeze now.

PR (via chat): No need to raise again.

IO: Just to confirm our direction - we're not going to confirm each change we incorporate. I've simply highlighted some points that we need to make a clear decision as the CRISP Team today. Other than that, the default is that we will incorporate all comments. The next step is agree on the unresolved issues I've listed and update the suggestions sent by tam members since the 7th version that Bill has sent.

BW (via chat): Reverting what, in which instances?

AB (via chat): Bill still has his hand up.

BW: The point I'd like to get across is that we inevitably have the same issue discussed in several different places. On the last we call agreed that we would go more in that direction instead of trying to get rid of redundancy. When someone suggests a change, the change needs to be applied in multiple places that need to be found. The person suggesting a change almost never takes that into account and so then 3 options: 1) the change gets applied to all of those places and you guys start arguing about it again; 2) the change gets applied in some of the places and then other people look and recognize the discrepancy and want it resolved; or 3) we apply the change in the one place and get rid of the other places. Any of those options are fine. Neither Michael nor I care much which one we chose, but we've got to be clear what we're asking for when we ask for a change. You've got to be clear on whether you want the changes applied throughout the document or not. That might affect other places other people care about and so on. This is why we need to stop working from the redline and start working on the whole document now. We need to minimize the number of things we're sort of bickering back and forth about.

PR: First, Bill, thanks for the document that you sent. I read the document very slowly and loved all the edits. When I went through those edits, I saw text that's changed, the edits I personally suggested you revert back... when I went to look at the rest of the document, these changes would't have affected many parts of the document. I kind of thought – “Whoah! This was kind of bickered about early on in the process.” I understand that you might not have seen this so you might think that something seems logical but the change might affect something that might not have a reflection throughout the rest of the document. I must say, when I look at the edits from AB, NN and myself, I still see a great flow within the document so I move to freeze this damn document, let's move on.

IO: Thanks for the comment. I agree with you. I think it's not as complicated as some people may be thinking. We simply need to add these additional comments that have been made and reverting back to what was initially agreed. I believe people are not adding new changes at this stage. If we can move with this general understanding, I'm not sure we have too many issues that need to be addressed.

NN (via chat): Well put Paul. Thanks! :) I don't think it's complicated.

PR (via chat): And there is a big thanks to you as well Bill.

NN (via chat): And yes, I also think most of the editing and tidying-up that Bill did was very, very good.

AB (via chat): I agree to accept all edits proposed relative to BW7, except if there were objections on the mailing list.

PR (via chat): There were very few instances of this.

CN (via chat): Why don't we just focus on what needs to revert, rather than a general discussion?

BW: Every change came from somebody. I can either apply everything that everybody sent me or I can apply the changes that multiple people support on the mailing list or I can do what I have been doing, which is applying the changes that seem uncontroversial to me and kicking things back if they seem controversial to me and I want to understand whether there is consensus. The problem is that people are not keeping up with the list and seeing what other people are proposing. Saying “revert” assumes that everyone has a common frame of reference, which is never exactly the case - you're looking at snapshots while the changes are getting applied serially. Just saying “revert” doesn't make much sense to the person holding the pen.

IO: Who will be holding the pen from now on? On the last call we agreed that MA would hold the pen and Bill would be in charge of the edits. I want to be clear about the next steps. He will incorporate all the comments I summarized in Annex A.

MA (via chat): My understanding is that Bill is handing off back to me at or after this call.

BW (via chat): From what point? When do we freeze and hand over the pen?

BW: Switching the pen is a process which I sent to the mailing list. It's not a matter of saying it; it's a matter of executing the process that involves many steps. 1) freeze changes, 2) update version, 3) switch the pen, 4) start the changes again. If you guys want to switch the pen, you've got to stop suggesting changes. It's not difficult. We've just got to do it instead of arguing about it.

AR (via chat): We need to agree on the baseline, all future changes are relative to it.

IO: We are going to stop sending suggestions. We freeze here. We're in general agreement; we just have a few items that we have to agree. I've listed them here in the summary. Bill's current version is 8, but I think people have commented on the 7th version. Is the 8th version out on the mailing list?

BW: Of course not. Eight is the current version. Seven is the version that has been frozen and distributed and you guys have already commented on. We can freeze 8 and move on to 9, but that can't happen yet because you haven't frozen changes.

BW (via chat): Current version is 8. All changes are relative to the present, not relative to 7. That would mean changes clobbering each other. I can't roll back time to apply changes to a version that no longer exists.

IO: It's clear that we have to freeze additional changes.

BW: No, people keep talking about reverting things.

IO: I think reverting means using the words that were originally agreed and used, but I think you can simply apply the suggested changes people have sent. The intention is sticking to the phrase that was originally agreed by the team. We don't mean that we have to go back a version. The work forward is that, as people have sent in comments to your version 7...

BW: It's not "my" version 7. There was only one version 7. Comments to version 7 get applied serially to version 8. Until we move to version 9, version 8 is open and changes are being applied to it. Saying "revert" is either a change or it's not a change. I can't apply and not apply a change and make everybody happy. When you say "things we have agreed to," that's aspirational. In point of fact, people send changes and they are in disagreement with each other. I've got to do something with that.

AB: Let's freeze the document. Let's agree that as of now we're not going to send any changes relative to 7. And let's get 8 out as quickly as we can. There's some confusion about the use of the term "revert." There's no suggestion that we should revert lots of stuff. Just a few suggestions that perhaps some of the text in 7 should be changed, so let's call it a change instead of a revert. To me it's the same thing but perhaps it will make Bill happier.

BW: I just want to make it clear that although you call it a reversion, it's a change to the present version.

AB: Yes. I understand it's a change relative to now.

AR: I agree with AB. Let's freeze v8 and for the time being stop sending changes. From v8, changes should be very explicit. No reverse, just "old" and "new." My point is that if anyone suggests a change it should be relative to v8, without any reference to previous versions. Simply specify "old paragraph" and "new paragraph."

IO: I think as we're freezing we don't want any more comments at this stage for any of the versions. We will start compiling comments based on what we've received until now. Then whoever will hold the pen will incorporate the changes, distribute and people will have the chance for final confirmation (one hour or so). I hope the process is clear to everybody.

BW (via chat): Status now: There are some changes from 7 applied in 8, some not yet applied.

AR (via chat): Hopefully there will be no changes once all changes to date and from this call are incorporated in V8.

BW (via chat): We can freeze 8 with all changes from 7. Or we can pass unapplied changes along to version 9. I'd prefer the former.

AB (via chat): Me too. Apply changes before freezing 8.

BW (via chat): That's correct. Version 9 opens as soon as version 8 is frozen.

JS (via chat): Apply all.

IO (via chat): That sounds reasonable

MA: I know there's been a lot of traffic on the mailing list. I'd like to thank everyone, especially Bill. I think we're making this more complicated than we need to. I agree with Bill that there needs to be a very clear procedure for the passing of the pen in the sense that we are conscious of which document is being passed on and which document is present. My understanding is that 7 that was circulated, we had a bunch of comments relative to 7, Bill started working on 8 which is in progress and has been able to incorporate some but not all of the comments we were making in relation to version 7. The question is do we have Bill pass the pen to me without freezing changes or does he incorporate the changes and then pass the pen on to me. I believe that as he has already put so much effort into 8, he can apply the remaining changes that he sees at this point. At this point all comments will be frozen and he passes the pen to me. What I can do is – with the help of everybody – make sure that any other items are addressed in that version. If anything needs to be updated I will work on a version 9, which will not be terribly different from v8. Also, I've already said this on the list: when we have version 9 and everybody is ok and good to go, we need to have time for everyone to reach consensus on that. We have a tight deadline coming up.

NN (via chat): +1 to Michael. Very clear. I don't think it needs to be more complicated than that.
CN, PR, AR, AB, MK, and AP agreed with MA (via chat)

BW: Once you guys get the text that you no longer want to change, we still need to split the cover letter as a separate document and do the pagination. That will take some time, probably 90 minutes to 2 hours of work. It's not quite as trivial as one assumes because stuff always comes up. You need to build in time to get that done before the deadline. I sent my schedule for the day and I asked that MA do so as well so we can figure out if/when there will be another change of pen.

MA (via chat): I can send my schedule but can also help in removing the letter and pagination as needed.

IO: MA and BW can work together to see what works for both of you. I will prepare a new timeline and share it with the team. Regarding the cover letter, our priority is to make sure we make the deadline, so if this requires a lot of work I suggest that we keep it as it is.

IO: Summary of how we'll move forward: I've summarized all the things that need to be included and I understand you have opened version 8 and incorporated some of the changes and NN has made some comments which are not listed here so I hope it's clear what needs to be worded.

From this point on, the conversation took the form of a somewhat difficult to summarize oral / written exchange. Some of the comments posted in the chat window were also read out loud by those present at the meeting so the words "via chat" will be omitted for clarity.

PR: I just want to see the changes were put in. No further comments, please.

BW: That isn't a big deal.

AR: Perfect is the enemy of the good.

BW: What's a big deal is whether we get further changes to 8, that have to be applied to 9. Because we can't split and paginate until we've finished making changes.

PR: I am reviewed out. If the suggested changes are in, I am cool.

BW: Or "reverting" if you think those aren't changes. The question at this point is whether there's going to be a version 10 or not. I'd really like the answer to that to be "no." Either there's a version 10 or not. Not a "small version 10."

AB: Changes from 8 to 9 should be minimal. Hopefully nothing else except pagination in between 9 and "final."

AP: Fully agree with Paul in freezing with version 9.

NS: +1 for Andres and his comment.

BW: Michael brought up a point about needing a confirmation vote. When and how does that happen? That happens in conjunction with version 9? in parallel with split/paginate?

AB: Vote to approve "9", just before or in parallel with prep of "final" version.

PR: +1

BW: And that happens by email? Also, I think I can clarify something: If all outstanding changes from 7 are applied to 8, there won't be any outstanding changes passed to 9.

AR: Consensus?

BW: If everybody can commit to no more changes, then 8 could be the one we vote to confirm.

AB: Can't commit before seeing "8"

BW: Ok. That's reasonable; I'm not trying to stifle debate. Just be clear about versioning and what goes where.

AR: + Andrei's changes re IPR.

AB: Agree with Bill's summary of the process.

BW: Can someone clarify / post text? Of the vote-to-approve requirement?

NN "Recognizing the need to produce a single RIR proposal to the ICG in a timely manner, the CRISP Team may proceed with any outcome given a supermajority approval of 8 out of 10 members, if rough consensus cannot be readily achieved. RIR staff are not voting members."

MA: That was my e-mail and it's an 8 out of 10 vote if consensus cannot be achieved.

BW: So rough consensus is sufficient, and we can avoid a vote.

JS: Yes. My interpretation as well. Looking at the charter right now.

PR: I think rough consensus is best. This is the spirit with which we all work in

AB: Yes, actively endorse on mailing list

BW: Okay, so we aim for rough consensus on 8 on the mailing list. If possible.

AB: I expect to have some comments on the glossary, which I have not yet reviewed.

BW: Can we establish a temporal deadline for changes to / approval of 8? And everyone commits to sending no more changes to 7, right?

PR: Yes, correct Bill.

AB and NN agreed.

BW: Pagination needs to start by 22:00 UTC. 22:00 UTC is secretariat upload. How about 21:00 UTC for pagination?

NN asked IO to please paste the proposed timeline into the chat window.

AB: Can we get version 8 by 15:30 UTC?

BW: No way for me to promise that until I've seen how many changes you guys have slipped in under the wire. If I start *right now*, I might be able to get it to you 15:15 UTC or so.

AB suggested excusing Bill to get started right now. MA, JS and NN agreed.

Further comments ensued regarding the proposed timeline and suggested changes

AR suggested that Bill should flag immediately in case of detecting conflicts.

NN: I don't think there are conflicts in the suggestions received in the last 7-8 hrs. I have read all the comments quite thoroughly.

BW: Yes, there have been LOTS of conflicts in suggestions, in the sense of overlapping suggested edits. Likely, more than ten but probably fewer than 30.

AB: Bill, just apply the edits. If there are conflicts that you don't notice, then let people pick it up when reviewing version 8.

AR and CN: +1 to Alan

PR: Bill, I really didn't see any overlap.

BW: Paul, that's exactly what I'm saying. You don't see it, because you're not the one applying the edits. I agree that you're having a hard time seeing them, but you're assuming that means that they don't exist. This is a false assumption.

Hans Petter Holen suggested using track changes (via chat).

MA: Agree. Track changes will negate the need for me or Bill to separately call out conflicts and it's incumbent on the group to review their changes and observe any issues after that. I mean that people can review their own changes and if we picked one (judgment call on editor or order) then that can be raised. But I agree Bill's observation of potential conflict. This has been an issue throughout but we have worked it out until now and I imagine it will be resolved here

AR: I think we've agreed on the substance. We may have editorial preferences, but these are less important at this stage.

MA: The editor can have choice of overlap or conflict and incumbent on the author of the changes to notice any issues.

BW: Please let's just move forward rather than re-hashing this. There aren't changes that aren't changes. If it's not a change, it's not someone emailing new text. If you think you're in agreement, don't send new changes

AB: I have not reviewed the glossary so I can't promise that I won't suggest any changes. Changes relative to 7 are frozen, but I can't promise I won't have any changes relative to 8.

JS: Changes should only be if substantive. Tweaks are not needed at this point.

BW excused himself to go to work. JS, MA, AR, BW, AB, NN and others thanked him

NN: Quick comment about the cover letter: the date needs to be corrected.

9. Next Steps

a. Reconfirm the pen

MA: Once Bill sends out 8, I'll take the pen from there if that is okay with everyone. Then hopefully we can finalize and be good to go!

All agreed.

b. Reconfirm Timeline

NN posted the proposed timeline on the chat window:

Version 8 15.30 UTC

3 hrs to review the draft

18.30 UTC Deadline for review of version 8

AR: In my opinion, 2 ours is enough to review the draft.

AB: I will need 30 minutes to prepare the HTML and TXT versions. This does not have to be a bottleneck because ICG does not need those versions.

MA: Who should submit?

NN: The Chair should submit.

PR, CN, MK and MA agreed(RIPE) to Everyone:

It was also established that IO would cc the CRISO Team mailing list as well as the IANA XFER list which would be open to comments.

AR: For clarification, do we agree on explicit endorsement? Or just no objections?

PR: No objection means "I agree."

JS, NN, CN agreed

NN: Can we confirm that the following is correct?

15.30 UTC Bill to produce version 8

18.30 UTC Deadline for review of version 8

20.30 UTC Michael to produce version 9 (including pagination, etc.)

21.30 UTC Publication on website

All agreed.

10. AOB

AR: There was significant support and the community delegated us the editorial work. We need to be very careful and clear how we announce this.

AB: If we are in danger of being late, let's let IO make an executive decision.

NN: Agree. IO has my full support to make an executive decision.

NS, JS, AR, MA all agreed

MA: I will be happy to work with Izumi on her executive approval of any last minute edits for finalization.

At this time, the team expressed its support and appreciation for the work carried out by IO and a vote of confidence from everyone.

NN congratulated IO for her excellent work, other members added to her words of thanks

MA noted how impressed he was with how well this group has worked and come together. He added that it was a very impressive and very worthwhile and important work for the community! Cheers to whole CRISP team!

After further expressions of appreciation and support, the meeting was closed at 1500 UTC.

Annex A:

Summary

Comments have been incorporated in Bill's version 7 except

--- Paul's comments "CRISP Team Proposal---BW5--- paul edit.doc"

[Confirm with Bill]

--- Andrei's text suggestion

"Possible inconsistency pointed out on IRP for Section III A2 and IIIA3"

--- Alan's comments (CRISP Team Proposal---BW7---apb---notes---4.doc)

--- Definitions to be added

"Glossary of Definitions for RFP response" glossary.docx

To be confirmed at 14th call:

1. Use of word should/can

IV.A. Description of operational requirements a new agreement can -----> "can and should be established"

Clarification about the use of wording: (Alan)

--- should" be done before the transition (it is a good idea), --- that it "can" be done (it is possible)

-----> If no objection at the 14th call, adopt

2. Description of arbitration for global PDP I.A.3 How disputes about policy are resolved --- avoid the word neutral and adopt Paul's text

-----> If no objection at the 14th call, adopt

3. Text Revision for III.A.2?

Too complex -----> Alternative suggestion?

CURRENT:

With regards to the IANA trademark and the IANA.ORG domain, it is the expectation of the Internet Number Community that both are associated with the IANA Numbering Services and not with a particular IANA Numbering Services Operator. Identifying an organization not associated with an IANA Numbering Services Operator to hold these assets in perpetuity will facilitate a smooth transition should another operator (or operators) be selected in the future. It is the preference of the Internet Number Community that the IANA trademark and the IANA.ORG domain name be transferred to an entity independent of the IANA Numbering Services Operator, in order to ensure that these assets are used in a non---discriminatory manner for the benefit of the entire community. From the Internet Number Community's perspective, the IETF Trust would be an acceptable candidate for this role.

4. Need update in VI?

Current suggested

--- "IANA Draft Proposal 14012015 --- MRA"

<https://www.nro.net/pipermail/crisp/2015---January/000990.html>

-----> Do we need more description?

5. Definitions --- Paul's definitions --- Where to put: btn "Abstract" and "0. Proposal type" ?
glossary.docx

Cover letter