CRISP Team teleconference held on Wednesday, January 7th, 2015
(13:00 UTC)

**CRISP members present:**

**AFRINIC**
Alan Barret, AB

**APNIC**
Izumi Okutani, IO
Craig Ng, CN

**ARIN**
Michael Abejuela, MA

**LACNIC**
Andrés Piazza, AP
Esteban Lescano, EL
Nico Scheper, NS

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

**Agenda**
–––


1. Agenda Review
2. Actions Review
a. Minutes
b. Version Control of the drafts
c. Announcement of the comments closed on the IANAXFER list

3. Issues after the last call
a. Contract details (continued discussions)
b. Defining Review Commitee process
c. Community engagement in developing contract

4. Confirm status of issues
a. Issues to be reviewed on the ML (no discusssions at the call)
b. Reflecting CRISP Team positions per issues
   (IRP, Review Commitee, SLA)
c. Issues Status list

5. Preparation for the 2nd draft announcement
a. draft announcement & its timing
b. Deadline of comments to be submitted for texts

c. Timing to share the updated version within CRISP Team

6. Next call

7. AOB
−−−−−

1. **Agenda Review**
   IO reviewed the major agenda items.

2. **Actions review**
   a. Minutes
   b. Version control of the draft

   IO underlines that German Valdes (GV) is working on these two ítems and will post the minutes as soon as possible on the website.

   c. Announcement of the comments closed on the IANAXFER list

   IO: The comments are closed of the editing of the first draft proposal.

3. **Issues after the last call**


   b. **Defining Review Commitee process**

   IO underlines that Sean suggestion is the following: before the transition takes place all the details of the  the Review Committee should be defined. She asked for any additional comments.

   No comments

   IO suggests to incorporate this suggestion and reflect in the draft.

   AR (via chat): There is no objection

   AP (via chat): Agrees there are no objections

   AB disagrees because he believes the draft shouldn´t have so many details. He thinks the RV process should be defined before the transition but not before the 15th January and suggests to leave the text as it is.

   IO explaines that there is no need to define all the details in the draft, just simply to say that the RC process should be defined before the transition takes place.

PR: I agree with AB. I believe each RIR should define what works for them in relation to the RC but I think this is out of the scope of the CRISP Team. We should probably add that this information should be defined before the transition but no to define what exactly needs to happen. I believe the community should define it.

IO suggested to write on the draft that the RC process needs to be defined before the transition takes places but not now.

AB (via chat) : OK to add "this needs to be defined" to the text.

MA (via chat): I agree with AB

AR: Underlines that that is not the main problem. He thinks that they are asking if rather what will be the process for developing the charter of the RC and whether we could use the mechanism for developing this proposal.

NN (via chat): For the record, I agree with including such a statement.

CN (via chat): Agree with Nurani/Alan

IO (reads the email wrote by Sean): I had made suggestion about process of building the review team i.e the formation, charter et all be determined before the transition is completed. May i know what the CRISP team decided about this?

AR believes that the question focus on how the RC should be develop. Do CRISP Team care?

AB thinks it is out of scope, it is up to NRO EC to define the charter and it´s up to RIR communities to define the process.

NN Agrees with AB. She believes that the RIR Communities should define the selection of all representatives for each region, it should be a bottom– up process.

MA (via chat): agrees with NN

IO Summarizes that the consensus is that is out of the scope of the Crisp team, it should be the community who decides it and it should be defined before the transition.


c. **Community engagement in developing contract**

IO askes for comments.

AB believes that they should say on the draft that it should be finalised but it´s out of the scope of the CRISP team to do the work.

NN (via chat): I agree with AB

AR suggested to include in the proposal " we accept community desire to have this process transparent and open" but other than that is completely out of scope.
IO suggested to say in the proposal that we encourage the RIRs to do a transparent process in developing the SLA and say that it out of scope.

AB(via chat):Support AR to encourage RIR staff to use open process

PR(via chat): agrees

NN(via chat): agrees

EL(via chat): agrees

IO Asked NN and PR to add the statement in the draft.

PR: Of course we will do it. We have to be careful that we don´t do the RIR Community and the CEO´s work.

MA: I agree that this is out of scope. Do we really need to put sth in the draft? (asked all the other members of the CRISP team)

AR(via chat): it is definitely not substantive

NN(via chat): Agree with MA. Very good point.

CN(via chat): Agree with Michael

AP(via chat): Agree, Michael.

IO summarised that it´s maybe better not to mention anything as it could cause more confusion and doesn´t really add any additional information. She concluded that that information is out of the scope of the CRISP team and they don´t consider it apropiate to mention it in the draft.

## a. Contract details (continued discussions)

IO mentioned the comment of Hans Peter Holen (HPH) and asked the Group whether to have or not a fixed contract.

AR highlighted that the current version says that should be fixed. Agrees to HPH in relation to high level principles.

IO suggested to describe all the elements that CRISP team believe are important rather than define if it should be fixed or not–

CN suggested to add an automatic renewal with a sufficient noticed period as it is suggested in the public mailing list.

PR (via chat): I would like to leave to RIR Boards, CEOs to bash out and they will certainly approach community but I am in favour of fixed term if anything

CN (via chat): The current document says fixed term. No problem with leaving it to be considered later

MA: I support the high–level principles statements but I believe that if we start adding some contract details in the proposal it should be difficul to argue why other contract details shouldn´t be in the proposal.

PR(via chat): Oh yeah MA! I am with you

NN Agrees to MA

AR(via chat): "RIR communities are in control of the contract" – as a high–level principle? (termination, SLA review)

NN (via chat): Yes, good Andrei. Exactly

MA (via chat): perhaps high level principles (which I think it already states to some extent) that to ensure stability and flexibility to allow the contract holder (the RIR's) to ensure proper performance of the duties required by the IANA operator...but obviously more eloquently stated than I just did

IO asked to NN and PR to share this idea in the draft.

PR (via chat): I like this direction

NN and PR agree on adding that information.

4. **Confirm status of issues**

a**. Issues to be reviewed on the ML (no discusssions at the call)**

IO asked the CRISP Team to take a look at the email that she sent to the mailing list and add any comments in the next 12 hours and incorporate in the draft.

b**. Reflecting CRISP Team positions per issues
   (IRP, Review Commitee, SLA)**

No comments observed. It seems that all comments observed have already been added.

IO asked AR to send the updated version to MA (about the IRP)

**c. Issues Status list**

5. **Preparation for the 2nd draft announcement**

   **a. draft announcement & its timing**

   IO suggested to add the comments in the next 12 hours. She also suggested to publish the announcement at 13 UTC on the 8th January.

   AB asked if there is going to be enough time to add all the comments provided in the mailing list.

   IO suggested to create a list with all the main points that need to be incorporated. She volunteers to do it and asked the other members to review it.

   AR(via chat): i.e. when do we think the readline version coudl be ready?

   AR suggested to have a teleconference and go through the redline version tomorrow.

   PR(via chat): I think we can substantiate this… I don't want to go line by line through text we have had time for this

   CN (via chat): I don't believe we need any meeting before the draft being released; there shouldn't be any controversial item; can be done on mailing list

   PR (via chat): Agrees with AB and CN

   IO suggested to discuss all online and not to have another meeting tomorrow.

   NN Disagrees about the meeting, she believes a last teleconference before the announcement of the draft is important.

   MA will be working in the redline today and asked the team to send him the final texts to incorporate them.

   IO propones to give 4 hours window for closing.

MA (via chat): Close comments 4 hours after this call (18 UTC)– 7 UTC show the draft and 5 hours to comment – 12 UTC send crisp team list – 13UTC. I'll start working based on what we have so far and then move forward on that...and I"ll circulate ARIN's process within the next few hours as well

AB (via chat) : announce at 13:00 UTC tomorrow; final final version at 12:00 UTC;  last call until 11:00 UTC; semi–final draft from Michael at 07:00 UTC tomorrow; close comments on suggested text at 18:00 UTC today.

MA (via chat): 08/12 12:00 UTC (final draft); 08/12 11:00 UTC (final comments for incorporation); 08/12 7:00 UTC (updated draft); 07/12 18:00 UTC (close comments)


IO suggested to follow the Schedule proponed by MA and AB.