

1. What do the members and liaisons on the CSC see as the value of the CSC?
CSC was expected to ensure cooperation between the stakeholders who rely on the effective operation of the IANA naming functions: is it achieving this?

2. Is the CSC effective in handling its business (as seen as by the committee as a whole and by representatives of different stakeholder groups)?
If there are any issues, are they associated with the charter?

The CWG-IANA saw the CSC as a primary part of the accountability model for the IANA naming functions: how do you think it is performing in this role?

- a) How well do you think that the interaction between members and liaisons, and between the CSC and PTI meet the expectations of the different stakeholder groups?
- b) Is there a need to differentiate responsibilities of PTI liaison and reflect in charter?
- c) Is the balance between members and liaisons correct?
- d) Does the workload demand too much from members? Do you expect the workload to change now that the CSC has bedded in?
- e) Does the size of the committee need to be reconsidered?
- f) Do the roles and responsibilities of members and liaisons need to be revisited?
- g) In relation to voting and non-voting – What goes to a vote and what doesn't (and why)? Are the views of the liaisons being taken into account before a vote happens?
- h) The CSC meetings are held once a month, and there are regular updates for the community 3 times a year. Given the need for the CSC to be engaged early in addressing any performance issues, how would you like to see the framework for interactions between CSC and PTI developed? Would there be issues if the frequency of calls reduced or calls were shorter?
- i) Does the CSC mandate need to be re-visited? If so, how and why?

3. A discussion on the CSC proposals (and their wider implications) for charter changes.