

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 Ojedeji 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.  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"
2014/12/19 (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.		
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?		

<p>2014/12/19 (Seun Ojedeji)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal:First Draft"</p>	<p>Proposal edits suggestions</p>	<p>Removing entire first paragraph in Section III and changing the word "contract" to "agreement"</p>	<p>Agreement that "contract" is the correct word. Ongoing over the need of the wording in the first paragraph of Section III.</p> <p>CRISP Team position shared on &lt;ianaxfer@nro.net&gt; list and agreed. (Izumi Okutani 2014/01/04 "Status on Comments received")</p> <p>Agreement that the wording in the first paragraph of Section III has been moved to Section II is an adequate place.</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>No revision needed to the latest draft proposal, as agreement confirmed on &lt;ianaxfer@nro.net&gt; list for the update made by CRISP Team about the paragraph. Agreement also observed on the list about the use of word "contract".</p>
<p>2014/12/19 (Seun Ojedeji)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal:First Draft"</p>	<p>Contract</p>	<p>Should not be termed based indicated in section III but should have termination conditions.</p>	<p>Discussions on details of the contract continued.</p> <p>Izumi Okutani shared CRISP Team's rationale behind fixed terms.</p> <p>Suggestion made to stick to high level principles and leave details for legal team at the time of implementation.</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>See Section III "Service level agreement with the IANA functions operator on number resources "</p>

<p>2014/12/19 (Seun Ojedeji)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal:First Draft"</p>	<p>Review Committee</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>No further discussions</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Discussed at the 8th call to select representatives in the same method and process as NRO NC from each RIR region.</p> <p>Decided on 8 Jan 2015 to focus on high level principles and omit the details of how many members or how they are chosen.</p>
<p>2014/12/19 (Seun Ojedeji)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal:First Draft"</p>	<p>Review Committee</p>	<p>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).</p>	<p>No further discussions</p>	<p>Reflected in the second draft.</p> <p>See Section III "Establishment of a Review Committee."</p>

<p>2014/12/23 (Seun Ojedeji)</p> <p>"IANA policy vis IANA operation - How they differ?"</p>	<p>Policy v Operations</p>	<p>Use existing structures, do not create new ones</p>	<p>Clarification was requested on the reason for not having NRO NC to conduct the review.</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>It's roles and objectives are different, therefore have a separate selection process.</p> <p>The process of selecting Review Committee is left for the RIRs to work out later.</p> <p>See Section III "Establishment of a Review Committee."</p>
<p>2014/12/19 (Seun Ojedeji)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal:First Draft"</p>	<p>global PDP</p>	<p>Update of section 10 of the gPDP as follow:</p> <p>In case Step 9 (c), should at least *two* of the RIRs agree that changes need to be made</p>	<p>1/3/2015 Seun Ojedeji 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.</p> <p>Seun agreed that it did not have to be addressed as sufficient accountability is provided under the currren scheme.</p>	<p>Completed per agreement on the &lt;anaxfer@nro.net&gt; list this does not need to be addressed.</p>

2014/12/23 (Seun Ojedeji)  "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 Ojedeji)  "Draft proposal differences"	Version Control	Version control on proposal	No further discussions	Completed.  Version information to be added to documents, and obsolete documents to be flagged on web page.
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" Item 2 a	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.

<p>2014/12/29 (MAEMURA Akinori) "JPNIC's comment for CRISP's initial draft" Item 2 b</p>	<p>Review committee qualifications</p>	<p>Review committee members should have sufficient knowledge.</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Discussed at the 8th call (5 Jan 2015). Agreed to add suitable text. Text prepared by Alan Barrett for inclusion in second draft proposal.</p> <p>See Section III "Establishment of a Review Committee."</p>
<p>2014/12/29 (MAEMURA Akinori) "JPNIC's comment for CRISP's initial draft" Item 2 b</p>	<p>Review committee process</p>	<p>It may be useful to define key points for the review.</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>Second draft describes that the review should focus on performance against the SLA, with particular attention to breach or near-breach.</p> <p>See Section III "Establishment of a Review Committee."</p>
<p>2014/12/29 (MAEMURA Akinori) "JPNIC's comment for CRISP's initial draft" Item 2 b</p>	<p>Review committee appointment</p>	<p>Review committee members should be selected by RIR communities, similarly to NRO-NC/ASO-AC. They should not be appointed by NRO-EC.</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Discussed at the 8th call (5 Jan 2015). Agreed that the process should be similar to appointment of NRO-NC/ASO-AC members.</p> <p>Discussed again on 8 Jan 2015, agreed to focus on high level considerations, so this low level detail was removed.</p> <p>See Section III "Establishment of a Review Committee."</p>

<p>2014/12/30 (Andrew Sullivan)</p> <p>"Comments on CRISP proposal"</p>	<p>Wording of "delegation of the 'in-addr.arpa' and 'ip6.arpa' DNS trees"</p>	<p>"delegation of the 'in-addr.arpa' and 'ip6.arpa' DNS trees".Perhaps this means "delegation from".</p> <p>(IANA doesn't delegate those two names to any of the RIRs, but delegates spaces within them.)</p>	<p>Suggested text provided by Alan Barrett on &lt;ianaxfer@nro.net&gt; list and supported by Andrew Sullivan.</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Text by Alan Barrett shared at &lt;ianaxfer@nro.net&gt; incorporated in the 2nd draft.</p> <p>See Section I.</p>
<p>2014/12/30 (Andrew Sullivan)</p> <p>"Comments on CRISP proposal"</p>	<p>How to handle the case where number resources are the only function which needs change in the IANA operator.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>No further discussions</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Discussed at the 8th call.</p> <p>Incorporated in the second draft with other description on SLA.</p> <p>See Section III "Service level agreement with the IANA functions operator on number resources "</p>

<p>2014/12/30 (Andrew Dul)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: First Draft"</p>	<p>Effect on the existing MoUs (NRO and ASO)</p>	<p>Confirmation about whether there is a need to change the existing MoUs</p>	<p>No further discussions</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Raised on CRISP Team ML ("Need to change existing MoUs (NRO &amp; ASO MoUs ) ?" Izumi Okutani)</p> <p>No objection to the interpretation that no changes are needed to the existing MoUs, as neither MoUs cover operation of the IANA function.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



<p>2014/12/30 (Andrew Dul)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: First Draft"</p>	<p>Review process on IANA function</p>	<p>Whether to include more details about the review process on IANA function for the number resources such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Frequency of review (every x year)</li> <li>- Disclosure of review report</li> <li>- Review committee selection and process conducted in an open and transparent manner</li> <li>- 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)</li> </ul>	<p>No further discussions</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Discussed at the 8th call, making final confirmation within CRISP Team to incorporate the suggestion.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>See Section III "Establishment of Review Committee "</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>2014/12/30 (Andrew Dul)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: First Draft"</p>	<p>RIR Accountability</p>	<p>RIR accountability &amp; oversight within their own regions is an important consideration.</p> <p>Every stakeholder should consider if the RIRs themselves are appropriately accountable to their members and stakeholders.</p>	<p>No further discussions</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Discussed at the 8th call, observed the current description in Section II B is sufficient, with reference to RIR Governance Matrix.</p> <p>"The corporate governance documents and PDPs of each RIR and its community are accessible via the RIR Governance Matrix, published on the NRO website"</p> <p>No support observed over the need for additional accountability mechanism.</p>
<p>2014/12/30 (Andrew Dul)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: First Draft"</p>	<p>RIR Accountability</p>	<p>Related point from above.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>No further discussions</p>	
<p>2014/12/30 (Andrew Dul)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: First Draft"</p>	<p>Determining support for the final proposal to ICG</p>	<p>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?</p>	<p>No further discussions</p>	<p>Discussed at the 8th call .</p> <p>Agreed to follow the same process to collect feedback as the 1st and 2nd drafts.</p> <p>Feedback received can be confirmed by ICG via archives of &lt;ianaxfer@nro.net&gt; list</p>

<p>2014/12/30 (Andrew Dul)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: First Draft"</p>	<p>Describe the global process in Section VI.</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>No further discussions</p>	<p>Incorporated in the 2nd draft.  See Section VI "Community Process".</p>
<p>2014/12/30 (Andrew Dul)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: First Draft"</p>	<p>Post the 2nd draft to the mailing list within an email in text format</p>	<p>Post the proposal in text format to facilitate discussions</p>	<p>No further discussions</p>	<p>Completed for the edited version of the first draft and to be addressed also for the second draft.</p>

<p>2014/12/30 (Andrew Dul)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: First Draft"</p>	<p>Real-time events to facilitate discussion</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>No further discussions</p>	<p>Completed. Discussed at the 7th call and no consensus to organize such events:</p> <p>Questions raised by several CRISP Team members on how we position feedback and questions on the events.</p> <p>It was agreed all feedback and questions be sent in written form to &lt;ianaxfer@nro.net&gt; for CRISP members to address without misunderstanding.</p> <p>For time zone issue, the recordings are made available on the NRO website and questions can be raised on the &lt;ianaxfer@nro.net&gt; list.</p>
<p>2015/1/4 (Filiz Yilmaz)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: First Draft"</p>	<p>Some editorial suggestions made on 3 points.</p>	<p>1. Add " providing secretariat roles." to describe RIR in PDP</p> <p>2. Provide full name of "ICC" for arbitration</p> <p>3. Add "together with their communities collectively." in description of Review Committee and RIR involvement</p>	<p>No further discussions</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Incorporated the suggestions in 2nd draft.</p>

<p>2015/1/7 (Seun Ojedeji)</p> <p>"Thank you for the feedback and update on CRISP Team Status"</p> <p># Confirming status or earlier post #</p>	<p>Process of Building Review Team</p>	<p>Suggestion about process of building the review team i.e the formation, charter et all be determined before the transition is completed.</p>	<p>No further discussions</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Considerations were also made on whether to describe what to be encouraged, even though they are out of scope of DRIP Team work.</p>
<p>2015/1/7 (Seun Ojedeji)</p> <p>"Thank you for the feedback and update on CRISP Team Status"</p> <p># Confirming status or earlier post #</p>	<p>Community engagement in developing SLA</p>	<p>Clarification on how/if the CRISP intend to engage the community in the development of the contract and SLA.</p>	<p>No further discussions</p>	<p>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.</p>

<p>2015/1/8 (Richard Hill)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: Final Call for Comments"</p>	<p>Add more details of dispute resolution</p>	<p>The current description in Section III A.3 x is not sufficient to address dispute resolution.</p>	<p>Richard claims dispute resolution is an important part of the contract which should be described properly. It should at least describe the same level of details as in the current ASO MoU or "ICC arbitration in a neutral venue"</p> <p>There was a general agreement that dispute resolution is an important part of the contract. There was also an agreement that it is the role of the RIRs as the stakeholder of this service to draft the details of the contract. A concern was expressed by the CRISP Team that stating the same details as the ASO MoU in the proposal would restrict the possible option to be considered by RIRs at the time of implementation.</p> <p>No concrete answer was observed to the question from the CRISP Team whether special considerations are needed in this contract, different from the regular dispute resolutions to guide the RIRs in developing the contract.</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>It was confirmed by legal experts within the CRISP Team the current description in the proposal gives sufficient guidance to consider dispute resolution through arbitration without specifying "ICC" at this stage.</p> <p>The suggested word "neutral" jurisdiction was observed to make it difficult to pragmatically meet this condition, to have a truly neutral place for all parties and more appropriate to consider as an agreed jurisdiction by all parties, which is obvious without stating.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>2015/1/8 (Richard Hill)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: Final Call for Comments"</p>	<p>VI. Reflect low input in RIR processes</p>	<p>The process itself is bottom up by low input from the community observed, which makes it doubt whether the proposal was developed in bottom up manner.</p>	<p>In responded to Richard details of "CRISP Team Status" was shared.</p> <p>Several community members expressed comments to echo explanation by the CRISP Team and explained they believe the proposal reflects the bottom up intention.</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Some CRISP Team members noted this observation by Richard does not match the situation in their region, and there were adequate level of discussions observed.</p> <p>The possible perceived low input reflects trust in the CRISP Team members by the community, and community members would express opinions if they have concerns about the proposal. No comments would imply no concerns with the proposal.</p>
<p>2015/1/8 (Richard Hill)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: Final Call for Comments"</p>	<p>Why the option of having NRO as an operator is not considered</p>	<p>The option of having NRO as an operator observed support in some RIR region which is not reflected in the proposal/the CRISP Team has not considered this.</p>	<p>No further discussions after response from the CRISP Team based on "CRISP Team Status".</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Stability is an important factor in maintaining the IANA Numbering Services, agreed and reached consensus in all RIR regions. Maintaining the existing IANA Numbering Services Operator, i.e., ICANN is an essential element for this.</p>

<p>2015/1/8 (Richard Hill)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: Final Call for Comments"</p>	<p>Change in ICANN Bylaws for global PDP</p>	<p>Reconfirmation whether changes in ICANN ByLaw is not needed to clarify that number policies are made by the RIRs, not by the ICANN Board.</p>	<p>No further discussions after response from the CRISP Team based on "CRISP Team Status".</p>	<p>It is not included in the proposal because NTIA doesn't play a role in global Policy Development Process (gPDP).</p> <p>If RIR communities believe this should be reconsidered in the future, it should be discussed under the standard gPDP process. It would not be appropriate for CRISP Team to break this existing bottom-up process, and propose something not related to NTIA stewardship transition.</p>
<p>2015/1/8 (Richard Hill)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: Final Call for Comments"</p>	<p>Community cannot approve this part of the transition plan without an SLA text</p>	<p>The proposal does not meet the requirement of the RFC without an SLA text.</p>	<p>After clarification that RFC does not require this level of details, and developing SLA text is the role of the RIRs as the direct stakeholder of the IANA Numbering Services alternative plans below was suggested by Richard Hill as below:</p> <p>(1) the community should give them some guidance and (2) the community should have the opportunity to comment on whatever the RIR legal team comes up with.</p>	<p>It was confirmed within the CRISP Team that the RFC does not require the SLA text to be submitted in its RFC.</p> <p>For points raised in "Discussions on &lt;ianaxfer@nro.net&gt;" (1) was addressed by stating "IANA Service Level Agreement Principles" in Section III.A.3. The same section clarified RIRs would consult the community in developing the SLA which appears to address point (2).</p>



<p>2015/1/9 (Seun Ojedeji)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: Final Call for Comments"</p>	<p>Review Committee Selection Process</p>	<p>A few clarifications about the selection process and a request that uniform membership requirement and uniform selection process acrosss the RIR regions.</p>	<p>Clarification questions were cleared on the mailing list. It was explained that the CRISP Team did not specify the selection process to be the same as NRO NC, as this is premature to specify and not the CRISP Team's role to define (the process is to be lead by RIRs). However, highlevel principles such as open, bottom-up in the selection are described in the proposal.</p> <p>"CRISP Team Status" was explained and no further discussions observed.</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Ambiguity regarding NRO EC was fixed by replacing it as RIRs.</p> <p>High level principles are agreed to be included in the proposal as described in "Discussions on &lt;ianaxfer@nro.net&gt;".</p> <p>It was agreed that process of selection should be defined based on what's appropriate for each region, based on the common high level principles. It was agreed to clarify equal representation from each RIR region in the proposal.</p>
<p>2015/1/9 (Pindar Wong)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: Final Call for Comments"</p>	<p>Questions about dispute resolution</p>	<p>Suggestion to describe how many times since 2004 have the RIRs and ICANN needed to go to Arbitration (to demonstrate no major issues in the past).</p> <p>Question : How can we be sure the existing dispute resolution system works if it has never been used?</p>	<p>The answer to the first point was provided by another community member. CRISP Team asked whether others feel the no. of arbitration is important to be incorporated in the proposal and no feedback from the community.</p> <p>CRISP Team member replied to the second question that the system is tried and tested perhaps not with ICANN, but in other circumstances.</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Questions have been answered on &lt;ianaxfer@nro.net&gt;. No substantial support observed on the list to incorporate past arbitration record, therefore not incorporated in the proposal.</p>

<p>2015/1/12 (Nick Hillard)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: Final Call for Comments"</p>	<p>IETF Trust status on transfer of the IANA trademark and iana.org domain</p>	<p>Has the IETF Trust agreed in principal to accept IPR transfer of the IANA trademark and iana.org domain?</p>	<p>No further discussions after explanation from the CRISP Team that this is something which still needs to be coordinated, including the IETF and the name communities.</p> <p>In the proposal, it describes what would be desirable from the perspective of the number resources in the use of iana.org, with the note that coordination is needed with relevant parties.</p>	<p>See "Discussions on &lt;ianaxfer@nro.net&gt;". It was confirmed the response reflects the CRISP Team position.</p>
<p>2015/1/12 (Nick Hillard)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: Final Call for Comments"</p>	<p>III.A.4.ix refer to IETF Trust as public domain.</p>	<p>The IETF Trust is not "public domain" so it may be appropriate to use a different phrase in this paragraph.</p>	<p>No further discussions after explanation from the CRISP Team that this point will be considered.</p>	<p>This part of the description revised.</p>
<p>2015/1/12 (Nick Hillard)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: Final Call for Comments"</p>	<p>Question about jurisdiction / governing law.</p>	<p>Which jurisdiction / governing law will be used for the proposed new IANA contract between the RIRs and ICANN? The State of California / US Federal law? or will this be left for a future discussion?</p>	<p>No further discussions after explanation from the CRISP Team this will be left for the decision of the RIRs with sufficient legal expertise with consultation with the community in developing it.</p>	<p>See "Discussions on &lt;ianaxfer@nro.net&gt;". It was confirmed the response reflects the CRISP Team position.</p>

<p>2015/1/12 (Nick Hillard)</p> <p>"Internet Number Community IANA Stewardship Proposal: Final Call for Comments"</p>	<p>III.A.4.x: resolution of disputes should first use arbitration</p>	<p>III.A.4.x: resolution of disputes should first use arbitration (although it may be difficult to get an appropriate arbiter), and then through the legal system.</p>	<p>No further discussions after explanation from the CRISP Team that:</p> <p>if it is a common principle in considering arbitration/dispute resolution, which doesn't need special considerations related to the number resources functions, we expect the RIRs with its legal team to address it, as a common sense consideration in the legal context.</p>	<p>See "Discussions on &lt;ianaxfer@nro.net&gt;". It was confirmed the response reflects the CRISP Team position.</p>
<p>2015/1/11 (Seun Ojedeji)</p> <p>"Budget Review?"</p>	<p>The proposal should clarify who review the budget, based on contribution from RIRs to ICANN.</p>	<p>I understand 800k+USD is contributed annually to ICANN by all RIRs. Who does the review?</p> <p>If noone does today, suggested to incorporate in the proposal, e.g. NRO NC can do the review.</p>	<p>The status of current contribution by RIRs to ICANN was shared by an RIR CEO on the mailing list.</p> <p>After "CRISP Team Status" was shared on the mailing list, personal estimation of the cost of the IANA operation was shared by a community member but no objections observed regarding the CRISP Team status.</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Regarding budget review, RIRs' contribution to ICANN and its fees to be paid as a part of the contract for the IANA operator should be treated and considered separately.</p> <p>Regarding the fees associated with the contract with the IANA operator on the number resources, the CRISP Team has described basic principle that the contract fee will be cost based, while not specifying a specific amount.</p>

<p>2015/01/12 (Jim Reid)</p> <p>"support for final draft"</p>	<p>Comments about SLA format and Review Committee composition</p>	<p>Skeptical about the practicality of a single contract between the IANA operator and 5 RIRs in a post NTIA world. Though I suppose any documented agreement for this new arrangement would effectively be a contract in one form or another.</p> <p>The composition of proposed review committee probably needs to be wider than just those drawn from the RIR communities such as the IETF. However this is implementation detail that is not needed at this stage.</p> <p>Despite these reservations, I support the draft proposal.</p>	<p>CRISP Team position shared on &lt;ianaxfer@nro.net&gt; list.</p> <p>The comment stated this is implementation details which does not need at this stage and no further discussions.</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>The CRISP Team agrees with the comment that format of SLA is implementation details. The CRISP Team clarified RIRs will consult with the community appropriately before fixing the SLA.</p> <p>The Review Committee's role is to provide advice to RIRs to review service level on the IANA Numbering Services. The CRISP Team believes any review needed from IETF's perspective would be covered in the proposal from the IETF.</p>
<p>N/A all editorial suggestions</p>	<p>Editorial suggestions</p>	<p>Editorial suggestions made by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pindar Wong</li> <li>- Alain Bidron</li> <li>- Wilfried Woeber</li> <li>- Niall O'Reilly</li> <li>- Paul Wilson</li> </ul>	<p>Agreed to incorporated editorial suggestions.</p>	<p>All incorporated except for a few suggested changes which were considered to change the intention of the sentence (i.e..changes which are not considered as editorial by the CRISP Team)</p>
<p>N/A Raised within CRISP Team</p>	<p>Editorial changes to the first draft for more clarify</p>	<p>To describe response in the same as questions listed in each Section. No changes will be made to contents from the first draft.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Editorial version posted on CRISP Team webpage and announced on &lt;ianaxfer@nro.net&gt; list.</p>

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 priniciples v1.0	N/A	Completed. Draft shared by Paul Rendek, called for comments from CRISP Team. Have been incorporated into the second draft.
N/A Rasied within CRISP Team	Reflect discussion for the second draft in Section VI.	Revise description about the area of discussions	N/A	Completed. Reflected in the final draft.
N/A Rasied within CRISP Team	Editorial improvements	Add table of contents, consistency in wording, and other formatting changes	N/A	Completed. Reflected in the final draft.