

CRISP Team teleconference held on Monday, January 5th 2015 (13:00 UTC)

CRISP members present:

AFRINIC

Alan P. Barrett, AB
Mwendwa Kivuva, MK

APNIC

Izumi Okutani, IO
Craig Ng, CN

ARIN

Michael Abejuala, MA
John Sweeting, JS

LACNIC

Esteban Lescano, EL
Andrés Piazza, AP
Nico Scheper

RIPE NCC

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

Agenda

1. Agenda Review
2. Actions Review
 - a. Minutes
 - b. Recordings
 - c. Version control of drafts
3. Confirm new comments since the 7th call
 - a. Each RIR region
 - b. Global list
4. CRISP Team position per issues
 - a. RIR Accountability
 - b. Contract
 - c. Determining support for the final proposal to ICG

5. Preparation for the 2nd draft
 - a. Topics to be reflected in the 2nd draft
 - b. Announcement
6. Next Meeting
7. AOB

1. Agenda review

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

2. Actions review

a. Minutes

DONE. Minutes from the previous meeting are already posted on website.

b. Recordings

All recordings of past meetings are available on mp4.

c. Version control of drafts

GV: This is a work in progress. I'm still missing a few MS Word documents. I've already started to publish some documents with version control on CRISP team timeline.

IO: As long as we have this sorted before we publish the second draft I don't see any problem.

3. Confirm new comments since the 7th call

a. Each RIR region

IO: Instead of going region by region, if there are any new comments, please raise them.

No comments were heard.

b. Global list

IO: The only new comment I observed is the feedback from Filiz, three suggested changes which I raised on the CRISP mailing list. I think we still haven't properly covered the comments from JPNIC, which AB has already shared on our list and is driving the discussions. Are there any other issues we should discuss?

None were heard.

4. CRISP Team position per issues

a. IPR

First I'd like to cover IPR rights status. AR has shared our position on global mailing list. There was one feedback received regarding transferring the iana.org and trademark to the IETF Trust. The point was, agreement is needed from the communities of the other two IANA functions, IETF and Names community to transfer to IETF Trust. AR, would you like to add anything?

AR: There was support from a community member. I also observed the comment IO mentioned. Our support is dependent on other communities, and that's why I haven't drafted the exact language. We should say that's how we would like it to be, not this is how it should be because there are dependencies. ("We propose to state that it is the expectation of the RIR communities that the public number resource registries are in the public domain. It is the preference of the RIR communities that all relevant parties acknowledge that fact as part of the transition. There were several suggestions on the IANAXFER mailing list that one of the possible entities could be the IETF Trust")

IO: I'm comfortable with your wording. Given that there's general support for AR's summary, I wonder if we're comfortable to reflect this general position in the second draft.

No opposition was heard.

IO: Any volunteers to work on the wording for the 2nd draft?

AR: I can certainly continue working on this issue.

MA (via chat): I'm happy to provide any support to Andrei as needed.

b. Contract

IO: PR has shared a draft of the main principles to be included in the SLA which I find very helpful. I think there was one comment on the NRO in the sense that they'd like the contract to not have a term but be dependent on termination conditions.

PR: I look forward to everyone's feedback on this. I don't know about having a "not fixed" term. I don't know if I'm willing to say that's a good idea at this point. We should really try to make sure that we position the RIRs as the ultimate stewards of the Internet number resources and the registries. That was the reason behind what was done here. I look forward to your feedback on this and also on Seun's position.

IO: My personal observation is that it does seem to cover the major points discussed within the CRISP team. I also welcome additional feedback, especially from those with legal knowledge and who have been reviewing the NTIA contract.

AB: I initiated a discussion on the IANA XFER list about the contract term. From Seun's message dated January 2nd, I get the impression that the reason he wants a continuous rather than a fixed term contract is that the renewal process would require resources (time, effort and money). My personal opinion is that we don't have to worry too much about that. If we have a review committee, not many additional resources should be required above that. I don't share Seun's concern.

NN: I agree with AB's comment about the review committee. I think it makes sense to have fixed term.

First, it will give flexibility in terms of the SLA (amendments between each term). Second, the RIPE community feels strongly that it is the numbering community that has the power here. We don't want to make it hard to terminate the contract.

PR (via chat): +1. I agree with NN. Those are good points.

AR: I think those are very good principles that PR sent to the list, I mostly agree with all of them. I also agree with NN regarding the reasoning for the fixed term. I suggest we make the principles relating to IPR consistent with what we've just discussed. Suggested wording: "It is the preference of the RIR communities that registry data be in the public domain and all relevant parties acknowledge that as part of the transition."

PR (via chat): I like the suggestion.

NN (via chat): Makes sense to me.

AP (via chat): I support.

JS (via chat): Support.

MA: I support the idea of having a specific term for the contract. This might be getting into details of the overarching principles, but there are a host of legal options (e.g., we can have automatic renewals if they're worried about the resources). But we should have the option of not renewing if we're not happy with the service or wish to explore different providers.

MK (via chat): A fixed contract is good because it gives us a point in time to reflect and assess the performance of the IANA operator, and if the RIR community have any issues with the IANA operator and the SLA is not sufficiently met, we can have options to either continue with this operator or look for a new operator.

AR (via chat): +1 to MK.

PR (via chat): +1. Nicely put, Mwendwa.

IO: If there are no other different comments related to the contract, I'd like to encourage everyone to review the comment PR has shared on line.

One more question: How would you like to include this in our proposal? Perhaps as an annex?

PR: I think it should be part of the proposal. It could be an annex, but I would like to see it in the proposal that the communities have the stewardship of what's going on here.

from Nurani Nimpuno (RIPE) to Everyone:

+1 part of the proposal

IO: Action: To incorporate this into the proposal. Paul, would you like to volunteer?

PR: We'll produce text on that. We can make a suggestion and then everybody can provide feedback.

NN (via chat): I can assist Paul in writing that.

IO: Let's set a 24-hour deadline after this call on any additional changes CRISP Team members would like to add to the list of issues.

IO: One of the comments I've seen on the list is about the composition of the review team. We also haven't addressed JPNIC's comments. AB will chair for the latter.

AB: Let me start with a summary of my understanding. There was a message from JPNIC raising several points, some of them about the review team. I sent a message to the CRISP mailing list with my summary of those. In my understanding, there are 3 issues we need to consider: 1) qualifications of review team members; 2) process for performing the review; 3) appointment process for the review team members. JPNIC's suggestion is that review team members should be elected by the RIR communities much like NRO NC members. Any comments on that?

MK (via chat): I am just wondering how Elections and Qualifications will fit in. Elected members tend to be politicians.

NN: I made my comment on the mailing list. The points by JPNIC were very good. However, as I said on the mailing list, we shouldn't –here– define the process and criteria for candidates of the review team, as that would be best left to the RIR communities. However, it might be wise to define principles such as “a good understanding of..., etc” but have the actual process defined by each RIR community.

AR (via chat): I support NN's comment.

AB: The NRO NC contains 3 members from each RIR – two appointed by the community, one appointed by the board or some similar structure. Would that kind of thing make sense for the review committee as well?

MK (via chat): Yes. If we use the NRO-NC way will be more acceptable by the community.

PR (via chat): Okay with me.

AB: Any volunteers to integrate this discussion into the document? I volunteer myself.

PR: In doing this we are leaving this up to each of the communities, right? It would be the communities

who decide how these members are appointed?

AB: Yes, we'd say we want three members, two appointed by the community, one by the board, but how it's done is up to the community.

JS (via chat): I think PR's point is important.

NN (via chat): +1 to JS.

c. Issues which are not yet being discussed

IO: Andrew Dul listed a few principles; you can check them out on the mailing list. These are high level principles (- The review report will be publicly disclosed; - the review committee selection and process conducted in an open and transparent manner; - If the NRO EC determines that a change is needed with the IANA numbers function contract; the RFP for a new contractor will be conducted in a fair, open and transparent process in line with applicable industry best practices and standards.)

My observation, shared by NN, is that is in agreement with our vision to include high level principles in our proposal. I'll send these principles to the list once again and I'd like to give 24 hours to respond to the email I sent asking for comments.

Another point I'd like to discuss is that there's been a suggestion whether to define an interval for the reviews. How do you feel about this?

AB: I sent a suggestion via email that it should be possible for the RIRs to call for a review almost at any time, even if we do have a fixed schedule. I suggest that we could define a minimum fixed interval but also that we could have a review at any time if it is proposed by at least 2 RIRs.

NN (via chat): I think Alan's suggestion makes sense.

IO: Let's incorporate AB's suggestion in the draft along with the 3 other issues Andrew Dul has raised. We'll wait 24 hours for feedback while, in parallel, we incorporate this into the proposal. Do we have any volunteers to reflect this in the proposal?

AB (via chat): I volunteer.

IO: Another point raised by Andrew Dull is accountability. He feels that RIR accountability & oversight within their own regions is also an important consideration and that every stakeholder should consider if the RIRs themselves are appropriately accountable to their members and stakeholders.

It seems, though, that in our proposal we've already covered accountability with the accountability matrix. Is there anything else we need to add in relation to this discussion of RIR accountability that we

haven't already included in the draft?

No comments were heard.

IO: It seems that people don't have a strong opinion on whether to work a bit more on this area of our draft. Any concerns in leaving the draft as it is and considering that we've sufficiently addressed RIR accountability?

No comments were heard, so it was decided to keep the wording as it is and explain that the CRISP Team has described what's been discussed in regards to RIR accountability.

4c) Determining support for the final proposal to ICG

IO: I think this is a very interesting and important point. Andrew Dul mentioned that one suggestion is that we set one place for feedback and then ICGs can refer to this mailing list/webpage/other resource to see what kind of support we have for the current draft. Is that something we could consider?

AR: I think we should use the same process we used for compiling community feedback. The issue tracker is a key element. It makes it clear that we tracked the issues raised, that they were dealt with and that the CRISP Team reached conclusions that are supported by the community. We could then leave some time for the community to comment on that and incorporate those comments.

AR (via chat): For every substantive issue the CRISP team will try to determine if there is sufficient support from the community for a proposed resolution. The CRISP Team will do this by consensus and as last resort - by voting (per charter).

CN (via chat): I agree with Andrei.

IO: That makes sense to me. We'll use the IANA XFER mailing list. Just to understand: if the ICG wants to confirm the level of support provided to the draft, they can consult the mailing list archives.

NN (via chat): Andrei's suggestion makes sense. It's consistent with our current process and consistent with the RIR spirit, in my view.

AR (via chat): I agree.

CN (via chat): Yes to IO.

MK (via chat): I agree.

AB (via chat): Yes, I agree.

NN (via chat): I agree.

5. Preparation for the 2nd draft

a. Topics to be reflected in the 2nd draft

IO: We've gone through and now have volunteers for the issues we've discussed today, but there are some issues that we haven't discussed but on which I'm seeking feedback on the CRISP mailing list (I sent a message to the mailing list today).

IO proceeded to read the issues (editorial suggestions). I think AB has provided some further editorial changes which NN has agreed to incorporate. NN, would you mind sending this to the CRISP mailing list to see if everyone's ok with those?

NN: I'll send another text after this meeting with your suggested changes and AB's.

IO: I'll resend the list so that everybody can check what other issues should be incorporated based on mailing list discussions.

b. Announcement

IO: This is pretty straightforward as we've already made a first announcement. The change is that we have the excel spreadsheet of issues raised by the community and how the CRISP Team has dealt with each of these issues. I'll update the spreadsheet based on today's call.

AR: Will we provide the differences from version one to version two?

IO: I think that's a good suggestion. I was assuming that by providing the list of issues we would naturally be providing the list of points that have changed. But if you believe it's better to extract the major changes we've made, we can do that too. I'm happy to do the drafting and see if everybody is happy with it.

AB (via chat): Can we produce a redline document showing changes from v1 to v2?

IO: We can certainly provide the issues list and the redline version. If I recall correctly, MA has volunteered to be the pen and reflect the changes from the edited version.

MA (via chat): Yes that is correct :-)

IO: We can send editorial suggestions to MA, who will prepare the redline version.

Conclusion: To provide both the spreadsheet of issues and redline version.

6. Next Meeting

IO: As a backup plan, may I suggest having a meeting on the 7th? Then, if everything goes smoothly, we can cancel this meeting.

PR: That's a great suggestion – to have one as a placeholder.

7. AOB

PR: An additional point I'd like to mention. We've got this wonderful spreadsheet – I'd love to go through that spreadsheet and see if there's anything we need to go back to. Just run through each item and make sure that we've done everything.

IO: Do you want to do this now?

PR: That would be helpful.

IO proceeded to go through the latest version of the issues spreadsheet (NRODiscussionList_20150104_CRISPinternal (1).xlsx)

Some notes on from this review of issues spreadsheet:

Confirmation about whether there is a need to change the existing MoUs

IO: I sent a message to the mailing list stating that this doesn't affect the existing MoUs. I continue to welcome feedback on the ML

MK (via chat): We can explain on the spreadsheet then broadcast to IANAXFR.

NN (via chat): I thought your mail to Seun regarding the gPDP was excellent Izumi.

CN (via chat): I don't believe those two MOUs will need to change.

Describe the global process in Section VI

IO: This is the part that we need to have more description (how the CRISP Team has conducted the process, the level of consensus achieved, etc.). We need to work on this before the second draft. I'm happy to draft this part, additional volunteers are welcome.

NN volunteered to help IO work on this.

Fill in information in ARIN and LACNIC regions

EL (via chat): We are working on LACNIC's information. We hope to have it done in next 48 hours.

IO: Let's set the same timeline for the ARIN region.

AB then went through the issues raised by JPNIC (NRODiscussionList_JPNIC2041229.xlsx)

IO: I believe Andrew Sullivan has raised two points. The first is already being addressed by AB, so the next step would be incorporating AB's text into our 2nd draft. The second point that Andrew is whether we are going to cover the case where only the number resource community wants to change the IANA operator, not the other 2 functions.

AR: AR: If I'm not mistaken, that was our main assumption – that we are not acting in isolation but we are independent from other communities. We, the numbering community control our own fate. Perhaps we can make it more clear that when we talk about the IANA function we are talking about the numbering resources IANA function. When we talk about SLAs, those SLAs cover just this particular function. When we talk about termination, again we are talking about this particular function. When I say not in isolation, I think that might require coordination with other communities should we decide to move to another operator. I'm not sure we should cover this necessarily in our response.

IO: I agree. I think that as long as we clarify the condition under which the contract might be terminated from the number community perspective that would address this point.

NN: I agree with AR. It wasn't entirely clear to me from Andrew Sullivan's email; I don't think he's asking for us to define all that here, but that it's assumed that we have an independent contract. Perhaps that could be made more explicit.

IO: If NN and PR could take a look at Andrew Sullivan's point again to see if the current draft language is sufficient. He's seeking clarity in the language, I believe.

NN and PR agreed to do this.

AB (via chat): We should add Andrew Sullivan's issues to the spreadsheet.

IO: They are reflected in the latest version that can now be posted on the NRO website as the official position of the CRISP Team, including the comments from JPNIC and the comments from Andrew Sullivan.

As no further comments were heard, the meeting was adjourned at 14.20 UTC.

