

CRISP Team teleconference held on Thursday, October 8th 2015 (13:00 UTC)

CRISP members present:

AFRINIC

Mwendwa Kivuva, MK

APNIC

Izumi Okutani, IO

ARIN

Michael Abejuala, MA

John Sweeting, JS

Bill Woodcock, BW

LACNIC

RIPE NCC

Andrei Robachevsky

Paul Rendek

Nurani Nimpuno

Laureana Pavón, LP - Scribe

Germán Valdez, GV (apologies)

Observers:

Chris Buckridge

Paul Wilson, PW

Greg Wood

Athina Fragkouli

Ernest Byaruhanga

Grace Abuhamad

Draft agenda:

1. Agenda Review
2. Action Items
 - a. Minutes from the last call
3. The questions from the ICG
4. IPR
 - a. Principles
 - b. IANAPLAN approach
 - c. Implementation time

5. General implementation plan
6. ICANN54
7. Next Meetings
8. AOB

The meeting began at 13:03 UTC

1. Agenda Review

Welcome. No items were added to the agenda.

2. Actions Review

a. Minutes from the last call

All notes will be posted before next meeting.

3. The questions from the ICG

IO noted they had been asked two questions:

- 1) Are we willing to coordinate with the other communities on this point?
- 2) Whether the numbers community would like to participate in the CSC and IFR processes proposed by the numbers community.

NN and IO had shared draft comments on the list as follows:

- 1) Short answer: Yes, we're willing to coordinate with the other communities on this point.
- 2) Short conclusion: Quoting from the number resources proposals: "the Number Community does not see a need to participate in the CSC and IFR" as we find it is out of scope.

IO noted there would be an ICG meeting in a few hours, so that was the time to share if anyone had any comments.

NN suggested that perhaps the best way to proceed was to wait for the ICG meeting to see if there are any further specific coordination, processes, structures, they feel should be put in place. NN added that was more of an RIR issue than a CRISP issue.

No further comments were added to what had been sent to the mailing list.

Conclusion: The text contained in NN's email to the list will be considered the CRISP Team's final comments.

4. IPR

a. Principles

IO said PR had shared the principles, people have felt they were good. She asked whether they wanted to be clear that the holder of the IPR must have expertise in IPR or whether they we feel that the term "competence" is enough.

AR said that if they're trying to imply that the existing organization has a good track record, then it's important to mention, but if they're talking about a new organization, "general competence" and how it's phrased now would be sufficient.

MA said the principles as written would cover what they want to cover.

Conclusion: In general, people are satisfied with the current wording.

NN said in her opinion 1) they want to have a competent organization, 2) a proven track record. She said she'd added something about "serving the public interest" which she felt would be a good principle to add.

MA agreed "public interest" would be a good addition and competence as well. About the proven track record, he said they're not sure what the ultimate solution was going to be, so adding this might be a limiting factor, restricting the identity of who they're trying to choose.

AR said they could mention IETF Trust as an entity they feel fulfills these requirements (one way to limit the scope would be to reference an existing organization that meets the requirements as a remark in this document).

NN said they want to be clearer, more descriptive. She said in some ways she liked AR's suggestion of at least mentioning the IETF trust.

Recap: CRISP will keep the principles drafted by PR as written, and then quote from the proposal about the IETF trust (so this will be an addition).

All agreed.

NN quoted from the proposal: "From the Internet Number Community's perspective, the IETF Trust would be an acceptable candidate for this role."

b. IANAPLAN approach

IO described the IANAPLAN approach and asked whether anyone saw any inconsistencies with the IPR principles.

AR and NN said they saw no inconsistencies. AR added they also need to ensure that the agreements meet the requirements.

Way forward:

IO will make a suggestion on the mailing list and see if there are any concerns. CRISP members will have until the end of this week for comments. If no objections are heard, they can share these IPR principles

and then say they see no inconsistencies in the framework of the approach and that, moving forward, they'd like to see that the final text observes the requirements.

c. Implementation time

IO said that initially it had been observed that they didn't see the need to complete implementation of IPR before the transition, but now there are different opinions.

AR noted that IPR issues were an accountability component and, because they were such an important component, they had to be implemented before the transition.

IO said that, at this point, the option was whether they wanted this completed before submission of the proposal to the NTIA or before the expiration of the contract, adding that there was no option to leave this for post-transition. She said that if no further comments were expressed, they could choose the option of trying to complete this before the transition.

No objections were heard.

Way forward: Try to complete IPR implementation before the transition.

5. General implementation plan

IO said they had already completed the second public comments on the SLA. She asked the RIR people to comment on whether negotiation with ICANN had started.

IO asked whether discussions had started regarding the appointment of review committee members.

PR replied that these negotiations were expected to begin in Dublin. He said there hadn't been any comments on the ARIN list but that he did have some questions sent to him by Jason Schiller which he planned to share later in the day (questions regarding the SLA and how the mechanisms will be enforced). He said he might suggest that Jason send his questions to the CRISP mailing list.

BW added that, as of last week, NTIA was reengaged and was actually able to consider proposals. Until November 1st there was a window for NTIA to do something if they were given anything actionable. Then it would have to go to Congress for approval.

IO asked whether any of the regions had updates on the review committee selection. She suggested going back to each RIR to start the process, as it would be good to know who the members would be before the transition.

6. ICANN54

IO said NN has asked the ASO AC chairs whether it would be possible to give a presentation on the status of the IANA transition from the numbers perspective.

Way forward: JS to follow up with Louie Lee and the ASO AC vice-chairs to see if there will be a session available and if they have a slot for CRISP (10-15 minutes). He'll then get back to NN later in the day.

IO suggested meeting as the CRISP team in Dublin.

Action: The NRO Secretariat to help coordinate a CRISP Team meeting in Dublin, including remote participation (if possible).

IO also suggested keeping track of CCWG discussions, as if they are delayed, the whole IANA stewardship transition timeline would also be delayed.

BW asked whether IO saw some possibility that the CCWG would come to a full conclusion in the next 30 days, because he was not seeing this possibility.

IO replied that it was a very tough situation and that she was not totally optimistic but thought the chairs were still seeking the possibility of publishing the draft proposal sometime in November (that's the best scenario).

BW noted that the CCWG were not in their critical path so there's no time spent on them that advances the numbers' cause.

IO said that while she didn't necessarily disagree, at this point she was of the opinion that they might want to keep the best efforts in moving the proposal forward in an integrated way.

BW asked what was the possibility of advancing in an integrated way before November 11th.

Without going into details, IO replied that certain options were seeing some traction (differences of opinion between members of the board and members of the SOs) and that she was of the idea that they shouldn't completely rule out the possibility of the CCWG being able to meet the timelines.

BW said that, to the best of his knowledge, the CCWG or the CWG were not going to do anything in this window, so they could either succeed or tie themselves to their position.

IO said it might be premature to conclude that before they see what's going to happen in Dublin.

NN said they needed to be clear about what their concerns were, adding that many people in the numbers community were expressing strong concern about what was going on in the CCWG. She said everyone wanted a successful transition, but they should also be aware of the risks. She noted that it would make sense to make a statement expressing their concern. NN was personally of the opinion that they need to remain constructive, but also discuss what the risks are and what other options there are, being careful with how they proceed.

IO asked whether NN was suggesting the CRISP Team should make a statement about the concerns regarding the timeline.

NN said she was just saying that at the ICANN meeting they should be clear about what their concerns were (comments in the various working groups, public forums was more along the lines of what she was thinking).

BW asked what the concern was exactly.

IO replied that it was a concern about the impact on timelines and the transition. NN added that if one of the three communities did not come to a conclusion on time, then that would affect everyone.

BW said that one of the communities had already not managed to come to a conclusion on time, that it was no longer hypothetical. He added that IO and NN had stated that they (CRISP) all shared the same concern, and that he was trying to understand what that concern was, as he was not sure there was consensus.

IO said it was a concern about the impact of a possible delay in the CCWG timeline, which might make it difficult for the transition to actually happen before the contract expires.

Just to be clear about what they were talking about, NN said what the NTIA and ICANN have expressed is basically that there are three phases (community proposal and public comments; NTIA review, evaluation and implementation planning; implementation execution). She noted that if the proposal was delivered to the ICANN Board in November, there would then be a phase of evaluation by the NTIA which would take them to April/May, an implementation phase that would take them to August/September, and the transition would still be possible. However, if there was no submission to the ICANN Board and the NTIA before the beginning of next year, then the transition won't be able to happen in time for the September 2016 deadline.

NN added that she thought it was premature to say the other community had failed and that they should be careful about being constructive.

BW noted that in that case they did not all share this concern.

PR said they were nearing a point where there was cause for concern and that he shared the concerns NN had expressed. He said if BW thought there was no cause for concern, he'd like to know why.

BW said they had two possibilities: 1) do nothing and continue talking about whether CCWG would come into harmonious agreement with CWG and the ICANN Board and in some time in 2018 the new administration can pick up the process and start all over again, or 2) try to get numbers and protocols through so NTIA can pass something to congress on 11th November or earlier.

IO said this discussion was very useful, but that they were already 20 minutes over time.

IO suggested the following way forward: "It's still premature to make a decision at this stage or at this call. Let's continue this dialogue at the ICANN meeting and, if needed, online as well."

All agreed.

7. Next Meetings

The next CRISP meeting will be held during ICANN Dublin.

Action: The Secretariat to schedule the call.

8. AOB

Meeting adjourned at 14.30