**IANA CWG Poll Questions for the CSC & MRT - 30 Dec 14**

Statements regarding the CSC

1. The CSC could 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 involve ccTLD and gTLD registry operators with liaisons from other impacted parties.
5. In case the CSC is only tasked with monitoring IANA performance, the composition of CSC may be dominated by the registries.
6. The CSC should include additional individuals outside the naming community who have relevant technical expertise.
7. The CSC members should preferably 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 with 1/3 members retiring on a rotation basis.
9. The actual users of the IANA naming functions should address issues directly with the IANA functions operator rather than require it to go through the MRT.
10. The role of the CSC should be focused on service level commitments, performance indicators and quality assurance.
11. The CSC may go directly to the IAP if there is an issue that cannot be resolved.
12. The CSC may decide whether it is needed to create an instance of the MRT to address a specific topic or issue.
13. The CSC may develop IANA service levels without going through the MRT.
14. The CSC could be a subgroup of the MRT.
15. The CSC should be tasked with the job of escalating issues related to policy deviation.

*DENIC:*

*The CSC is one of the roles needed. The CSC should be focused on service level commitments, performance indicators and quality assurance (see 10.)   
The CSC membership should primarily involve ccTLD and gTLD registry operators with liaisons from other impacted parties (see 4.).*

Statements regarding the MRT

1. The MRT should only create a Contract Co. if and when it is needed.
2. The MRT could 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 IANA Support Organization & an IANA Resource Organization).
4. If an MRT is convened under the auspices of ICANN, it needs a legal status (i.e./e.g., incorporation) of its own.
5. If an MRT is **NOT** convened under the auspices of ICANN, it needs a legal status (i.e./e.g., incorporation) of its own.
6. The MRT should not be a recreation of another ICANN.
7. Adequate care should be taken to restrict the growth dynamics of the MRT.

*DENIC:*

*The MRT is a second role needed. It should be an incorporation or body that is responsible to contract, to oversee and – if needed- retender the IANA functions operator.*