

3. Action Items

a. Minutes from the last call

- Circulated within the CRISP Team.
- Waiting to be published on the website.

b. Share future steps with the community

- Done. <https://www.nro.net/pipermail/ianaxfer/2015-April/000433.html>

c. Confirm about IPR and the IETF Trust with the IETF

- Follow up e-mail sent by Izumi. No response from the IETF.

d. Arrange a call with CWG-Stewardship Chairs

- Request made by Izumi, waiting for CWG-Stewardship Chairs to share the availability.
- The CWG-Names proposal is out now, so need to reconsider what we request for.

e. Doodle poll on future call schedule (have some regularity)

- Done. Waiting for the candidates to be fixed.

4. Confirm community feedback

- a. ARIN35
- b. Other RIR regions
- c. Global list

- Request has been made to share SLA Text. A comment made about 7f.

<https://www.nro.net/pipermail/ianaxfer/2015-April/000448.html>

- *Would anyone from RIRs please be able to share the latest status on the ianaxfer@nro.net list?*

I don't want to give the wrong impression that RIRs are holding something up and not transparent.

5. Update on GAO interview

- GAO has been asked by the Chairs of the House Energy and Commerce Committee and its Communications and Technology Subcommittee to review the NTIA's planned transition.
- Nurani and I joined the interview, based on the questions circulated on the CRISP Team mailing list.
- There were two additional questions are reported on the CRISP Team ML: <https://www.nro.net/pipermail/crisp/2015-April/001785.html>
- Based on the interview and to have identified additional information needed, Nurani and I will share the updated written response with the CRISP Team before submission.
- Suggest sharing the response with the numbers community. (I observe support from John, Michael, Andrei)

6. Update on the call with NRO EC

a. Overview: What was confirmed, follow up items

b. The role (if any) of the CRISP Team in community consultation

c. The role (if any) of the CRISP Team in NRO website of discussions at RIR meetings

a: <https://www.nro.net/pipermail/crisp/2015-April/001774.html>

b: The process should be led by the RIRs. The CRISP Team give observation on whether community input is in line with the intention of the proposal.

c: My suggestion

- The draft report can be developed by RIR staff, but before publishing it, the CRISP Team members from that region (and any other member who attended the meeting) reviews it.
- It will then be endorsed by the NRO EC. This should be shared on the regional and global MLs.

- In parallel, it would be desirable to share broader discussions on the IANA stewardship transition which took place at the RIR meetings, not just on SLA real-time as possible on the global regional MLs.
- Therefore, make sure to post before each RIR meetings on the global MLs, and may be good to have a quick unofficial update of the general discussions at the meeting on IANA from a CRISP Team member from that region.

7. Preparation for ICANN Board panel

- a. Jurisdiction**
- b. Country of the IANA function operator**
- c. Implications for delay in submission of the proposal**
- d. Ability for RIR community to chose the IANA operator**
- e. IPR**
- f. Gap between traditional negotiations and open community process**

Draft ideas:

(As a starting point of consulting at the CRISP Team call)

- a. Do we have an opinion this more than the discussions we have had?
 - (It should be fair to all parties involved in the IANA Numbering services)
- b. Country of the IANA function operator
 - No need to change.
 - As separate topic there are some discussions in ICANN Accountability CCWG about incorporating in the Bylaws for ICANN to have its headquarter in the US.
- c. While NTIA states that there is no deadline, one could argue that ambiguity may increase on whether the proposal will be accepted.
- d. This is a possibility, not concrete plan. We have clearly stated the numbers community is satisfied with the current IANA operator(ICANN). However having this ability is important.
- e. We consider the IETF Trust as an acceptable option. We are not saying this is the only option and open to coordination with the three operational communities. It

is important it will be lightweight and to be based on existing mechanisms as much as possible.

- f. We would expect gaps but strong support for open community process. This is based on NTIA's requirements.