

26th CRISP Team meeting, held on Wednesday, August 26th 2015 (13:00 UTC)

CRISP members present:

AFRINIC

APNIC

Izumi Okutani, IO

ARIN

Michael Abejuala, MA

John Sweeting

LACNIC

RIPE NCC

Andrei Robachevsky

Paul Rendek

Nurani Nimpuno

Laureana Pavón, LP - Scribe

Germán Valdez, GV

Observers:

Athina Fragkouli

Draft agenda:

1. Agenda Review
2. Actions Review
 - a. Meeting Notes
 - b. Update on communications plan
 - d. Update on IPR status
 - d. Update on CRISP Comment to the ICG
3. SLA ver.2
4. AOB

The meeting began at 13:02 UTC

1. Agenda Review

-

2. Actions Review

a. Meeting Notes

IO noted she's holding a couple of meeting notes and needs to get back to GV about them.

b. Update on communications plan

- NN shared the plan from the RIR communications team (the general draft that might be made available for anyone to copy and use as submission to the ICG). This document is still under work,

IO will follow up with the communications team to know when this will be ready.

NN noted that a first draft was circulated to IO and NN and the other communications people and was waiting for comments. NN will try to give her reply this week (it was very general). Perhaps they could try to work a bit more on that text by the end of this week.

d. Update on IPR status

IO gave the following update:

- The CWG held their meeting
- The current direction they're moving towards is they're trying to be consistent with the number community proposal (organization independent from the IANA functions, e.g. the IETF Trust), but at this stage they are trying not to specify a specific organization, simply the general criteria (the specific organization is left up to the implementation).
- They're trying to come up with more bullet points on what would be the criteria for the organization holding the mark. We'd be expected to share our feedback on those bullet points, so in parallel we might want to start thinking about what these bullet points might be.

NN noted they could start putting together their own principles so they're not only commenting on the CWG's. Just like with the Sidley analysis, the CWG will be looking at what's important to the names community, so they could start putting together the principles that are important to the number community.

Suggestion: Discuss on this on the mailing list.

PR volunteered to work on some bullet points.

IO thanked PR and said she expected there would be a suggestion for a call with the CWG once they have their points ready, so this would be very useful.

Action: PR will take a stab at drafting bullet points on the IPR issue, put together something and send it to the list. Deadline: by the end of next week (there's no hard deadline, but it would be nice to have it early).

d. Update on CRISP Comment to the ICG

IO noted she had circulated the latest draft a couple of hours ago. She commented highlights from the email sent to the mailing list (end of last week, subject: Response to the ICG Re: Actions).

IO asked for comments regarding her notes on questions 2 and 6 and/or also regarding DNS vs. IANA numbering services (one or both).

NN and MA: Let's cover both

AR: I feel uncomfortable covering the overall DNS. We should limit this to our particular delegated service.

NN: I think it's fine for us to comment on the IANA functions. The first part is commenting on the overall combined proposal, for the other things where we've commented more in general (bottom up, supports multistakeholder model, etc.) perhaps we're confident to comment on the CWG proposal as individuals, not as the CRISP team.

AR: There was general agreement that we're looking at the proposal from a numbers perspective. In this case I feel the scope needs to be limited. In this case we can comment on the DNS, not the other things.

Suggestion: Everyone take a look at the latest version and comment whether they're confident with what we're covering.

General agreement: We don't want to go much further than what's relevant to the number community (DNS, reverse zone, stability and re saliency of number services)

Next step: After this call, let's give one hour for everyone to take a look, if no further comments on this are heard, we'll circulate this latest draft (absolute deadline within UTC 23:00 today, August 26th).

Messaging to the community when we share this to the general list:

- Ask to spread the word to their peers to make comments to the ICG
- Feel free to use CRISP response as a reference

IO asked the following question: Do we want support expressed for the CRISP team response to the ICG? I don't think we need to ask for edits or suggestions, but what about explicit support on the global list?

She mentioned the following options:

- We ask the community to express support for the CRISP team response to the ICG on the global list
- We ask them to submit comments to the ICG directly saying they support the CRISP team response

NN suggested saying the following: "Here's my response, please read it. You can then send a message saying 'I support the CRISP team response.' "If you want to copy any part of our response, please do". "You don't need to reply to all the questions." She suggested that if the RIRs could write a draft in

support of this process then that would be very useful too.

IO said she'd drafted an announcement and would share it soon to the list so people can add these things NN mentioned and any others they feel are needed.

AR: We should make it clear that we are expecting a sense of community support.

PR: Agree with AR. We've been consistent with how we ask for support. The CRISP team has been mandated to do our work and come back to the community. Without changing it up too much, consistency of our communication is important. Of course anyone can comment, but for this specific piece we'd like to see support.

AR asked a question regarding the timeline: If we ask for support from the community, we should be prepared to incorporate their feedback. Do we have time for that?

IO: It's important that the community feels comfortable with the response. If any of community member feels slightly different, they can send their own response. But if several members feel different, how do we address that? We're tight on the timeline. My preferred approach: we make this the CRISP team response, we welcome support "as is" and others can submit comments to the ICG themselves. Is this democratic enough? Comments?

NN: It depends on how we see this submission. I feel our response is not being crafted by the community (the proposal was). I find it hard to go through the same process for this submission, there's not enough time. We did say it was the CRISP team response, not the community response. I find it hard to seek consensus as we did with the proposal. The pragmatic way to go about this is to try to draft a response that's as good as possible, and say this is the CRISP team assessment. It comes back to our mandate, what we were elected to do. We need to be clear that we're not claiming to be the channel, and that if anyone has a different opinion, please submit it to the ICG.

AR: I agree. This is the best we can feasibly do.

IO: How we submit our comment to the ICG is different from our submission of the proposal as well as our observations on the SLA and Review Committee charter. We are expected to encourage the numbers community to submit comments to the ICG, but I don't think our comment will be seen as the comment of the community. We might put as introduction "this is the comment of the CRISP team, not of the community". I think with that we're accountable enough to the community.

MA (via chat): I was going to raise my hand but IO said what I was going to say. There are different contexts of a proposal vs. a comment. As long as we are careful to not take community positions but rather are just commenting it elaborating on the proposals, we should be well within our bounds and encourage other comments if different from our comments.

3. SLA ver.2

IO noted the deadline was next Monday and was hoping to have feedback on this before this call. She apologized for not having had time to look into the details.

IO said CRISP team comments from version 1 had been adequately incorporated and asked MA for highlights that might be worth taking a look at as compared to version 1.

MA (via chat): I'm happy to put together a write up for the group. I'll circulate some of the key points of the changes to consider.

Action: Everyone to provide feedback by Thursday 27th (14:00 UTC), then compile comments on the 28th and submit to NRO RC on Monday 31st.

IO suggested the following next steps:

- 1) Ask the RIRs about the possible next steps and clarity on the timeline so people know what to expect
- 2) How do we ensure that the final implementation details will be consistent with the proposal? Not ask this kind of question, but perhaps some kind of statement.

No further comments were heard.

4. AOB

Next call:

Decision: Go back to the regular call schedule.

Nest regularly scheduled teleconference will be on 10th September.

Call ended at 14.01 UTC