
MARRAKECH – SSAC Outreach
Tuesday, June 25, 2019 – 08:00 to 08:30 WET
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

JULIE HAMMER: Good morning, everyone. This is Julie Hammer, Vice Chair of SSAC. I know Rod was up working late because I saw him out at very late hours so I'm sure he's on his way, but we might just make a start. We're meeting this morning with the ATRT3 Team and I'm just wondering if you'd like to do a quick introduction around the table or just have people introduce themselves as they speak? Right, the latter just to save time. We only have half an hour. So, we have received a number of questions from ATRT3 and what I might do is throw it to Cheryl and ask you to facilitate asking us any questions that you might have, and we'll respond as best we can. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much Julie. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. And we really do value the time you're sharing with ATRT3. Now, we've already learned that we are supposed to at least once at the beginning of these interactions the Accountability and Transparency Review Team Third Generation but I kind of figured you're all okay if I just say ATRT from now on. Pat and I are the Coaches. I'll tell you what, just how about as you

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

introduce yourselves as we go here, just put your hands up if you're part of the ATRT3 Team. I figured you'd probably recognize anyone who wasn't so but there we are. We've identified ourselves now and anyone who is going to speak will say who they are.

I also don't believe we need to tell you, as an Advisory Committee that keeps its Seniors on the pulse of a whole lot of things, what the purpose of ATRT is in terms of accountability or any of our history, so we'll skip the sales pitch and we'll hopefully get right down to a little discourse and interaction. Because what we would value is hearing from your thoughts, individually and collectively, so we understand if it's a personal opinion, it's a personal opinion. But this is our one opportunity to look at how your Advisory Committee feels about Accountability and Transparency, both in the Organization, in your own context, and with the other component parts of ICANN.

But, that said, we've got the questions. We appreciate the fact that we could've got the questions to you earlier but never mind, we didn't. Least you got a few minutes notice. We also would appreciate that if we can't get through all of them and we know that could be a difficulty, that we could perhaps have some interaction later if you've got a thought on any of these. And be warned, you will also be being sent a questionnaire later on with

some other materials. So, let's start from the top and I see both Liu and Vanda as Work Party. We broke into four Work Parties and their particular Work Party is the GAC one so who wants to do the question? Vanda? Okay.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Thank you for the opportunity to be here. I have been SSAC Member once and I'm glad to be back and our question is some communities have increased their relationship with GAC and I understand the specific issues from SSAC but in addition to any intention of liaison that you have in the past from the GAC side, can you articulate additional opportunities that you see to enhance this cooperation with the GAC? It's an open question but please.

JULIE HAMMER:

This is Julie Hammer. I'll respond to this in a couple of ways. First of all, we do have interaction with the PSWG, Public Safety Working Group of the GAC. We have had that interaction over a long period of time. It fell into abeyance for a period but we have revitalized that over the last few ICANN Meetings and we have a meeting to discuss issues of common interest with them tomorrow morning. So, through that interaction we do have an ongoing relationship with a subset of the GAC.

Having said that, we have discussed the issue of liaisons both into and from the SSAC with a range of other SOs/ACs including the GAC. And this has been something that's come up in our review by the independent examiner recently. The thing that we struggle with is that we're only a small group and we try and focus on core SSAC work which is looking at Security and Stability issues of the DNS and if we begin trying to provide liaisons to a range of other groups, then we're left with nobody to do the work. And so that we do struggle with that. We're not against liaisons but we simply don't have the capacity to do that. Having said that, we have been approached, I think probably 18 months to two years ago, by the GAC with the proposal that the GAC send a liaison to the SSAC. And we were certainly not averse to that but for whatever reason that never actually eventuated. So, it's not a topic that we are against. It's really an issue of capacity.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

This is Rod Rasmussen. Let me add to that liaison question. In particular, we do have an unofficial official liaison from the ALAC. The way that works, though, is that whoever that liaison is has to pass membership qualifications for the SSAC and be accepted as a full member of the SSAC. So, whichever group that ends up sending that person over loses that person. So, it's not our preferred modus operandi. But as Julie says, we're always open

to having discussions around that. And I would also add that we've had a pretty good informal working relationship with the GAC Leadership around several issues in the last year or so that have come up that are of mutual concern.

LYMAN CHAPIN:

Thank you Cheryl. Lyman Chapin with SSAC. The question brings to my mind what I think may be a slightly higher-level question that you folks may be thinking about and I'd be curious to know if this on your agenda. Which is we always think of each of the ACs/SOs has a charter in which its pretty explicitly stated that the obligation is to provide advice to the Board and to the Community in the case of SSAC. And behind your question I see a concern about well what are the responsibilities either formal or informal latterly among the SOs/ACs? And I know we don't have a lot time here but one of the things I'll be interested in hearing from the ATRT effort is the extent to which you think that needs to be put on some kind of a more formal basis. It's very informal now as Rod just said. Each SO/AC does it differently, but it will certainly be interesting to me and I think to the rest of SSAC to know what your thoughts are on that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Lyman. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Is there anyone else who wants to speak on that, if not I'll just briefly respond to you? Of course, it is very much of interest to us because we're also looking at the Work Stream 2 work and how it has or has not been implemented and as you are well aware there was a good deal of work done on the Accountability of the SOs/ACs in that. So, definitely is in our bailiwick. I can't tell you what the responses are now because right now we're doing data capture. Next step will be data analysis. Yes, watch this space because it is part of the job description. And thank you all and remember we are open to comments on any of these questions at any time so just pass them through to us and we would appreciate more.

The next question is to do with the transparency and I'm assuming that Michael will ask that if he can get to a microphone. Or you could just project.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hello all. Michael Karanicolas for the record. The question that you see in front of you is what is your perception of transparency within the Policy Development Processes, including the EPDP but maybe based on yesterday's discussion we will broaden that out slightly to also include any accountability challenges that you see in how those processes are carried out.

JULIE HAMMER:

Okay, so, Julie Hammer again. I'll respond initially but I also welcome other SSAC Members to chime in. So, just at a high-level, we have a number of SSAC Members who are involved in various PDPs, probably in most of them, through other roles that they play within ICANN. And this provides us with a level of visibility of what's happening within PDPs as well as the information that the PDPs themselves make public. But our members who are involved through their other roles do not provide formal SSAC input. For the EPDP, it's a little bit different because we do have formal SSAC representation there and those representatives have a formal SSAC Working Group sitting behind them validating their input that they're giving so that one is a little bit different. But it usually what our modus operandi is that once a PDP is concluded and provides recommendations, that that is when the SSAC provides its formal response to the recommendations.

So, my conception is that there isn't a problem with visibility as such, but I would certainly welcome other SSAC Members who've been directly involved to make comment. I guess they agree with what I said.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We'll take silence as agreement. That's great. The next question if I can spot Jaap. Jaap, where are you? There you are. Perfect. Give that man a microphone. Did you want to articulate the next question about whether or not SSAC is satisfied with the...

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Not allowed to answer this question. I mean it's just for this SSAC finds about Advisory Board. I can't answer that. Better leave it to...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alright, so you're going to plead that you don't want to compromise your role in the ATRT then? Alright, it's okay.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: I don't know which hat I'm wearing then.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I wouldn't want to see you confused this early in the morning, believe me. Alright, well you obviously can all read the question. So, let's open it to the floor in general without any entrée. Is SSAC satisfied with the how the Board handles advice knowing that your primary purpose of course is advising the ICANN Board. And

we are well aware of what happens with the advice you give but this is how do you feel about how it's being managed?

JULIE HAMMER:

Julie Hammer again. So, this has been a subject that has taken our attention in quite a significant way in recent times and our various Board Liaisons, both Ram Mohan and Merike Kaeo, have put a lot of effort into this as have our own SSAC Support Staff in working with them to review all of our SSAC advice going back over many years. And we have looked at this in a lot of detail.

The examination of all of our SSAC advice is ongoing with follow-up action happening and there are instances where the implementation of the advice has been less than optimal and there are other instances where it's been good and there's other instances where the advice is so old and the fact that it's been not acted upon, it's now become redundant. So, I guess the situation is in the past, there've been concerns. At the moment, there's a lot of work being done and both the Board and ICANN Org are receptive to working with us on that. So, it's very collaborative relationship and there's a lot going on in that space. So, I think going forward, there will be much less of an issue with how the Board responds to our advice. Not just in accepting it but then in following through and is it implemented in the way that it was intended.

What I would like to do is ask Merike Kaeo, who has actually been doing a massive amount of work on this, if she'd like to add anything.

MERIKE KAEO:

Sure. Good morning, everyone. So as Julie was iterating, I mean both Ram and now myself, as a Board Liaison from SSAC, have undertaken to be working with ICANN Org who has been very, very receptive to helping us in really understanding what was implemented and really going back to even the first SSAC advice. I mean, we've been going through the entire history to take a look at what has been implemented, how it has been implemented, how is where we are today impacted any advice that really wasn't implemented and a lot of it as Julie said has been redundant. But I have been extremely pleased with the Board and also ICANN Org in terms of the help that they've given us to really get through this and then get to a steady state.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Rod Rasmussen. Just to add. We've been having a collaboration to improve the process that's the advice registrar or advice registry or tracking system. I think I just called it arts instead of are. I like bar better myself. We all paid much more attention to it when it was the bar. One of the things we identified was, and it's

already been mentioned but I wanted to emphasize, that the Board has been working towards more diligently getting through advice as it's come in. They've formed the BTC, I think partly due to do to trying to move advice through. That's the Board Technical Committee.

What we identified though was that there was a gap in the tracking which is what happens after the Board takes a resolution and says, "Do x, y, and zed with this advice." The Implementation Phase. So that's what we've been working on most recently with ICANN Staff, the Implementation Staff, to do a process there. To say, "Okay, where does this actually end up." And by the way, does it even make sense from what the Board said and what we said originally and trying to do that. Now, that's an ongoing process. I think that would be something that would be of interest to get more feedback on from this group.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record again. We're going to move to the next question. Did you want to say something? Go ahead, Wolfgang.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Just additional question. Wolfgang Kleinwaechter. You said you went through the whole history, how the Board has reacted. Is

there any case in the long history where the Board has ignored or rejected the advice?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yes.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Was it a conflict in substance or what you did that was to reject that advice?

ROD RASMUSSEN: There haven't been really flat out, "Oh you guys are totally off base. We're going to ignore you, and this is wrong." Danny might have recollection of one. There's none just off the top of my head. Danny, do you have something?

DANNY MCPHERSON: Yeah. This is Danny McPherson. It wasn't flat out rejected but I think a good example is the name collision issue in 2012 where SSAC had given numerous prior advice. And I don't know that the Board ignored it flat out, but it really wasn't acted upon and there were a lot of long term things that delayed the program and impacted all the Stakeholders. And so I know some of private sector helped elevate the urgency and concern for acting upon

some of those recommendations and then SSAC multiple times restated advice, probably at least three or four times to Merike's earlier point. And then I think from that ICANN actually, and OCTO and the Board created the Board Advice Register and began tracking things much more elaborately. And so now we're in a much better place probably as a result of that activity and so I think it's much better than it was but that was a big one that still has implications on where we are with the first round of gTLDs and name inclusions and what not.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And indeed, the second round, if it's ever going to get off the ground. The Subsequent Procedures PDP is very aware of the name collisions work and what state it is currently in. Yes, go ahead.

MERIKE KAEO: Yes, this is Merike Kaeo again. Another comment also is as we were reviewing all of the older advice, sometimes the language that the SSAC had given, it wasn't necessarily clear in terms of who does what. And so that's also a learning phase in terms of when the SSAC does give advice, what is the language so that it can be acted upon and by whom?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Just add one more point. One of the reasons that we've gone through to the Implementation Phase is where we've taken a look at things, and the Board may have passed a Resolution to do something, and then that disappeared. My personal favorite one is a Work Party I led. I know where this one landed. I found out where this one ended up but that was SAC 70 which was on the public suffix list issues and that the Board said, "Yeah. That sounds like a good idea. Org, go off and do something with this." and then Org said, "We don't think there's something to do here." Just disappeared into the ether. Yeah, so given that I was the one who led that party and am now chair of the SSAC, it will get addressed at some point.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just a small likelihood you think. Okay. Thank you very much for that. This is exactly the sort of interaction we're looking for so thank you. This is really very valuable. Hopefully we'll squeeze this next question in and I'm looking around the table and I note, of course, Sébastien Bachollet was deeply involved in the Work Stream 2 Work in Diversity, so I might get him to briefly articulate the next question for us.

SEBBA: Okay. Recognizing the unique structure, function, and purpose of SSAC and given the lack of term limits, how does SSAC envisage it can deal with increasing skillset diversity while limiting the number of SSAC Members? We of course in the Work Stream 2 went through a long, not so long, but a list of various diversity purposes. Here, we are specifically wanting to discuss the skills that you need within the SSAC. And as you say that you have difficulty to have more people to do other job like liaison to other group. But how you are able to fulfill the need and diversity and the skillset not to have just for example all the members are very knowledgeable on network but nothing on the domain names, also reversed. And what the global organization can do to help you with that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. Julie?

JULIE HAMMER: Great, thanks. And this is something, an issue of diversity based in skills and other diversity elements that has come up in a number of forums. One being in Work Stream 2. The other being in SSAC Review. And we've actually been talking about quite a bit of this over a period of time and in response to both of those inputs, we recognized that the SSAC is sometimes limited in its

thinking about its own strategizing by the skillset we possess, and it might be that if we had a broader skillset, our strategizing might be broader in itself.

So, what we're planning to do and we're working on some of this in the current meeting this week, is taking a much more deliberate approach to our strategizing and prioritizing, looking at the environment, and thinking, "What are the things that we should be concentrating on? What are the skillsets we currently have and what are the skillsets that we might need to focus on the issues that we believe SSAC should be working on?" And identifying any gaps in skills. Not only skills though but also thinking about how other aspects of diversity such as the diversity that comes with people from particular geographic regions or people with particular language skills might bring into the mix and give us perspectives. People in different levels of development within their countries, technological development. How that impacts the issues that we're working on.

Bringing all of those things together to identify both what skills we need, what skills we currently have, derive about our skillset but also look at the same issues with diversity elements that we believe we might need to supplement our group with. And from that try to come to a better grip on what's the sort of size of SSAC that we need to actually meet all of those skills needs and

diversity needs. It's not going to be an exact number. It'll be some sort of a range and it'll be a bit dependent on the existing members and the sort of skillset they currently possess.

But we are planning a more deliberate approach to trying to come to some decisions on those issues and what we then want to do is also implement a more deliberate approach to our seeking new members, making our needs more public, publishing it on our website in a way that we don't currently do, and going to a more deliberate approach to make that visible to members in the Community whose skills we need and outside the Community to in fact maybe attract them in. So, we've been talking a lot about this. We've got a lot of work to do in this space, but we've certainly taken on board the thoughts expressed in both Work Stream 2 and by our review by independent examiner.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Lyman?

LYMAN CHAPIN: Thank you Cheryl. Lyman Chapin. Add one very specific observation to what Julie just said that may be helpful in the larger ATRT context. One of the things we've realized SSAC is a highly technical group and when you get a group of people together who have spent their professional lives honing their

ability to recognize a certain set of skills that are important with respect to the problems that we can see right in front of us now, you run the risk that what you don't have is the ability to see the skills that will be necessary to address problems that you don't even know about yet.

And that's a very tough one to crack because we all believe ourselves to be really good at evaluating the skillsets of potential members of SSAC, but of course what we're using are our own understanding of what skills are valuable. And they tend to be the skills that we have ourselves. It's just human nature. So, we overvalue the skills that we have already acquired and undervalue skills that might help us recognize and deal with problems that haven't come along yet. So, it's one of the things that as Julie mentioned we're going to be spending some time trying to figure out how might we do that but of course if you take it up a level from SSAC I think that's relevant to the more general questions that you folks are looking at, too.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much and this meeting is being recorded, isn't it? Excellent. Because I think we might just cut and paste out of the transcript there. It seems to be beautifully articulated. Thank you, Lyman. Pat, would you like to wrap us up?

PATRICK KANE:

Certainly. And I just make one comment with what Lyman had said. This is Pat Kane. I think that with the answers to the first question about not having enough people to have liaisons, that the size discussion would be very interesting in terms of what you're doing in terms of composition. So, the last question that we had really was just is there anything that you would like to share with us directly in terms of what you're seeing from a... What looks good from Accountability and Transparency or what doesn't, but we'll put that into the survey and let you guys kind of free form. So expect a follow-up with these same questions and then on the third question where we had to ask for specific examples of when advice was either rejected or ignored or not acted upon, we'll ask for some specific examples in that area as well. So, we'll follow up with this survey. So, I want to thank you all on behalf of the ATRT3 for your time this morning and your commentary.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Great. Thank you for that. Julie already covered some of the things we're doing on trying to be more transparent ourselves about our needs from a membership perspective. And there are several things that are going on as far as interaction with the rest of the community. We have some things that we're planning on

doing from a sharing more about the activities we're doing and doing more to kind of publicize our reports as well.

We were in a Tech Day Meeting yesterday and we just released this really good, really, really, really good, SAC 105 Document on IOT and how it interacts with the DNS and Jacques Latour presented that and then asked the question, "How many people have read it?" Only two non-SSAC people have read it so far. So, we have a little bit of work to do there. And there was 150 people in the room and they're the techies. So, there's being transparent and then there's actually does anybody care or know about it? Actually, it's obfuscation that was the issue, right? You were doing this work but do people actually know it even exists?

And then one of the interesting things we're doing as well is we have the NCAP Project going on right now where we're actually incorporating members of the Community in a discussion group. We've never done anything like that before. But that was seen as a strong need because of the nature of the NCAP, Name Collisions Analysis Project. So that's a little bit new and different. I don't know if we'll continue doing things like that or not, but we'll see how that works out.

One last thing, and there is a concern, this is a meta-concern, and I know some of you have heard me on this horse before, but I might as well get it on the record here, as a SO/AC Chair, we are

looked at to do things and we have very few things written down as to how to do them. And this came up in the context of SSR2 a year and a half ago and we have not solved that problem. And that problem desperately needs solving because we don't know what the next thing is that the Community is supposed to have our Leaders come together and figure out but how do we do that? How do we even give... Fortunately we've come to consensus because we've known each other and liked each other and said we got to figure this out but how do we actually... What are the tools? So, anyways, I wanted to get this on this record, too.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And we appreciate that, and we appreciate your time. Thank you so very much and we do look forward to continuing interactions with you. Our door is open, our ears are very keen to hear what you want to say. Did you want to do something, Negar?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Good morning everyone. Negar Farzinnia for the record. I actually wanted to comment on what Rod, you just noted about the responsibilities or the actions that the Community has to take under the new Bylaws and that there are not a lot of specific guidelines. The Operating Standards that actually have just been adopted by the Board, they do lay out some guidelines about

certain actions that the Community, as Leaders having to come together and decisions that they have to make. These guidelines are laid out in the Operating Standards. It may not cover everything just yet, but I highly encourage everyone to read the Operating Standards, take a look through those sections and see if you find the information that you think might be useful in helping guide the actions that hopefully will never have to be taken again but if so there might be some help there for everyone. And we're happy to share that link with everyone if you're not able to find Operating Standards Document for ease of access. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen who belong to ATRT, let these people get back to the important work they do. Thank you so much, Rod. Thank you so much, Julie.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]