

Initial post	Issue	Summary	Discussions on <ianaxfer@nro.net>	CRISP Team Status
2014/12/19 (Richard Hill)  "Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal:First Draft"	Intellectual Property Rights	Discussion on how to address the IP rights of IANA trademark and iana.org domain name	CRISP Team position shared on <ianaxfer@nro.net> list.  (2015/01/02 UTC16:27 Andrei Robachevsky "IPR considerations in the RIRs submission to the ICG")  Question raised from Seun Ojedej on the need for agreement by IETF and names community on transfer to IETF Trust.	Completed.  CRISP Team reflected Andrei's summary in the 2nd draft proposal .  It is acknowledged by CRISP Team coordination with IETF and names community to transfer to IETF Trust, which is described in the 2nd proposal.
2014/12/19 (Richard Hill)  "Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal:First Draft"	Intellectual Property Rights	The generic data base rights that ICANN might have regarding the top-level allocations that it publishes.		At the same time, CRISP Team has considered it is important to describe and express what is requested from the perspective of the number resources communities.  See Section III "Intellectual property rights (IPR) related to the provision of the IANA services stay with the community"
2014/12/23 (Alan Barrett)  "IANA IPR considerations"	Intellectual Property Rights	Discussion on how to address the IP rights of IANA trademark and iana.org domain name		
2014/12/26 (Andrew Dul)  "Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship"	Intellectual Property Rights	Clarification about the rights related to in-addr.arpa and ip6.arpa: It would seem at the moment that those domains are held by the IETF, and thus would be covered under the protocols response to the ICG?		
2014/12/19 (Seun Ojedej)  "Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal:First Draft"	Proposal edits suggestions	Removing entire first paragraph in Section III and changing the word "contract" to "agreement"	Agreement that "contract" is the correct word. Ongoing over the need of the wording in the first paragraph of Section III.  CRISP Team position shared on <ianaxfer@nro.net> list and agreed. (Izumi Okutani 2014/01/04 "Status on Comments received")  Agreement that the wording in the first paragraph of Section III has been moved to Section II is an adequate place.	Completed.  No revision needed to the latest draft proposal, as agreement confirmed on <ianaxfer@nro.net> list for the update made by CRISP Team about the paragraph. Agreement also observed on the list about the use of word "contract".
2014/12/19 (Seun Ojedej)  "Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal:First Draft"	Contract	Should not be termed based indicated in section III but should have termination conditions.	Discussions on details of the contract continued.  Izumi Okutani shared CRISP Team's rationale behind fixed terms.  Suggestion made to stick to high level principles and leave details for legal team at the time of implementation.	Completed.  Incorporated the suggestions in 2nd draft, to describe high level principles. Details, including terms of the contract will be considered at the time of implementation, based on high level principles.  See Section III "Service level agreement with the IANA functions operator on number resources"
2014/12/19 (Seun Ojedej)  "Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal:First Draft"	Review Committee	The Review committee may not be required. The review of compliance to agreement terms be handled mainly by the NRO-NC in conjunction with NRO-EC.	No further discussions	Completed.  Discussed at the 8th call to select representatives in the same method and process as NRO NC from each RIR region.  Reflected in the second draft.
2014/12/19 (Seun Ojedej)  "Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal:First Draft"	Review Committee	The community of each RIR should elect a member while the chair of the NRO-EC at any point in time will be co-opted to serve as the review team (6 in total).	No further discussions	See Section III "Establishment of a Review Committee."
2014/12/23 (Seun Ojedej)  "IANA policy vis IANA operation – How they differ?"	Policy v Operations	Use existing structures, do not create new ones	Clarification was requested on the reason for not having NRO NC to conduct the review.	Completed.  NRO NC provides advice to ICANN Board on Global policies. Review Committee is to provide input to NRO EC on operation of IANA function on number resources.  It's roles and objectives are different, therefore have a separate selection process.  The process of selecting Review Committee is proposed to be compatible with that of NRO NC  See Section III "Establishment of a Review Committee."
2014/12/19 (Seun Ojedej)  "Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal:First Draft"	global PDP	Update of section 10 of the gPDP as follow:  In case Step 9 (c), should at least *two* of the RIRs agree that changes need to be made	1/3/2015 Seun Ojedej asked for status regarding this item, Izumi Okutani replied explaining the CRISP team rationale for not including changes to the gPDP, that it should be changed under the regular process.  Seun agreed that it did not have to be addressed as sufficient accountability is provided under the current scheme.	Completed per agreement on the <ianaxfer@nro.net> list this does not need to be addressed.
2014/12/23 (Seun Ojedej)  "Access to the recordings"	Recordings	Access to the recordings in user friendly format. Not able to access with Linux.	No further discussions	Completed.  Updated from NRO secretariat to the <ianaxfer@nro.net> list, the recordings are made available on MP4 format for all past CRISP Team Meetings.
2014/12/20 (Seun Ojedej)	Version Control	Version control on proposal	No further discussions	Completed.
2014/12/29 (MAEMURA Akinori) "JPNIC's comment for CRISP's initial draft" Item 1 (a and b)	Involvement by NTIA in operation of IANA function on number resources.	Check that the document makes it clear, especially for ICG members from other communities, that (a) there is no direct NTIA involvement, except (b) in conducting SLA reviews.	None.	Completed.
2014/12/29 (MAEMURA Akinori) "JPNIC's comment for CRISP's initial draft"	Agreement (contract) with IANA function operator	Important to have SLA, ensure accountability, transparency of criteria and procedures, complaint resolution process.	None.	Completed.  Details of SLA items are described in the second draft.

2014/12/29 (MAEMURA Akinori) "JPNIC's comment for CRISP's initial draft" Item 2 b	Review committee qualifications	Review committee members should have sufficient knowledge.	None.	Completed. Discussed at the 8th call (5 Jan 2015). Agreed to add suitable text. Text prepared by Alan Barrett for inclusion in second draft proposal. See Section III "Establishment of a Review Committee."
2014/12/29 (MAEMURA Akinori) "JPNIC's comment for CRISP's initial draft" Item 2 b	Review committee process	It may be useful to define key points for the review.	None.	Second draft describes that the review should focus on performance against the SLA, with particular attention to breach or near-breach. See Section III "Establishment of a Review Committee."
2014/12/29 (MAEMURA Akinori) "JPNIC's comment for CRISP's initial draft" Item 2 b	Review committee appointment	Review committee members should be selected by RIR communities, similarly to NRO-NC/ASO-AC. They should not be appointed by NRO-EC.	None.	Completed. Discussed at the 8th call (5 Jan 2015). Agreed that the process should be similar to appointment of NRO-NC/ASO-AC members. Text prepared by Alan Barrett for inclusion in second draft proposal. See Section III "Establishment of a Review Committee."
2014/12/30 (Andrew Sullivan) "Comments on CRISP proposal"	Wording of "delegation of the 'in-addr.arpa' and 'ip6.arpa' DNS trees"	"delegation of the 'in-addr.arpa' and 'ip6.arpa' DNS trees".Perhaps this means "delegation from".  (IANA doesn't delegate those two names to any of the RIRs, but delegates spaces within them.)	Suggested text provided by Alan Barrett on <ianaxfer@nro.net> list and supported by Andrew Sullivan.	Completed. Text by Alan Barrett shared at <ianaxfer@nro.net> incorporated in the 2nd draft. See Section I.
2014/12/30 (Andrew Sullivan) "Comments on CRISP proposal"	How to handle the case where number resources are the only function which needs change in the IANA operator.	The text does not seem to discuss the possibility of the NRO finding itself in the position of needing to change IANA operators, and yet being unable to get other IANA users to do the same thing.  It might be worth saying something about how termination is expected to be handled. If this is implied in the retention of the existing framework, perhaps an additional sentence asking this slightly plainer would be helpful.	No further discussions	Completed. Discussed at the 8th call. Incorporated in the second draft with other description on SLA. See Section III "Service level agreement with the IANA functions operator on number resources "
2014/12/30 (Andrew Dul) "Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: First Draft"	Effect on the existing MoUs (NRO and ASO)	Confirmation about whether there is a need to change the existing MoUs	No further discussions	Completed. Raised on CRISP Team ML ("Need to change existing MoUs (NRO & ASO MoUs) ?" Izumi Okutani) No objection to the interpretation that no changes are need to the existing MoUs, as neither MoUs cover operation of the IANA function.
2014/12/30 (Andrew Dul) "Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: First Draft"	Review process on IANA function	Whether to include more details about the review process on IANA function for the number resources such as:  - Frequency of review (every x year) - Disclosure of review report - Review committee selection and process conducted in an open and transparent manner - Principle for the RFP for a new contractor: to be conducted in a fair, open and transparent process in line with applicable industry best practices and standards (If the NRO EC determines that a change is needed with the IANA numbers function contract)	No further discussions	Completed. Discussed at the 8th call, making final confirmation within CRISP Team to incorporate the suggestion. In regards to frequency of the review, CRISP Team suggests to define maximum interval for the review and keep the flexibility to shorten the interval as needed. See Section III "Establishment of Review Committee "
2014/12/30 (Andrew Dul) "Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: First Draft"	RIR Accountability	RIR accountability & oversight within their own regions is an important consideration.  Every stakeholder should consider if the RIRs themselves are appropriately accountable to their members and stakeholders.	No further discussions	Completed. Discussed at the 8th call, observed the current description in Section II B is sufficient, with reference to RIR Governance Matrix. "The corporate governance documents and PDPs of each RIR and its community are accessible via the RIR Governance Matrix, published on the NRO website"
2014/12/30 (Andrew Dul) "Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: First Draft"	RIR Accountability	Related point from above.  Consider if a periodic review of the RIR's accountability to their members should be reviewed on a periodic basis and what form that formal review should take	No further discussions	No support observed over the need for additional accountability mechanism.
2014/12/30 (Andrew Dul) "Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: First Draft"	Determining support for the final proposal to ICG	How will the CRISP team determine support for the final draft from the global number resource community? - Will there a mechanism to proactively confirm support/lack of support?	No further discussions	Discussed at the 8th call . Agreed to follow the same process to collect feedback as the 1st and 2nd drafts. Feedback received can be confirmed by ICG via archives of <ianaxfer@nro.net> list
2014/12/30 (Andrew Dul) "Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: First Draft"	Describe the global process in Section VI.	Missing details about the formation of the CRISP team: - the team's processes and methods for developing, publishing, receiving feedback from stakeholders - determining consensus on the final draft	No further discussions	Incorporated in the 2nd draft. See Section VI "Community Process".
2014/12/30 (Andrew Dul) "Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: First Draft"	Post the 2nd draft to the mailing list within an email in text format	Post the proposal in text format to facilitate discussions	No further discussions	Completed for the edited version of the first draft and to be addressed also for the second draft.

2014/12/30 (Andrew Dul) "Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: First Draft"	Real-time events to facilitate discussion	An open global conference call and/or global txt chat in a couple of different time zones to accommodate all members of the Internet community	No further discussions	Completed. Discussed at the 7th call and no consensus to organize such events:  Questions raised by several CRISP Team members on how we position feedback and questions on the events.  It was agreed all feedback and questions be sent in written form to <ianaxfer@nro.net> for CRISP members to address without misunderstanding.  For time zone issue, the recordings are made available on the NRO website and questions can be raised on the <ianaxfer@nro.net> list.
2015/1/4 (Filiz Yilmaz) "Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: First Draft"	Some editorial suggestions made on 3 points.	1. Add " providing secretariat roles." to describe RIR in PDP 2. Provide full name of "ICC" for arbitration 3. Add "together with their communities collectively," in description of Review Committee and RIR involvement	No further discussions	Completed.  Incorporated the suggestions in 2nd draft.
2015/1/7 (Seun Ojedeji) "Thank you for the feedback and	Process of Building Review Team	Suggestion about process of building the review team i.e the formation, charter et al be determined before the transition is completed.	No further discussions	Completed.  Discussed at the 9th call both points are out of scope of CRISP Team's role. These processes will not be handled by CRISP Team.
2015/1/7 (Seun Ojedeji) "Thank you for the feedback and	Community engagement in developing SLA	Clarification on how/if the CRISP intend to engage the community in the development of the contract and SLA.	No further discussions	Considerations were also made on whether to describe what to be encouraged, even though they are out of scope of DRIP Team work.  It was agreed that while this does not lead to substantive result as CRISP Team is not in the position to make decisions over these points, concerns were expressed on the confusions this may cause on CRISP's team's role.
N/A Raised within CRISP Team	Editorial changes to the first draft for more clarify	To describe response in the same as questions listed in each Section. No changes will be made to contents from the first draft.	N/A	Completed.  Editorial version posted on CRISP Team webpage and announced on <ianaxfer@nro.net> list.
N/A Raised within CRISP Team	Work on improvement for "Section V NTIA Requirement"	Describe more clearly how our propose meets the requirements by NTIA	N/A	Completed.  .
N/A Raised within CRISP Team	Fill in all regional processes in Section VI.	Fill in information in ARIN and LACNIC regions	N/A	Completed.  ARIN region and LACNIC region processes completed.
N/A Raised within CRISP Team	Fill in CRISP Team selection process of each region in Section VI.	Fill in information in AFRINIC and APNIC regions	N/A	Completed.  Draft provided from APNIC and LACNIC regions.
N/A Rasied within CRISP Team	SLA – Main sections and relevant principles	First draft of SLA main sections and relevant principles v1.0	N/A	Completed.  Draft shared by Paul Rendek, called for comments from CRISP Team. Have been incorporated into the second draft.