In the implementation phase staff will have to deal with evidence emanating from several jurisdictions.  
Moreover staff will face the arduous task of assessing evidence/information/data  from different sources and of different  evidential value.  
The burden of testing the reliability of evidence/information/data will be on staff who will have to assess and weigh these evidence and to decide whether  same may be used to establish  abuse or wrongful use of  INRs.  
 The possibility of collecting evidence/information /data coming from different sources  via affidavits or depositions before Commissioner of Oath may have to be envisaged to ease pressure on staff.  
AFRINIC will have to protect itself and act only on reliable, cogent and admissible evidence before finally revoking allocation of resources which the investigated member claims has been prejudicial to it and consequently claims for compensation. This possibility should always be envisaged. The increasing value of IPV4 resources point in that way.  
What modus operandi should be put into place to “hear” the investigated party to ensure fairness? The policy proposal does not provide anything in this regard  
It will not always be possible to confront the investigated party with data/documents/evidence coming from third parties who may have disclosed same in confidence and have expressly refused to be named or referred to.  
The arbitration referred to in the proposal has to be effected within the jurisdiction of one country what would that be?  
I refer to Section 13.5 of the proposal wherein it is stated that  “ the outcome of the arbitration process is unequivocal” . This is in contradiction of ,Articles  1027 to 1027-9 of the Code de Procedure Civile of Mauritius which provides that a party to an arbitration may seek the “annulation “of an award by seizing the Supreme Court.