

IANA CWG Survey Questions for the CSC & MRT - Draft 2 Jan 15

Introduction

This is a survey of IANA CWG participants (i.e., Members and Participants) regarding suggestions from the public comments, as well as questions from the RFP 3 subgroup. The goal is to get a high level sense of the views of CWG participants prior to the intensive work weekend on 10-11 January. Please respond with your personal views, since we assume that Members may not have time to go back to their respective groups; there will be opportunity for that later as we develop the final proposal. To the extent possible, Members should make choices that you believe reflect the views of the group you represent; when that is not possible, please express your personal opinion.

Some of the public comment suggestions were provided regarding a particular proposal (either the CWG proposal, the alternative "internal to ICANN" proposal, or another proposal). Because the proposal(s) to be submitted to the IANA Coordination Group (ICG) has not yet been decided, the survey statements are designed to be independent of any particular proposal. This survey contains suggestions related to the Customer Service Committee (CSC) and the Multi-stakeholder Review Team (MRT). Please respond to all items regardless of the proposal you prefer.

The results of the survey will be used to guide the CWG in considering the public comments and continuing its work toward development of a final proposal for submission to the ICG. Please note that this is **NOT** a consensus poll in any shape or form. Another survey is planned in a few days that will include suggestions related to the Independent Appeals Panel (IAP) and Contract Co.

Instructions

1. Select one response for each of the statements that best represents your view. The choices are:
Strongly Agree/Agree/Neither Agree nor Disagree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/No Opinion
2. Do not assume any particular proposal (i.e., CWG proposal, Internal to ICANN proposal, or some other proposal).
3. Select a response even if you do not support the concept of the CSC or MRT, as applicable.
4. Names are requested for the sole purpose of ensuring that there are no duplicate submissions; names will not be reported with the results.

Statements regarding the CSC

1. The CSC should perform the functions of the MRT.
2. There should be a substantial multi-stakeholder component of the CSC.
3. The CSC membership should be restricted to ccTLD and gTLD registry operators.

4. The CSC membership should primarily consist of ccTLD and gTLD registry operators with representatives from other impacted parties.
5. If the CSC is only tasked with monitoring IANA performance, the CSC may consist predominantly of registries.
6. The CSC should include additional individuals outside the naming community who have relevant technical expertise.
7. The CSC members should be drawn from the MRT so that there is coordination between CSC and MRT on matters that are escalated.
8. The CSC should have a continuous existence.
9. Members should have staggered terms (e.g., only one-third of the members should be replaced each year), to provide continuity.
10. Users of the IANA naming functions should be able to address issues directly with the IANA functions operator rather than being required to go through the MRT.
11. Users of the IANA naming functions should be able to address issues directly with the IANA functions operator rather than being required to go through the CSC.
12. The role of the CSC should be focused on service level commitments, performance indicators and quality assurance.
13. The CSC may go directly to the IAP (rather than the MRT) if there is an issue that cannot be resolved.
14. Assuming the MRT is not a standing committee, the CSC should decide whether an instance of the MRT needs to be created to address a specific topic or issue the CSC has been unable to resolve.
15. The CSC may develop IANA service levels without going through the MRT.
16. The CSC should be a subgroup of the MRT.
17. The CSC should be tasked with the job of resolving issues related to policy implementation, or escalating these issues to the MRT if not resolved.
18. The CSC (composed only of registry representatives) should be solely responsible for annual IANA tasks (performance review, budget review and customer survey input).
19. The CSC (composed of direct customers and other stakeholders) should be solely responsible for annual IANA tasks (performance review, budget review and customer survey input).

Statements regarding the MRT

1. The MRT should be convened by ICANN in conjunction with the I* organizations.
2. The concept of the MRT could be replaced by a dual-pronged vehicle similar to that used by the addressing community (e.g., an IANA Support Organization & an IANA Resource Organization).
3. If an MRT is convened under the auspices of ICANN, it should have a legal status (e.g., incorporation) of its own.
4. If an MRT is **NOT** convened under the auspices of ICANN, it should have a legal status (e.g., incorporation) of its own.
5. The MRT should not recreate another ICANN.
6. Adequate care should be taken to restrict the growth dynamics of the MRT.
7. There should be multistakeholder representation on the MRT.
8. Membership in the MRT should be restricted to the direct customers of IANA, the registries.
9. Control of decisions in the MRT should be restricted to the registries even if there are representatives of other stakeholder groups in the MRT.
10. The MRT should be solely responsible for annual IANA tasks (performance review, budget review and customer survey input).
11. The MRT (with input from the CSC) should be responsible for annual IANA tasks (performance review, budget review and customer survey input).
12. The MRT should have a continuous existence (regardless of how often it meets).
13. The MRT should be "re-created" each time it is needed.
14. Members should have staggered terms (e.g., only one-third of the members should be replaced each year), to provide continuity.