MARRAKECH – RSSAC Work Session: Reviews
Tuesday, June 25, 2019 – 09:00 to 10:15 WET
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

BRAD VERD: So, this is our first RSSAC session today. This first RSSAC session today is in regarding … This is about the reviews, right? And this is our feedback to the NomCom piece?

FRED BAKER: Right.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. This is our feedback to the NomCom Review and they've asked for specific feedback from us. So, this goes to the larger question, the ongoing discussion that RSSAC has had about voting in NomCom. So, there's a couple of things going on that I just paint the playing field so everybody understands before we start the discussion.

In the NomCom review, there was a recommendation that both SSAC and RSSAC should be voting members and the board said yes. So, that means if we don't want to be voting members, we have to tell the board no and why we're saying no.

So, a couple of ways to go through this. One, we want to talk about becoming a voting member in NomCom and then, two, if

we're not comfortable with it because of the way the words are written in our bylaws, what do we need to change in those words to make it so people are comfortable if we want to be voting. Does that make sense? Follow that? That's kind of the crux of this discussion here.

So, NomCom has a recommendation that was accepted by the board for RSSAC and SSAC to be voting members. So that falls on us now to figure out how we implement that or not. Any comments or questions? Thoughts? Everybody okay with that? We can be voting? Yeah. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I do have a couple of comments, but should we first do it around the table for the audience, so that they know who we are?

BRAD VERD: Sure. Happy to do that. Now let's do introductions. Liman, go ahead and start.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: So I'm Lars Liman. I work for Netnod and we operate one of the root name servers.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Good morning. I'm Ryan Stephenson. I work for Defense Information Systems Agency. It's one of the agencies with the DoD. We operate the G-root name server constellation.

PAUL VIXIE: My name is Paul. I'm part of the RSSAC caucus.

NAELA SARRAS: Good morning. I'm Naela Sarras. I'm the IANA liaison to RSSAC.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Good morning. I'm Kaveh Ranjbar, RIPE NCC root operations.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Andrew McConachie, ICANN support staff.

OZAN SAHIN: Ozan Sahin, ICANN support staff.

CARLOS REYES: Carlos Reyes. ICANN support staff.

FRED BAKER: Fred Baker, ISC.

BRAD VERD: Brad Verd, Verisign.

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro Hotta, WIDE and JPRS root operator.

JEFF OSBORN: Jeff Osborn, ISC.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy, SSAC liaison to the RSSAC.

DUANE WESSELS: Duane Wessels, from Verisign as the root zone maintainer liaison to RSSAC.

KEN RENARD: Ken Renard, ARL.

KARL REUSS: Karl Reuss, University of Maryland. Root server operator.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Daniel Migault, IAB liaison.

WES HARDAKER:	Wes Hardaker, University of Southern California's Information Sciences Institute.

FRED BAKER:	Let me stick something in here that Kaveh mentioned to me a few minutes ago. We have a number of people in the audience, we have at least one caucus member, we have obviously the RSOs. Today, the meetings are going to be basically among the RSOs, among the RSSAC. Tomorrow, we will have metrics meetings and we'll a resolver meeting, and they're open. And specifically those are caucus meetings that happen to be happening here. This particular meeting, though, is of the RSSAC, of the RSOs that are operating the network.

BRAD VERD:	Yeah, just to elaborate on that, engagement questions at the mic will be specifically limited to RSSAC members. Back to the topic, which is a voting seat in NomCom. Liman, did you want to speak?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	Yes, thank you. We've been around this a couple of times before in other settings. I still struggle with the concept that we should have voting power over a board that appoints this committee. That, to me, constructs a circular dependency that I'm not quite

comfortable with. Having an advisory role is fine. You know my bad memory, but I understood that there were proposals first to remove some of the influence that the RSSAC would have through its liaison in the NomCom. But here, I hear that they want, instead, to give the RSSAC liaison more power by giving it voting power. Striking the right balance is there is a problem … Or, sorry. We need to strike the right balance there. I still struggle with that circle of dependency. How can we appoint the board that appoints us? That doesn't really work well for me.

We should also keep in mind that if we have voting power, that will be the first place where we actually have voting power, I believe. We have voting power among ourselves to generate advice, but that advice is not binding, which means that we don't need to carry the responsibility of having produced decisions. If we have voting power in the NomCom, that will put a responsibility on our shoulders that could tie in to a need to look at insurances for lawsuits, and all that kind of stuff that we don't have to deal with right now. I'm not a lawyer, as you all know, but to me that's a big cloud of problems that appears, and as we stay on the right side of the border, we don't have to deal with that. We might have to deal with that if we climb the fence here. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Liman, let me respond to your first point. I very much agree that there's a circular dependency if we're appointing a board that appoints us. That said, that's not actually what we do. That's what the language is in the bylaws, but what actually happens is that Netnod or ISC or whoever says, we would like for so-and-so to represent us and the board says, "Sold! So-and-so represents whoever." And I wonder if there is a better word for what we actually do that would also alleviate your concern. So I would suggest that we change the word "appointed" to "accepted" or another word somewhere in that category. If we were to do that, would your issue be alleviated?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, it would. It will require some thought, and I'm sure that I'm not the right person to figure out the exact language. But it would be alleviated if we changed that word, if we broke the circle. But I think that ICANN should make sure that they make the same changes for all the advisory committees in that case, so that we have a clean model of how it works, so that we have the same settings for SSAC and RSSAC. I don't know about the other advisory committees are more complicated and more cloudy to me. Thanks.

[JEFF OSBORN]:   Yeah, I share your concern, Liman. I'm just wondering, is this part of the same slippery slope, and do we want to have the discussion about being part of the Empowered Community as well? If I'm getting that term right.

BRAD VERD: I don't know if it's the same slippery slope, but it falls maybe in the general area.

[JEFF OSBORN]:   So is that going to come up this week as well? The two of them being discussed separately feel a little funny to me. Maybe that's just me.

BRAD VERD: We can certainly discuss it. it's just that right now we've been given an action from the board, so we need to talk about that action, and as I alluded, if that action leads to us changing the bylaws for RSSAC, that could be an outcome. Another outcome could be the decision to go down the Empowered Community route. As they're all intertwined, we can certainly bring it up now. But we do have an action in front of us that we need to address.

RUSS MUNDY:	Thanks, Brad. One thing that I wanted to point out, with respect to the point that Liman raised, is that the ICANN board is approximately half made up of appointees by the NomCom. The rest of the board is, by the bylaws, designation from particular communities for a member. So it certainly does have somewhat the flavor of, gee, if we're going to nominate the board, then does it make sense for us to be appointed by the board? Carlos, do you know what the number is? My recollection is it's approximately 50%, and I don't remember which way it goes, if slightly over 50% is NomCom, or slightly under 50% is NomCom. It's not like the NomCom is the only source for board membership, just a major one.
BRAD VERD:	Wes, and then I'll make a comment after Wes.
WES HARDAKER:	So, there has to be another group that has the same issue. We can't be the only group with a feedback loop problem. Isn't there some other group that's already solved this problem that we can model things after?
CARLOS REYES:	Liman was alluding to this as well. If you look at some of the history, RSSAC and SSAC originally started as advisory

committees to the president and CEO of ICANN. That's different from how the GAC and the ALAC started. They're all advisory committees, but their origins are slightly different. So in that sense, they were appointed members by the board, because they were advising the president and CEO. The community has evolved, etc. I don't think that those changes have ever been affected.

So we can look at ALAC and GAC. Those two advisory committees are also members of the Empowered Community. I think RSSAC and SSAC had some similar foundational relationships within the ICANN community, so we can address that. But I actually think, in many ways, because RSSAC is already thinking about evolving RSSAC, it may be an opportunity to look at a new model as well. Wes?

WES HARDAKER: Thank you, Carlos.

BRAD VERD: I was in the queue, then Liman. I have a comment going to what Liman said, around this cyclical thing that everybody has pointed to. It's more commentary than anything. I don't want to lose sight of the intent, whereas we're all engineers, and you interpret the actual words – and you are correct, Liman, there's

a cyclical relationship there. But I believe the intent of what actually happens, and what goes on, maybe are two different things. That's kind of where I come back. If we need to change the words in the bylaws – we're making bylaw changes anyway for the chair and vice chair and what not, so this is a great time to do it. I think we need to figure that out.

Just to add more color or context to the challenge or what's being put in front of us, the NomCom is being called now. The NomCom is being seated for this year. It's happening now. None of this would affect what's going on now. This voting mechanism, or voting seat, if we went forward with it, wouldn't happen until next year's NomCom because of the time that's going to be involved to change the bylaws. I don't want to confuse the two, because we are going through nominating NomCom people now. This discussion would not affect that. It would affect the next NomCom at the earliest.

BRAD VERD: Okay. Liman, go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. If we were to vote on the nominating committee, that would mean that we go from a pure advisory role into a decision making role. I am not averse to that. I hear what you

say, that the entire community has changed over time. It's been 20 years, and I appreciate that. But if we are going to step into the decision-making process, maybe we should look at the longer horizon, not for this item, for voting power on the board as well. That's a different issue. But something several years down the line.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. We've just raised two other issues now, the Empowered Community, and now you're talking about a voting member on the board. I don't necessarily disagree with any of that. What I'd like to point out, though – at least my interpretation, and maybe I'll look to Carlos or Ozan to help me here – is we're not making any decisions by this seat becoming a voting member. With the confidentiality of the NomCom, the representative goes in. They don't come back here and consult us on what we think or want. It's not like this body is making a decision on what happens in that NomCom room. That's my interpretation. Is that correct, Carlos?

CARLOS REYES: I think the RSSAC would give the liaison guidance.

BRAD VERD: But not decision making … Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I would interpret the decisions of the NomCom as decisions. And the members of the NomCom would be collectively responsible for those decisions, meaning that the liaison would take on a role of democratic decision within NomCom. And that puts a collective responsibility on him or her. That means that we step into this role. We don't make single-handedly the decision, but we step into the circle where decisions are being made, whereas today, we just give advice to the people who are in the circle. To me, that's actually stepping across a border. I can be fine with that, only if we are conscious about taking that step. "Okay, we want to do this." And that's fine. If we could modify slightly the bylaws so that we break this circle of dependency, I'm actually fine with it. I just want to make sure that you understand my view of what we're doing.

[JEFF OSBORN]:   Well, again, Liman puts it better than I do. There's a series of changes we're talking about. If becoming the quietly, in the background, NomCom member where it really doesn't show, so it really doesn't matter, that may be one thing. Some of these other steps do. We're proposing in an hour to talk about being a money accepting organization that actually signs contracts. There are big steps in the very soon often. If I was doing any of

these independently, I would have counsel. I don't know if we're going to have to talk, God forbid, to lawyers or anything else but these are all legally binding steps which is out of our nature in the past.

BRAD VERD: I'm not sure how to address the legally binding nature of a NomCom member making that a voting seat. So, I don't know how to …

CARLOS REYES: Yeah, we can talk to ICANN Legal. This isn't setting new precedent in terms of the relationship between the NomCom and their decision. My colleagues from MSSI are here if we have any questions about the actual implementation steps of the NomCom review. If the RSSAC thinks that's be helpful, they are here and can comment on that. We don't have anyone from legal here, but we can follow up on that.

RUSS MUNDY: Having been on the NomCom a couple of times, I can say that there's some particularly unique things about the NomCom besides the confidentiality factors that have been mentioned. One of the factors that seems to be a big impact is each year, in theory, the NomCom completely restarts how their specific

details of their process operates. That's something that has been criticized. I know there was at least something that came out of the review process about that, with the idea that it would be much better if the processes that NomCom used were – if not developed and consistent from year to year – were at least visible to the community prior to the beginning of how NomCom is going to work, because each time, it works differently.

One time when I was on it, as a liaison only, non-voting person, I actually ended up voting on everything except the very last formal vote for the people. In looking at the responsibilities of a liaison versus a voting member, what was written in the paperwork, there was no difference in terms of your responsibilities and what your liabilities were, whether you voted or not.

But those were just those particular NomComs. I do not know if it would be different in the future, or if this year's NomCom, if there are identical responsibilities or not. I just haven't followed it that closely. But in theory, redo their procedures every year. What I saw in practice was that mostly they use what the previous year used.

FRED BAKER: That's all well and good. That's a little bit aside from the point that we're dealing with right now. We're not fixing the NomCom at the moment. Maybe one of these days, but not right now.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: The biggest issue for me with this specific question on the table here, the NomCom one, is to make sure, to have, so to speak, guarantees from ICANN legal or the ICANN organization that the liaison from RSSAC, or the appointed person from RSSAC, receives the same legal protection as anyone else on the NomCom, so that the individual person doesn't risk being sued for a decision he took part in as a member of that group. It should be a business insurance behind that that covers that type of liability. That's the biggest concern I have.

BRAD VERD: Certainly. Maybe I'm being naïve, but I'm assuming that all members of NomCom have the same protections, and none of them are any different. But we can certainly verify that. Can we take that as an action item with legal, please?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you.

BRAD VERD:

Back to the question at hand, which is multi-dimensional and complicated. But the question at the top of the pile is the voting seat. If we can fix the verbiage, are we okay with going forward as a voting seat? That's a general, let's get a feel for the room.

If we don't want the voting seat, then we need to come up with the answer of why we are saying no to the board. Those are the two different paths there. Jeff, you like you want to …

JEFF OSBORN:

Yeah. Again, I share a lot of Liman's concerns. I can't believe I'm the brand-new kid, I've only been coming to these for two years. But I think we're in the process of thinking about changing the role of RSSAC or whatever it becomes within ICANN. And it is going to be a body that is more a partner to negotiating, it's going to be a partner that is more a party to receiving funding, being held to goals, and all kinds of other things. So we kind of can't hold all of the same principles as sacred as we used to, because we're about to sell them all for a bowl of porridge. I'm just wondering whether this vote isn't simply the first step in, "We're here, we're proud, we're RSSAC, get used to it." You know what I'm saying? It's a change in our function.

But to turn this one down because we used to not do this thing I think would be wrong. I think we want to take this on just because we're about to take a bunch of things on. We either

have to decide now a bunch of stuff isn't going to happen and it will all be like it used to be or this is symbolically the first step of, we need lawyers, guns, and money going forward.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Wes, did you want to say something? Otherwise, I'm going to jump in. Okay. So just to add commentary to that, I agree with what you just said. I think we need to separate it into bits and pieces as much and possible, because what happens to RSSAC is really going to be directly influenced from the GWG, the Governance Working Group, which is yet to be put together and have that work happen. I think we all have an idea of where that's going to go, but that has yet to happen. We're going to certainly have an influence on all of that. So that's one piece. What happens to RSSAC?

I think there's two other pieces that we can talk about and have direct impact on, which is, one, the voting seat at NomCom, which is what this topic is now. The second piece is do we, RSSAC, regardless of what happens with the GWG, do we want to become a member of the Empowered Community, as you pointed out earlier?

All of these are, as you say, steps along the way that go down this road that I believe we've been pretty transparent about and

talked about, where things are going. Is that an accurate portrayal of the environment or the playing field right now?

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah. I think we have to be careful of what we try to do in a vacuum, because we have fewer vacuums in which we're going to be working.

BRAD VERD: Up on the screen and in the room, this is the verbiage for – I'm sorry, I don't have it in front of me – our bylaws.

CARLOS REYES: The ICANN bylaws.

BRAD VERD: Right. Carlos took the ICANN bylaws, which call RSSAC, and made some proposed changes that would break this loop that Liman is referring to. Carlos, do you want to go through them?

CARLOS REYES: Sure. First, the potential bylaw changes. If the RSSAC accepts the recommendation and moves forward with it, the immediate bylaw change would be Article 8, which is about the NomCom.

That spells out the membership of the NomCom. Obviously, the non-voting would be modified.

But to Liman's point, and to what Jeff is getting at, if the RSSAC continues this conversation about how RSSAC is changing, the Empowered Community option, etc., then to remove that circularity, we would have to modify Article 12 about RSSAC and how the board appoints. So that would be the next step. And Brad and Fred asked me to show this to you because it may help visualize the discussion.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Historically, I think we do better when we have something to look at, so we asked Carlos to identify the pieces that would need to change and suggest some verbiage. So that's what you see in the room now.

CARLOS REYES: And just a quick reminder. Sorry, I just remembered. The non-voting liaison would actually become a voting delegate, so I need to change that as well.

FRED BAKER: Now, just reading this, and thinking about the comment that I made to Liman a little while ago, you've changed the "RSSAC

chairs and members shall be appointed by the board". You've removed that? I think something along those lines is actually necessary to understand A, because it now says things that are true about that appointment. I think we still need something where RSSAC membership is accepted by the board, or something along those lines. And I'm not wordsmithing at the moment, but avoiding the word appointed. Then in A, if it's not an appointment, we need to use whatever word we've chosen in that place.

CARLOS REYES: Yeah, Fred, I think you're right. Ultimately it depends on the direction the group wants to take. This is just to illustrate that there are changes we can make in Article 12 to reflect that.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Would the word recognized by the board work?

FRED BAKER: Works for me. Except that I don't understand it now in A. RSSAC membership ratification shall live for a three-year term. Huh? I don't understand that. I think, in A, then, we might want to simply say RSSAC membership is for a three-year term.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	I agree. Members are appointed by their root server operators. And recognized by the board. Question mark.

FRED BAKER:	The next question is, where do we come from? There's discussion of that in RSSAC 037, but we probably need something here. If you go look at RSSAC 037, it says, today we have membership from the RSOs. In RSSAC 037, we talk about membership being from the RSOs and also from the community. How did the community, did they sprinkle down from Heaven? How did that work?

BRAD VERD:	Okay. I'm not hearing opposition to changing this verbiage. Is that a correct assessment here? Alright. I also interpret that as I'm not hearing opposition to not being a voting member. Okay. So a couple of things.
	One, we will validate with legal the protections. Unless there is an objection, unless we want to do this now, we will go modify this verbiage and bring it back to the group, unless we want to wordsmith this now. I don't think wordsmithing it now is the best use of our time.
	Okay. And then that will provide us the answer that we need to give to the recommendation. Right? Okay. Is that all that …

CARLOS REYES: At this point, yes. We'll work with the NomCom review implementation group. They're setting a timetable for how they're moving forward with this. Any verbiage proposals will actually come from them, because it's part of the NomCom review. Once we have that, obviously, we'll come back to the group.

BRAD VERD: Since MSSI is here, is there anything that we want from them? Any clarifications?

CARLOS REYES: Anything you'd like to raise, Larisa, Lars, Jennifer, Negar?

BRAD VERD: Since you're here, it would be a good opportunity.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thank you. Lars Hoffmann from ICANN staff. Just to reiterate what Carlos said, the implementation of these recommendations have been delegated by the board to the NomCom review implementation working party. They are currently drafting a detailed implementation plan, which is due in mid-September, and we expect it to be adopted by the board

in Montreal. Then implementation will start. As Carlos and you just discussed, this would require bylaw change, and obviously not just for the RSSAC but for the SSAC as well, and the GAC as well.

BRAD VERD: Sorry, just to be clear, we're not talking about SSAC or GAC here.

LARS HOFFMANN: No, no, no. For them it's one package. Absolutely. And so that package would essentially be proposed to them as a change to the bylaws and then start a bylaw change which includes public comment from the whole of the community, et cetera. And so we expect that to happen in the beginning of 2020.

This discussion is very timely, and it would be good, if you have some input at this point already that you wanted to give to the implementation working group, you're welcome. Certainly there will be opportunities in the next year as well before any actions will actually be taken. If you have any questions, the chair is here, the co- and one of the vice chairs, Tom Barrett and Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and I'm supporting the group as well. You can reach out at any time if you have any questions. Thanks.

BRAD VERD: Great, thank you. Any questions for them?

FRED BAKER: I'd just like to have crisp in my own mind what's happening next. So, Carlos is talking with legal, we're sorting this out, and then we vote?

BRAD VERD: Yeah. We need to wordsmith this so that we get consensus from the group as to what this should read. Then, we would, I guess, vote on it and then provide it to the implementation group. Is that a correct assessment, Carlos?

CARLOS REYES: I think before we even start wordsmithing, I'll get the guidance from legal. We can either invite them to a monthly call, or I can write up questions and send them. So we'll get that. We'll bring it back to the group so you can review that. We'll probably have another discussion just to make sure everyone's on the same page. The redline will come from the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group, so at that point you can review what they're suggesting, and then provide feedback. I don't think there's a formal vote unless we're changing RSSAC operational procedures. The operational procedures actually

don't go into detail about the role of the liaison and how the liaison behaves in that role.

BRAD VERD: We could hold a formal vote on what we believe the text should be and provide that to the implementation team. We could certainly hold that formal vote.

CARLOS REYES: Yes. If you want it on the record.

BRAD VERD: It wouldn't necessarily be a publication or document, but we could certainly vote on it. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I would like to see a vote on it. The phrasing could be that we endorse the proposed changes from the review team.

FRED BAKER: That's reasonable. I'd like to summarize where we're at with this. I believe, in the discussion in the room, we have come to consensus, or something close to consensus, about what it should be set. The discussion with legal is about how to say it. Am I correct in that?

CARLOS REYES: I do want to clarify, though, that we're not going into the relationship between RSSAC and the board in this. This is just about the NomCom. So we're not going to go into appointment, or acceptance, or recognition by the board, etc. That doesn't involve the NomCom seat.

BRAD VERD: The whole point … I think it requires changes to that sentence about appointment. That's my understanding. That's what we just talked about. So in order for the members here to feel comfortable with that seat becoming a voting seat, we need to fix the cyclical relationship between RSSAC being appointed by the board, and us appointing the board. Is that correct, Liman?

CARLOS REYES: Yes, but Article 8 comes from the NomCom review. Article 12 has to come from RSSAC. So the scope of the implementation is different, right? They're related, but it's who's initiating.

FRED BAKER: I do believe that the RSSAC, then, wants to say something. We want to do it at the same time, just because it's convenient.

EN

BRAD VERD: But is it not reasonable, I'm look over there right now, if we believe that Article 8 and Article 12 are directly related, could they not both be sent forward in the implementation plan?

LARS HOFFMANN: So the discussion you just had on Article 12, I was not aware of. I understand the arguments. It makes sense. It's not for me to comment. It seems straightforward or logical. As Carlos said, 8 will be initiated by the NomCom implementation team, I don't see any problem why this could not go hand in hand. I assume, in fact, that maybe some members from other community groups might have similar concerns and would like to see that cyclical relationship broken as well in order to agree to 8.

And so, if you said, look, we see a problem with 12, we would like to change that at the same time, I think it would be no problem at all to coordinate that. From my perspective, I think we want legal's advice as well for this. But I think that would be easily coordinatable. Because we just wait for your vote for this, take the rest of the text, and we then put that out as one process, interlinking the two.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, I would hate to do two separate comment periods. To me, these are tied together. It seems like it's most efficient to do them together.

LARS HOFFMANN: Correct.

FRED BAKER: Now, we are already changing Article 12 anyway, so this would be an additional change in that article. I think it's the same submission.

CARLOS REYES: So in terms of action items, our team can work with this group on Article 12 and the changes we need to make there. And then we can provide that as input to the NomCom review implementation group.

FRED BAKER: The timing of, I'll use Liman's word, endorsing the change, our next monthly call is in August. So is that something we can schedule on that call? Or do we need to take a vote between now and then?

EN

CARLOS REYES: How soon do you want the input from legal?

FRED BAKER: Yesterday?

CARLOS REYES: Fair enough. I'll reach out to legal while we're here. If I can get some sort of feedback in the next few days, I'll bring it back to the group, ideally before the meeting tomorrow. Then we can start working on the redline of Article 12 for you to review in time for the August teleconference.

FRED BAKER: August makes sense.

BRAD VERD: So is everybody okay with that plan forward? Any objections, any more comments? Alright. Carlos, is there anything else to cover in this?

CARLOS REYES: There's the public comment proceeding on streamlining, the organizational reviews. RSSAC already issued advice, but we agreed that we would share a public comment draft with the group.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Since we're talking about reviews, there is an open public comment right now on streamlining the review process. That's open right now. It's not necessarily something that was tasked with us, but all the SOs and ACs have been tasked with providing comments. We, the admin team, met. We were going to draft a response that essentially pointed to RSSAC 041, where we talk about reviews, tie that together, and make that the public comment. We don't want to create anything new, the work's been done, I think we've beaten that horse. We just wanted to point to it. We were going to provide it to the group here prior to sending it to public comment, obviously. That was our plan on going forward there. Any questions or concerns around that from the group? No? Alright.

FRED BAKER: Do you want to walk through this?

CARLOS REYES: Just to be cautious, we'll walk through it. In the public comment proceeding, there's a series of questions that are being asked of community groups. The draft here basically introduces RSSAC 41, gives a little bit of background on the RSSAC review that

EN

happened 2017 to 2018. Then, working with Brad and Fred, we responded directly to the questions.

The first question here is, do you or your organization agree with the proposed list of issues that should inform the focus of the streamlining process? If not, which do you disagree and what would you like to add?

Broadly, RSSAC agrees with the issues list. However, RSSAC encourages the ICANN organization to proactively manage the work of independent examiners conducting organizational reviews. That aligns with recommendation four in RSSAC 041. And then RSSAC also encourages the ICANN organization to more thoroughly consider Recommendation 5 from RSSAC 041 to capture lessons learned after each organizational review. So those aren't explicitly called out in the issues list. We thought it would be helpful to call attention to that.

Question two. Do you or your organization agree with the proposed underlying principles that should guide the solutions? If not, which do you disagree and what would you like to add?

Again, most of the principles are covered from RSSAC 041, and there were a few that were not, so the paragraph reads, "The RSSAC broadly agrees with the proposed underlying principles to guide the solutions for streamlining process of organizational reviews. The RSSAC also encourages the ICANN organization to

ICANN POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

consider the principles of attribution, objectivity, professionalism, and evidence." Those are the extra principles that RSSAC identified in RSSAC 041.

Question three is about the role of the community. That's a pretty easy response from RSSAC which is yes, basically. "RSSAC agrees that the role of the community in the streamlining process of organizational reviews is to provide substantial input and agree on possible solutions."

Question four is about the timing. Again, "RSSAC agrees with the proposed high-level timeline, and that the next round of organizational reviews should not start until the streamlining process is complete."

Brad and Fred reviewed this and, as Brad mentioned, the intent is to submit this to the public comment proceeding. It wouldn't be a numbered document from RSSAC, because we're just referring to RSSAC 041.

FRED BAKER: My question is does that give anybody any heartburn? I don't see anyone foaming at the mouth.

BRAD VERD: Okay. So we will move forward with that. We'll send this out to the list so you guys can look at it. Do we have a timeline when we have to have this submitted by?

CARLOS REYES: I think it's due July 15th? Right? Okay.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. We'll send this out just to the RSSAC mailing list, with the intent here that this will get posted before the 15th. Actually, let's just put a timeline on it. If we don't hear anything by the end of next week, any feedback on this – I will send it out today – that we will assume good and move forward.

FRED BAKER: The end of next week is the 5th of July?

BRAD VERD: Correct. Great. Alright. So with that, unless there are other questions or comments about the reviews …

The comment here was, just so you know, obviously we're moving forward with the RSSAC review, a handful of different recommendations that we agreed with and we're implementing. Most of them are already done, we had already done them prior to the review being finalized. But we're continuing to work

through and finish that. But I don't have anything to report on here.

So unless there's no questions about reviews, we will draw this to a close. … All right, thank you. We will adjourn. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: And we'll be back at 10:30.

BRAD VERD: We'll be back here at 10:30.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]