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

CRISP members present:

AFRINIC
Alan P. Barrett, AB
Mwendwa Kivuva
Ernest Byaruhanga

APNIC
Izumi Okutani, IO
Craig Ng, CN
Dr Govind

ARIN
Michael Abejuala, MA
John Sweeting
Bill Woodcock

LACNIC
Andres Piazza, AP
Esteban Lescano
Nico Scheper

RIPE NCC
Nurani Nimpuno, NN
Paul Rendek, PR
Andrei Robachevsky

IO welcomed everyone at 13.00 UTC and said that, although there was no formal agenda, there were two things she'd like the Team to discuss:

1) There have been changes in the timeline for the names cross community group (their current plan is to submit their proposal in June this year and it's likely to change the overall timeline for the ICG). Possible actions and considerations or anything we should confirm during the ICANN meeting.

2) Future role of crisp team

3) Comments made on the IANA XFER list regarding -the response CRISP Team provided (comments by

Richard Hill (RH) and other community members).

4) Another post sent to the ICG forum by RH expressing concern over considerations for the number resources proposal within the ICG.

5) Confirm notes / notes format for upcoming CRISP meetings. Continue current format or find a more efficient alternative?

6) IO sent the slides that she plans to cover at the ICG meeting and would like to cover that as well.

1) Changes and possible delay in schedule

IO: Suggestion: We haven't' heard anything formally. First, confirm this and then inform the community about the next steps and how these affect the numbers community. I personally feel that it would be better to wait for the ICG to publish the timeline.

All agreed.

IO: During the ICANN meeting we want to communicate with the NTIA if there are any representatives there and with the ICG members as well.

AR: I agree with this approach. I understand the updated timeline doesn't change the previously announced deadline. Formally, we're still aiming at 30 of September to come up with the proposal. I read they were planning to prepare a partial proposal and I would be interested in the ICG's view on that.

IO: It might be good to talk to ICG members and hear their opinion. It's true that no changes in timeline have been published yet, but they will need time for comments and so on. Let's wait for reactions from the ICG on this.

CN: The ICG has the job of integrating the 3 different proposals. The reality is that the 3 will stand quite independently, we're not going to have one proposal that the 3 communities agree on. There needs to be some sort of green light to start preliminary work on our part in the next couple of months.

NN: I agree with the suggested way forward. The ICG were given the task of taking the 3 proposals and coming up with one. I understand they'll start looking at the 2 they've received and see how the names community affects the whole timeline. In any case, our work is to discuss how this delayed timeline affects us and whether there are any actions the CRISP Team should take given the new timeline

IO: In Singapore, let's try to get a feeling and confirm what the ICG thinks at this stage and also try to communicate with the NTIA representatives. It might be worth asking about the impact of this changing situation in the names community.

2) RH's comment suggested to ICG forum

IO: RH submitted his concerns over the considerations made within the ICG about the number resources proposal. One is related to conflict of interest. The second point is he's asking why this situation can be considered consensus for our proposal. He feels that he wasn't supporting the proposal and wants to understand why the CRISP Team considered that consensus was reached. This will be discussed at the ICG meeting tomorrow afternoon. The number representatives will likely be required to provide the rationale.

CN: My view is that this consensus issue stems from a misunderstanding by RH of what consensus means. This community of all communities understands what consensus means – never unanimity of view. On the subject of level of detail of the contract, I think he's specifically said he could accept as a compromise a contract prepared by RIR staff with community review. The Team has considered the issues that were raised, some we've agreed and others we've rejected. We received a lot of support for our position; RH's position has not received much community support at all.

NN: First, our task is simply to explain why we believe that there is consensus. Indeed, consensus is very hard to explain. As CN says, our community has a good idea of how the consensus building process works. That said, I think it's our task to help people who don't have this experience understand how we see that consensus was reached. We did that in the proposal showing long discussions in the RIR communities that the CRISP Team brought here. The lack of support for RH's point is another aspect – as far as I can see, there's been no support for his position. The second part is also where we need to trust our community. It's not necessarily only up to us to decide whether there's consensus. Let's wait a few days and see whether the community speaks up. Finally, I think it's important for us to leave a clear record: make the minutes easy to find, mailing lists, telephone conferences, etc. so people can judge for themselves.

IO: A common observation by NN and CN is that people on the global list didn't support RH's point. That shows that people didn't feel the need to incorporate his comments. I like the point raised by NN: let's leave it up to the community to decide whether there was consensus or not. Third point: improve information sharing.

AR: Mostly in support for NN's and CN's points and IO's summary. Community support is very important, so I hope we'll encourage support from our communities. This is not the first time we see this misunderstanding re consensus.

IO: It would be great if each of us could go back to our regional communities and seek feedback. I'd like to add that maybe RH's definition of consensus and our definition of consensus are different. He's assuming consensus equals universal agreement. We define consensus as majority support for a proposal and if there are positions against we have a procedure to properly consider and address them. If this position against is not supported by other members of the community, I think it's fair to say that rough consensus was reached. It might be worth clarifying within the ICG about this difference in definition.

PR: I'm not sure it would be worth it to explain this to RH. Consensus building in the ITU works very

similar to how it works in our community. At this stage I'm not sure what more we can say. The mails IO sent out were brilliant. We spent a large amount of time touching on the points that were brought up and I think they received the attention they needed to receive.

IO: To clarify, don't mean to explain and convince RH. Just to make sure that the ICG knows how we define consensus so that they can summarize the situation.

NN: I agree with you IO. Our task is not to convince RH one way or another, our task is to show the ICG and the broader community that we've done the right thing and that we believe there's consensus on the proposal.

3) Discussions on the IANA XFER list

IO: I submitted our responses to Guru's and RH's comments to the IANA XFER list. In response we received a comment from RH saying that our response to Guru was not clear and that we hadn't replied sufficiently to his question. Some other members of the community have started joining the discussions. We may want to consider how we want to address and respond to this comment from RH.

CN: My personal view, I hope it doesn't come across as too rough, is we've said what we need to say. We don't need to continue to respond to his messages or we'll never see the end of it.

JS (via chat): Agree with CN. Respond adequately to his points and then stop.

NN (via chat): Agree with CN.

IO: I want to make sure that we are accommodating adequately and sufficiently the community's feedback. If we all feel that this is not worth responding at all, we can do that. Another way of thinking is to take this as an opportunity to clearly explain our position and share our message more clearly.

AR: I agree with CN. I feel that dialogue should happen between RH and the community. It's more powerful if the community defends our work than if we do it.

PR (via chat): Great point, AR.

JS (via chat): Yes, and they have been doing that.

IO: I agree with what you said. Instead of us defending our own proposal, it's better to leave it to the community to discuss and engage with RH.

Conclusion: No action regarding RH's comment on the IANA XFER list.

4) Presentation for Monday ICG session in Singapore

IO: I'm sure you haven't had time to see my slides yet as I sent them just a few minutes ago. Once you have, please provide feedback, suggestions, etc.

5) Notes for CRTISP teleconferences

IO: The NRO Secretariat has been helping us produce really good notes, explaining who said what, etc. This was important, especially for the first meetings when we didn't provide recordings. But now that we actually provide recordings for every meetings I'd much rather have a simple format: action items, major points agreed and maybe an overall summary of the discussions. If people are curious they can go to the recordings. That way the Secretariat could focus on other tasks such as the NRO website and reduce the workload of the team as well.

NN (via chat): Good suggestion, Izumi - agree on more succinct notes!

IO: If there are no other comments or concerns regarding changing the format of the notes, let's change to a simplified format (core essence of what's been discussed at each meeting).

IO: I forgot to update you that the NRO EC expects us to continue engaging even after providing justification for the numbers proposal. There may be cases where the ICG expects a response from the number resources perspective. At some point it might be a good idea for the CRISP Team to prepare those responses. That's the type of engagement that will be expected. Also, I don't have a plan for a next call but I may ask for a call from time to time. I look forward to seeing you soon.

The meeting was closed at 13.43 UTC.