Key points of the proposal

The key points CRISP Team has worked are on regional differences we observed on two points. Please see "Summary of RIR proposals" for more details.

https://www.nro.net/wp-content/uploads/Summary-of-RIR-proposals.pdf

1. Agreement to be exchanged with the IANA function operator.

Differences:

- RIPE community believes it is desirable to have a single SLA, and not AoC
- Other communities propose AoC and SLA

Proposal:

- Exchange an agreement which can serve as SLA with the IANA function operator
- While there will be no document called AoC, intended contents of AoC will be reflected in the same agreement which covers SLA AND/OR
- IANA operator is considered as service operator, in which case, SLA suits better, as in the case of IETF.

Rationale:

- All regions agree about the need for SLA
- As long as contents of AoC is reflected, it does not matter whether a separate document, or merged with SLA document

2. Oversight body/function

Differences:

- LACNIC community prefers to have a broader based community group to review the performance of the IANA functions. Multi-stakeholder Oversight Numbers Council(MONC) is proposed.
- Some of the RIRs believe that MONC is complex and overly burdensome, to oversee the performance of a contract (over the past 12 months, the IANA functions operator has performed only eight transactions for the RIRs.)

Proposal:

- The NRO (as the umbrella body through which all the RIRs will enter into any proposed contract with the IANA functions operator) can commit to convening a broad based community group, in a manner similar to the creation of the CRISP team
- This will be done on an annual basis, to advice and report to the NRO Executive Council on the performance of the SLA during the past year.

Rationale: (This is my guessing - more than happy to be corrected)

- Accommodates to conduct oversight without setting up a separate entity for this role.
- We already have experience from CRISP team on nominations and selection process.