

## Matrix on comments on draft Review Committee Charter

	Initial post	Issue	Comment/ Summary of comments	Action taken
1	Shane Kerr, 30 June 2015	Functions/ Objectives	<p>I think it might make sense to require a specific time for a regular report from the Review Committee (RC), perhaps annually. (Currently it is just "advise and assist the NRO EC in its periodic review".)</p> <p>Even a 1-line report saying "everything is fine" seems okay, as long as the RC has some concrete deliverable.</p> <p>Supported by Seun Ojedeji, 30 June 2015</p>	A new provision has been inserted at paragraph 2, to require at least one report to be submitted each year.
2	Shane Kerr, 30 June 2015	Proceedings/ Requesting feedback by the community before the submission of final reports to the NRO EC	<p>I think that requirement #10 is unnecessary: Before the Review Committee submits any final report and/or recommendation to the NRO EC, it must first consult and seek the feedback and comment from the Internet Number Community about such proposed report and/or recommendation.</p> <p>I think I understand the intent, but I feel that the RC should be able to do its job in a straightforward and timely manner. This requirement would seem to make it very difficult to offer any kind of opinion quickly. We should instead trust in the RC and the transparency that it operates under.</p> <p>If feedback and comment makes sense for a specific issue, I am sure the RC will be willing and able to elicit that from the appropriate communities.</p>	<p>There appears no consensus for this view. The NRO EC believes that community feedback and participation is an important element of the work of the Review Committee.</p> <p>It seems unlikely that any work of the Review Committee will be so urgent as to dispense with community consultation.</p>

	<b>Initial post</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comment/ Summary of comments</b>	<b>Action taken</b>
			Disagreement expressed by Seun Ojedeji, 30 June 2015	
3	Seun Ojedeji, 30 June 2015	Composition	I think there should be a general standard of running the two community members in a staggered manner so one would expect that either of the two members would run for one year initially and then two years subsequently. The essence of this is to avoid a situation where two newbies get on RC at the same time (although this can be ensured at regional level, but again it may be good to have that globally)	Following further discussion on this subject at various RIR meetings, the NRO EC believes that the composition and term of the RC members (including staggered terms) should be left to the RIRs themselves. The provision has been changed accordingly.
4	Seun Ojedeji, 30 June 2015	Definition	Can you add a footnote for the definition of "internet community" just for clarity?	We believe that the generic meaning of the Internet community is sufficiently clear, and well understood.
5	Seun Ojedeji, 30 June 2015	Not covered issues	There are other things specific to RC that may need to be included in the charter. The following comes to mind <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meeting quorum requirement</li> <li>- Role of chair and vice chair</li> <li>- Communication processes between RC and IANA</li> <li>- Scope of RC to be clearly defined to exclude policy issues</li> <li>- Determining if an individual can serve in both RC and ASO</li> </ul>	These are good ideas, but the NRO EC believes that this should be left to the RC to establish amongst the members themselves. As the number of IANA Numbering Services transactions performed each year (that is the subject of the RC's review) is very low (five in 2014), the NRO EC would prefer not to overly prescribe these details.
6	Seun Ojedeji,	Governance	On governance, it may be good to consider regionally	Paragraph 15 already requires

	<b>Initial post</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comment/ Summary of comments</b>	<b>Action taken</b>
	30 June 2015		rotating the Chair/Vice Chair position in a manner currently followed with the EC	the Chair and Vice-Chair to be from different regions. See comment 5 above.
7	Seun Ojedeji, 30 June 2015	Secretary	Can I assume that the NRO staff (the executive secretary) will act as secretary for the RC? if yes then it should be indicated in the charter otherwise the secretary position should be defined. The secretary may also be rotated regionally by the staff member of each region that is on RC.	The secretariat arrangements may change from time to time, and the NRO EC prefers to deal with this issue periodically, rather than have this entrenched in the charter.
8	Seun Ojedeji, 30 June 2015	Proceedings	The minimum number of days for sending meeting notification needs to be indicated so community members who intends to join and listen can be prepared.  Supported by Mwendwa Kivuva, 30 June 2015	Please see comment 5 above.
9	Mwendwa Kivuva, 30 June 2015	Proceedings/ Requesting feedback by the community before the submission of final reports to the NRO EC	Currently, how does the NRO-NC share with the community? I expect we can adopt the same method with NRO-RC	
10	Mwendwa Kivuva, 30 June 2015	Secretary	Rotating the secretarial function would be ideal. This would share the workload if any, and also give capacity to all RIRs on functions of the RC.	Please see comment 5 above.
11	CRISP Team, 6 July 2015	Functions/ Objectives	The number community proposal limits the scope of the Review Committee's advice related to the IANA	This is addressed by the removal of the word "main" in

	<b>Initial post</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comment/ Summary of comments</b>	<b>Action taken</b>
			<p>Numbering Services.</p> <p>Clause 1 of the charter describes "The Review Committee's main function" which may give room for additional functions as needed.</p> <p>We do not observe inconsistencies if additional functions will be related to advice around the performance of the IANA functions but it may be worth giving more clarity in the language.</p>	paragraph 1.
12	Andrew Dul, 6 July 2015	Composition	<p>I do not necessarily believe that the review committee needs to be a permanent body. It might be an active body through the initial transition, but at some point there may come a time when the review committee is more overhead than substance.</p> <p>I'm not really opposed to anything in the current charter, but think we should consider if the committee should be called for a period by the EC to do a specific function, rather than being a standing body waiting around in some cases for something to do.</p> <p>Disagreement expressed by Shane Kerr, 13 July 2015</p>	There appears no consensus for this view. In any event, the composition of the RC should change from year to year, and having a standing committee will enable the RC to review any transaction that was performed in that year.