

**STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS:  
MULTISTAKEHOLDER REVIEW TEAM**

Issue	Proposed Response
Entity Status of MRT	MRT will be a “working group.” MRT will not be a legal entity (e.g., corporation, partnership, trust, etc.) or an unincorporated association. It will not be located or “domiciled” in any particular jurisdiction.
Relationship to ICANN	MRT will be wholly independent of ICANN, similar to the ICG.
Organizational Documentation (Charter, etc.)	MRT will have a Charter, similar to the ICG or this CWG. The Charter must include a clear and limited mission statement and fundamental principles and limitations for the MRT (e.g., requiring an RFP [either at the end of every contract or when the MRT wants to switch from ICANN]) and prohibiting granting the IANA Functions Contract to an intergovernmental or government-led entity.) Where appropriate, these “dos and don’ts” should also be reflected in the organization documents of Contract Co. and the CSC. [Consider whether Charter amendments may be made by the MRT and whether these amendments need to be ratified by Members’ respective organizations. In any event, the mission statement should be difficult to change.]
Transparency	The MRT will function in a fully transparent manner, with an open mailing list, open meetings, and publicly posted recordings, transcripts and chat transcripts.
Accountability	Members will be accountable to the SO/AC/community that appointed them. A Member can be recalled by their community if he/she is not acting in accordance with the community’s instructions. The MRT will also be subject to annual public comment and review by the global multistakeholder community through an independent online process, to be collated and displayed by the MRT Secretariat. The MRT budget will be subject to an equivalent review.
Composition – Organizing Principles:	The MRT will primarily be made up of Members representing groups/organizations within the names community. The composition will be structured and balanced to ensure that the MRT embodies a strong commitment to efficient and neutral administration of the DNS root zone rather than any specific policy agenda.

Issue	Proposed Response
Stakeholder Organizations, Advisory Committees and other “names community groups” represented by Members	ccTLDs Registry Stakeholder Group (RySG) Registrar Stakeholder Group (RsSG) Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG) Business Constituency (BC) Intellectual Property Constituency (IPC) ISP/Connectivity Providers Constituency (ISPCPC) Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG) Non-Commercial Users Constituency (NCUC) Non-Profit Operational Concerns Constituency (NPOC) Government Advisory Committee (GAC) Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) Root Server Operators Advisory Committee (RSSAC) At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) Others? [See below]
Are there other “names community” groups that should be represented? If so, which, and should their representatives be Members?	TBD
Should the other “operational communities” be represented? If so, should their representatives be Members?	The ASO (for numbers) and [IAB or IETF] (for protocol parameters) should each appoint a non-voting but fully participating liaison to facilitate coordination across the different IANA functions.
How will the Member seats on the MRT be allocated (i.e., number of seats per group)?	TBD
Will there be “Participants” in addition to Members?	No. Broader community participation in the MRT will happen through group representation via bottom-up multistakeholder processes. MRT members will be expected to properly represent their groups’ views.
Will there be Alternate Members?	There will be no permanent Alternate Members, but Members will need to provide a proxy [or an alternate?] (for purposes of consensus calls) if they will miss a meeting.
Should ccTLD registry representative seats be allocated by region?	TBD
Should there be any other “balance” considerations, aside from balance among stakeholder groups? (e.g., geography, gender, etc.)	Each individual community should feel free to select Members based on that community’s individual criteria. There should be no “balance” requirements set for the MRT as a whole.
How are members chosen?	Members will be chosen by their stakeholder groups using processes developed by those groups

Issue	Proposed Response
How would it meet (phone, web, F2F with remote participation)?	Meetings would be conducted primarily by phone and web. F2F meetings as above.
Can Members be recalled by their communities?	Yes. This should be specified in the Charter, and each community should be encouraged to implement a method for recall.
Can Members be removed for other reasons?	If a Member exceeds a stated number of absences, the Member's community will be required to replace that Member
Term length and limits	MRT members should be appointed for limited terms, of a length appropriate given the contract renewal cycles. [Members should be limited to two terms.]
How will the leadership of the MRT be constituted?	The MRT will need at minimum a Chair and a Vice-Chair. An interim Chair and Vice-Chair would be picked ahead of time by the Members to get through the first meeting where an election can be held. [Consider desirability and need for co-Chairs or additional vice-Chairs]
How will decisions be made?	Wherever possible, decisions will be made on the basis of rough consensus among the Members. Where necessary, a formal consensus call will be conducted among the Members. [There will be no voting] or [There will be a supermajority voting construct ( $\frac{2}{3}$ or $\frac{3}{5}$ ) for key decisions.]
Will there be a standing group of independent experts?	[No] or [There should be 4 independent experts [in TBD fields] external to the ICANN community selected through a public nomination process administered by [MRT secretariat? ISOC? IEEE?] but subject to conflict of interest constraints.]
If there are experts, what are their areas of expertise?	TBD
Will the MRT have other advisors (including legal counsel)?	[In addition to the experts mentioned above,] the MRT will be able to retain Advisors and Legal Counsel on an as-needed basis.
Communication to Contract Co.	MRT will communicate on all formal and required matters in writing to Contract Co. Email will be considered a "writing," but social media, texts and "chat" will not.
Support Needs (e.g., secretariat, email, wiki, website, interpretation, accessibility, SOI space)	MRT will require a secretariat. Secretariat services will be [independent/supplied by the IANA Functions Operator on a [free/cost] basis]. MRT will require an internal wiki (including SOI functionality) and external web presence, as well as email and email list functionality.
Compensation for Members	Members will not be compensated
Travel support for Members	TBD; could be limited to support based on financial need for Members not supported by their employers.

Issue	Proposed Response
When would the MRT meet?	The MRT would meet as required by their duties (e.g., meetings before, during and after annual review). F2F meetings will be scheduled whenever possible to coincide with ICANN meetings or other Internet Governance meetings at which a substantial number of MRT members would attend. The MRT will not meet if there is no business pending before the MRT.
Funding	TBD. [Funding could come from a variety of sources, such as (a) fees set forth in the IANA Functions Contract, which could be based on annual flat fee (paid quarterly or monthly) or on customer transactions with the IANA Functions Operator]; (b) a royalty charged to ICANN for use of the IANA name (This assumes that ICANN will be required to transfer the IANA trademark registrations to Contract Co. (as the party granting the IANA Functions right to ICANN as the service provider)). or (c) initial "seed" funding from [ICANN and/or USG] of [\$TBD]].
Capture	Safeguards must be in place to ensure that the MRT remains independent of "ICANN corporate" but also cannot be captured or unduly influenced by governments, intergovernmental organizations, or specific economic or ideological interests.
How would the MRT manage an RFP?	The Secretariat would assist the MRT in managing the RFP process, along with outside advisors and legal counsel as necessary.
How would the MRT conduct site visits?	TBD by MRT
If there is an "independent Evaluator," how will the MRT hire and manage this person or entity?	TBD