CRISP Teleconference held on Thursday, December 11th 2014 (13.00 UTC)

0. Welcome

1. Agenda Review

2. Actions Review

Action I: GV to create a private, closed mailing list for CRISP members as soon as possible.
Action II: GV to update Micheal´s draft CRISP timeline
Action III: Craig, Andrei, Michael and Esteban to prepare and share a first draft of the document.
Action IV: GV to gather proposals in each RIR regions and post on NRO website.

3. Discussions about the draft proposal
   a) Briefing from the initial draft volunteers
   b) Discussions

4. Drafting tool(s)
   a) Agree on the tool to use

5 Reconfirm next steps & schedules
   a) Timeline to fix 1st draft as CRISP team
   b) Communications with respective RIR regions
   c)The next call date

6 AOB

7 Adjourn.

CRISP members present:

AFRINIC
Alan P. Barrett, AB
Mwendwa Kivuva, MK
Ernest Byaruhanga, EB (

APNIC
Izumi Okutani, IO
Craig Ng, CN

ARIN
Michael Abejuala, MA
John Sweeting JS

LACNIC
Esteban Lescano, EL
Nico Scheper, NS
Andres Piazza AP

RIPE NCC
Nurani Nimpuno, NN
Andrei Robachevsky, AR

1. Agenda Review

No agenda items were added.

2. Actions Review

IO presented and reviewed the agenda and the four actions items proposed during the last meeting. All the actions were done.

Action II: https://www.nro.net/nro-and-internet-governance/iana-oversight/consolidated-rir-iana-stewardship-proposal-team-crisp-team

Action IV: https://www.nro.net/nro-and-internet-governance/iana-oversight/timeline-for-rirs-engagement-in-iana-stewardship-transition-process

IO encouraged all the RIRs to share key updated about developing the proposal by CRISP team within their communities as APNIC has already done.

3. Discussions about the draft proposal

a) Briefing from the initial draft volunteers
b) Discussions

IO suggested that AR and MA share the essence of the proposal.

AR underlined that the proposal was based on high-level principles that RIPE community discussed during the past months. He recommended

looking for the gaps and absences that NTIA- ICANN contract has and trying to fill them.

AR described the content in each section (1-6) of the draft proposal and highlighted that section 3 presents a simple and straightforward approach based on a contract with SLAs, seeing the IANA services are separate from the policy development process.

In relation to section 6 AR mentioned that it is only filled for the RIPE community and needs input from other regions.

IO thanked AR for the information shared on the draft and asked MA to add any further explanation.

MA agreed with all the explanations given by AR. In addition he pointed out that the information of the ARIN community survey was included in the draft and underlined that the draft was a good starting point.

IO thanked to MA and asked CN to make a brief summary of the similarities and differences among the 3 proposals circulated between APNIC, RIPE and LACNIC.

CN explained the differences among the AOC, SLA and MONC remarked on the document. CN explained a compromised proposal, accommodating regional differences.

IO asked the CRISP Members to give an input from the perspective of each region.

There was general acceptance of this approach explained by CN. None of the team member voiced an objection to this approach.

In addition, each CRIPS Team members shared observation in from their regions as below.

AB from AFRINIC region explained that there is no formal proposal in the region and underlined that the community identified some important aspects to be included (bottom-up process, documentation, addition languages other than English and satisfied with SLA or MOU)

MA highlighted some important subjects such as stability and SLA.

EL agreed with the draft as a starting point and underlined the importance of the MONC for the LACNIC community.

CN clarified NN questions about the role of the NRO in the envisaged contractual arrangement.. CN explained that the NRO is just a coordination body for the 5 RIR. CN remarked on the idea that 5 RIRs work as a group and not separately. CN said that the signatories of the new agreement would be the 5 RIR. In addition he highlighted that APNIC proposal is based in AOC and SLA and that their community is satisfied with those concepts.

CN clarified IO's question about how much of details have been considered about NRO representatives to review SLA including criteria of review. CN explained this is the stage the basic concept has been shared and no objections observed.

AR clarified about the internal structure related to the SLA within the IETF.

4. Drafting tool(s)

a) Agree on the tool to use

AR suggested having just one person (MA) editing the document in order to have consistency.

MA agreed in being the editing person.

EL suggested a process of working between the 4 volunteers; first sharing the information between them and then sharing with the rest of the CRISP Team.

5 Reconfirm next steps & schedules

 a) Timeline to fix 1st draft as CRISP team

IO reconfirmed that December 18th will be published the first draft to ianaxfer mailing list and suggested that CRISP team members could provide feedback to MA until December 16th so the 1st draft could be finished by December 17th.

Action item: CRISP team members to provide feedback to MA until 16 December.

Action item: MA will finish the draft on December 17th.

 b) Communications with respective RIR regions

IO observed that all RIRs agreed and are satisfied with the draft proposed and asked for volunteers to continue working on the draft.

CN suggested that the 4 volunteers proposed in the 1st Teleconference continue with the draft and all of the agreed.

After a brief discussion about the use of the mailing lists (Crisp and Ianaxfer) and about opening the archives or not, it was decided to use the CRISP mailing list just for internal coordination and generate the discussion in the global mailing list in order to avoid confusions and be transparent.

On the other hand, AB proposed a compromise to open the archives in the CRISP mailing list at the end of producing the first draft.

AK and NN agreed with AB.

No objections expressed to AB's proposal by other members.

GV clarified that the role of the NRO in this process was a facilitator of the process. He added that the CRISP team members own this process.
AR suggested to share documents with the community either as an online publication or PDF format.

C) Next call date

CRISP team members agreed in having next Teleconference on December 17th at 13 UTC.