24th CRISP Team teleconference held on Wednesday, August 12th 2015 (13:00 UTC)

**CRISP members present:**

**AFRINIC**

Mwendwa Kivuva, MK

**APNIC**

Craig Ng, CN

Izumi Okutani, IO

**ARIN**

Michael Abejuala, MA

John Sweeting, JS

**RIPE NCC**

Andrei Robachevsky, AR

Paul Rendek, PR

Nurani Nimpuno, NN

Laureana Pavón, LP - Scribe

**Draft agenda:**

1. Agenda Review

2. Actions Review

 a. Meeting Notes

 b. CRISP Team Charter

 c. Communications

3. Coordination with Other communities: IPR

4. CRISP Comment to the ICG

5. SLA ver.2

6. AOB

**1. Agenda Review**

**2. Actions Review**

**a. Meeting Notes**

Action: NRO Secretariat to double-check to see all meeting records are up to date on the NRO website.

**b. CRISP Team Charter**

NN updated what had been discussed during the last meeting.

Action: NN to send a reminder to the CRISP list (last call for comments on CRISP team charter).

**c. Communications**

IO: Comms have updated the website. If anyone has feedback, send it to IO or NN and they’ll forward it to the comms team.

**3. Coordination with Other communities: IPR**

IO recapped what she had already shared on the mailing list.

IO circulated a draft memo of observations on IPR in general.

Next steps: Submit this to the CWG in writing before they have a call on 20th August.

Comments brought up:

- At this point the timelines are not totally clear.

- There was encouragement from ICG chair (Alissa) that a new proposal not consistent with the numbers proposal could disrupt the timelines. They’re expecting to submit their comment before the close of the comments period (8 September).

- The CWG doesn’t seem to understand what they are trying to reach, e.g., consensus or 100% agreement. The group is nowhere near agreement. Alissa has also encouraged the CWG to try to move towards consensus. Perhaps it might be worth confirming about this.

- The chairs of the CWG are trying to see what variations are possible being consistent with the numbers proposal. In addition to the IETF trust, other options were proposed (e.g., ICANN holding the mark). This would not be compatible with the numbers proposal. It’s important to have our views in writing so they can see what their options are.

CN: We as a community need to be sensible as well. We don’t want this issue to derail the entire transition. None of these issues are essential (use of the IANA trademark, the IANA name). We’re not talking about whether or not we can continue to provide the service in the future, we’re talking simply about the name. Also, we need a license to use IPR, not ownership. A license to use can be given to us in many ways or forms. I’m not asking to change our proposal, but simply saying in the interest of a transition we might want to be reasonable and not have this holding things up.

MK: Should we consider a plan B if at any eventuality CWG insists that the IPR should stay within ICANN?

NN: We need to be clear that the CWG doesn’t have consensus on this, there’s nothing we can do at this point. Another thing is that we cannot make any judgment calls on behalf of the community, so if anything is not in agreement with our proposal we need to go back to our community.

MA: We don’t want to be moving backwards. We have a proposal, including about IPR, the CWG doesn’t seem to have a firm position on this. We need a firm response.

Everyone agreed with MA.

IO: Suggested way forward: If the CWG comes up to us and says they didn’t reach consensus on what seems to be compatible with the numbers proposal, at that point CRISP can actually say yes or no about certain things.

Next steps: IO has circulated a draft of the observation to be sent to the CWG and would like the CRISP team’s input so that details can be discussed on line.

IO proceeded to go through and comment on the draft she’d circulated to the mailing list earlier that morning, including the Sidley’s three scenarios.

AR: From a historical perspective, I would focus on the IETF, not the NTIA.

IO: It’s a matter of brushing up the language that’s been circulating.

NN: The Sidley analysis is very much from the numbers perspective. Maybe we can find a way to communicate that.

Way forward: Continue discussions on the mailing list, targeting submission to the CWG on the 17th.

**4. CRISP Comment to the ICG**

Volunteers provided an update:

AR: In general we’re agreeing on the ICG assessment of the proposal. Some details need to be sorted out, but no substantial issues stand out.

JS: I basically followed the same thought pattern as AR.

IO: I agree with the approach to put focus on the numbers proposal. We can’t speak on behalf of other communities.

NN: I admit I struggled in finding the right balance when answering the questions. I found that rehashing the text in our proposal might not be that useful.

IO: The reason why NN and I had more challenge is that the questions we covered are of a more general nature. My approach: I focused on the number community perspective but briefly mentioned what might not be controversial to other communities.

PR: I read your draft. I agree with the document. I felt we’re reconfirming the positions of our communities. If anything, my suggestion would be to strengthen the comments in the sense that we are listening to our community and staying true to what they’re asking from us.

IO: Next step: We have it until the end of this week for comments on the individual components (UTC 14:00 on Friday), then MA can combine the proposals in a single document. Hopefully people will have already commented and there will be nothing controversial. MA will compile the proposal by Monday and share on the global list on Tuesday next week. I encourage all to communicate this to your regional communities once the response is out on the global list.

**5. SLA ver.2**

IO: We have until end of the month for comments. I suggest we give ourselves 2 weeks to review the SLA and compile comments before this additional CRISP call suggested for next week (to be confirmed).

Action: IO will send a reminder to provide comments on SLA ver.2.

CN: The legal team is working and will produce a matrix. If necessary, a new version of the document will be produced, but there have been no substantive comments.

**6. AOB**

Action: The Secretariat to set up a doodle poll to see when the next call will be held (doodle poll options: August 19th or 20th, 13:00 UTC)

The call ended at 14:06 UTC.