CWG CSC/MRT Survey

* Required

Introduction

This survey is based on suggestions from the public comments, as well as additional, related questions. The goal is to get a high level sense of the views of CWG participants (i.e., Members and Participants) regarding these suggestions prior to the intensive work weekend on 10-11 January. To the extent possible, Members should make choices that they believe reflect the views of the group they represent; when that is not possible, they should express their personal opinion. (We assume that Members may not have time to go back to their respective groups in a timely fashion; there will be an opportunity for that later, as we develop the final proposal.)

Some of the public comment suggestions were provided in the context of 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/have 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 overall proposal you prefer. Where necessary, assume that the CSC and MRT are the same as described in the Draft Proposal, except as modified by the statement in question.

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/Is Acceptable/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/No Response.
- "Is Acceptable" should be used for statements that you believe you (or your group) can accept.

2. Do not assume any particular proposal (i.e., CWG proposal, Internal to ICANN proposal, or some other proposal). However, where necessary, assume that the CSC and MRT are the same as described in the CWG Proposal, except as modified by the statement in question.

3. Select a response even if you do not support the concept of the CSC or MRT, as applicable.

4. Names and other demographic information are requested to ensure that there are no duplicate submissions and to analyze certain data trends; names will not be reported with the results.

CWG Proposal Definitions of CSC and MRT

When responding to the statements in this survey, assume the following definitions (based on the CWG Proposal) apply, except to the extent modified by the statement in question:

Customer Service Committee (CSC)

Primarily made up of a number of representatives of registry operators, including ccTLD and gTLD registries. Input from the CSC would feed into and inform the work of the MRT. The CSC may also include additional individuals with relevant expertise and/or liaisons (or representatives) from other SO/ACs. The CSC would work with the MRT to establish Service Levels and Performance Indicators for the performance of the IANA Naming Functions; receive and evaluate reports from the IANA Functions Operator including regular performance reports; review these reports against established service levels; attempt to resolve any issues that arise; and escalate any unresolved issues to the MRT.

Multi-stakeholder Review Team (MRT)

A multistakeholder body with formally selected representatives from all relevant communities, operating with maximum public transparency. The MRT would develop the detailed contract terms for the agreement between Contract Co. and the IANA Functions Operator based on the key contract terms proposed by the CWG; make key decisions for Contract Co. (e.g., whether or not to enter into an RFP process); conduct the annual IANA Functions Operator Budget Review and performance reviews; address any escalation issues raised by the CSC (including engaging in enforcement); managing a re-contracting or RFP process (whether as an enforcement option or as part of a regular rebidding procedure).

Demographics

1. **Name** *
   Name is requested for the sole purpose of ensuring that there are no duplicate submissions.

   .....

2. **Email address** *
   Please enter your email address where you want a confirmation of completing the survey sent.

   .....

3. **Member or Participant**
   Please specify if you are a member or participant of the CWG.
   Check all that apply.

   - [ ] Member
   - [ ] Participant
   - [ ] Other: .....

4. **Organizational affiliation**

   .....

Customer Standing Committee (CSC)

5. **Customer Standing Committee (CSC)**

Select one response for each of the statements that best represents your view of the Customer Standing Committee (CSC)
Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Is Acceptable	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
There should be a Customer Standing Committee to carry out the tasks as defined in the CWG Draft Proposal (see introduction to this survey).						
The CSC should be an ICANN working group.						

6. **Customer Standing Committee (CSC)**

Select one response for each of the statements that best represents your view of the Customer Standing Committee (CSC)
Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Is Acceptable	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
1. The CSC should perform the functions of the MRT, and there should be no separate MRT.						
2. The CSC membership should include a substantial multi-stakeholder component.						
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 related experts, e.g., representatives of the SSAC, the RSSAC, the RIRs, ISOC, and the IETF.						

7. **Customer Standing Committee (CSC)**

Select one response for each of the statements that best represents your view of the Customer Standing Committee (CSC)

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Is Acceptable	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
5. If the CSC is only tasked with monitoring IANA performance (and not with resolving performance issues), 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.						

8. **Customer Standing Committee (CSC)**

Select one response for each of the statements that best represents your view of the Customer Standing Committee (CSC)

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Is Acceptable	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
10. Users of the IANA naming functions should be required to go through the CSC or the MRT to address issues relating to the IANA functions operator.						
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 MRT.						
12. 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.						
13. The role of the CSC should be focused on service level commitments, performance indicators and quality assurance.						
14. The CSC may go directly to the IAP (rather than escalating issues to the MRT) if there is an issue that cannot be resolved.						

9. **Customer Standing Committee (CSC)**

Select one response for each of the statements that best represents your view of the Customer Standing Committee (CSC)

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Is Acceptable	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
15. 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.						
16. The CSC may develop IANA service levels without going through the MRT.						
17. The CSC should be a subgroup of the MRT.						
18. The CSC should be tasked with the job of resolving issues related to policy implementation, or escalating these issues to the MRT if the CSC cannot resolve the issue.						
19. Assuming the CSC is composed only of registry representatives, the CSC (and not the MRT) should be solely responsible for annual IANA tasks (performance review, budget review and customer survey input).						
20. Assuming the CSC is composed of registries and other stakeholders, the CSC (and not the MRT) should be solely responsible for annual IANA tasks (performance review, budget review and customer survey input).						

Customer Standing Committee (CSC) - Comments

10. **Additional comments about the Customer Standing Committee (CSC)**
Please use the space below to enter any additional comments you may have about the CSC

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Multistakeholder Review Team (MRT)

11. **Statements regarding the Multistakeholder Review Team (MRT)**
Select one response for each of the statements that best represents your view
Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Is Acceptable	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No opinion
There should be a Multi-stakeholder Review Team to carry out the tasks as defined in the CWG Draft Proposal (see introduction to this survey).						
The MRT should be an ICANN working group.						

12. **Statements regarding the Multistakeholder Review Team (MRT)**

Select one response for each of the statements that best represents your view
Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Is Acceptable	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No opinion
1. The MRT should be responsible for creating or selecting an entity for contracting with the IANA Functions Operator, only if and when it is needed (i.e., when the Operator is no longer ICANN).						
2. The MRT should be convened by ICANN in conjunction with the I* organizations.						
3. The concept of the MRT could be replaced by a dual-pronged vehicle similar to that used by the addressing community [e.g., an "internal to ICANN" structure like the Address Supporting Organization (the "IANA Supporting Organization") and an external structure like the Numbers Resource Organization (the "IANA Resource Organization")].						
4. If an MRT is convened under the auspices of ICANN, it should have a legal status (e.g., incorporation) of its own.						

13. **Statements regarding the Multistakeholder Review Team (MRT)**

Select one response for each of the statements that best represents your view
Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Is Acceptable	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No opinion
5. If an MRT is NOT convened under the auspices of ICANN, it should have a legal status (e.g., incorporation) of its own.						
6. The MRT should not recreate another ICANN.						
7. Adequate care should be taken to restrict the growth dynamics of the MRT.						
8. There should be multistakeholder representation on the MRT.						
9. The composition of the MRT should be weighted toward greater representation of the registry operators, as direct customers of the IANA Function.						

14. **Statements regarding the Multistakeholder Review Team (MRT)**

Select one response for each of the statements that best represents your view
Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Is Acceptable	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No opinion
10. Membership in the MRT should be restricted to the direct customers of IANA, the registries.						
11. Control of decisions in the MRT should be restricted to the registries even if there are representatives of other stakeholder groups in the MRT.						
12. There is a danger that an MRT drawn entirely from ICANN's policy making and policy advisory organizations will politicize the IANA naming functions.						
13. The MRT (and not the CSC) should be solely responsible for the annual IANA tasks currently performed by the NTIA (performance review, budget review and customer survey input).						
14. The MRT (with input from the CSC) should be responsible for the annual IANA tasks currently performed by the NTIA (performance review, budget review and customer survey input).						

15. **Statements regarding the Multistakeholder Review Team (MRT)**
Select one response for each of the statements that best represents your view
Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Is Acceptable	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No opinion
15. The MRT's primary function should be deciding whether to renew the IANA Functions Contract and whether the IANA naming functions contract needs to be amended.						
16. The MRT should have a continuous existence (regardless of how often it meets).						
17. The MRT should be "re-created" each time it is needed.						
18. Members should have staggered terms (e.g., only one-third of the members should be replaced each year), to provide continuity.						
19. The MRT should be kept small in number, e.g., no more than a dozen representatives.						

16. **Statements regarding the Multistakeholder Review Team (MRT)**
Select one response for each of the statements that best represents your view
Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Is Acceptable	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No opinion
20. The MRT can be larger in number, e.g., twenty or more representatives, so that broad representation can be achieved.						
21. The composition and size of the MRT should be difficult to alter or amend.						
22. The term length of MRT members should be limited to two full contract cycles.						

Multistakeholder Review Team (MRT) - Comments

17. **Additional comments about the Multistakeholder Review Team (MRT)**

Please enter any additional comments you may have about the Multistakeholder Review Team (MRT) in the space below.

Thank you

Thank you for completing the CWG CSC/MRT survey.

Powered by Google Forms