

ICANN Root Server System
Advisory Committee (RSSAC)
Review Work Party

RSSAC2 Review
Feasibility Assessment &
Initial Implementation Plan

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	3
1.OVERVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS	4
2.FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENT & INITIAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN	5
RECOMMENDATION 1	5
RECOMMENDATION 1A	5
RECOMMENDATION 1B	7
RECOMMENDATION 2	9
RECOMMENDATION 2A	10
RECOMMENDATION 3	11
RECOMMENDATION 3A	13
RECOMMENDATION 3B	14
RECOMMENDATION 3C.....	16
RECOMMENDATION 4	17
RECOMMENDATION 5	18
RECOMMENDATION 6	20
RECOMMENDATION 6B	20
RECOMMENDATION 6C.....	20
RECOMMENDATION 6A	22
ANNEX 1: BACKGROUND.....	24

Introduction

On 3 July 2018, Interisle Consulting Group published its [final report](#) of the second review of ICANN's Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). The [final report](#) includes an assessment of the RSSAC and six principal recommendations for improving its operations.

Based on its detailed review of the [final report](#), the [RSSAC Review Work Party](#) (RWP) has prepared this Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan (FAIIP). This plan includes an analysis of recommendations in the [final report](#) for usability and prioritization, provisional budget implications, anticipated resources and the proposed implementation timeline. The RWP has noted any objections or proposed modifications to recommendations where applicable, along with supporting rationale.

Once finalized, the RWP will present this document to [the Organizational Effectiveness Committee](#) of the ICANN Board (OEC) to inform its recommendation to the Board on next steps.

1. Overview of Recommendations

2. Feasibility Assessment & Initial Implementation Plan

Issue 1

Issue identified by the independent examiner: As long as its membership is defined to be representatives and alternates from the RSOs the RSSAC will be perceived by many to be an advisory committee of the root server operators, not the root server system, and its advice will be interpreted—erroneously—as advice from the RSOs (p54).

Recommendation 1

Independent examiner’s final recommendation: Modify the RSSAC membership criteria to allow the RSSAC to recruit a variety of skills, perspectives, and interests that include but are not limited to those available from the root server operator organizations.

and

Issue 1a

Issue identified by the independent examiner: The RSOs might retain their prerogative to appoint representatives to the RSSAC, but the RSSAC could recruit members from other sources as well (p54).

Recommendation 1a

Independent examiner’s final recommendation: Extend RSSAC membership by invitation to any qualified person.

	Y/ N	Level of Consensus* (*As defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines)
Does RWP support the issue?	N	N/A
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	N/A
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	Y	N/A
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	Y	N/A
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner’s final recommendation, please provide rationale.	<p>This organizational review dismisses the Liaisons to and from RSSAC and the RSSAC Caucus in the discussion about this recommendation.</p> <p>As agreed upon with the ICANN Board, the establishment of the RSSAC Caucus in 2014 was a direct result of the first organizational review of the RSSAC. Currently, the RSSAC Caucus has 100 members,¹ broadening the base of technical expertise available for RSSAC work. The RSSAC Caucus contributes substantially to the work of the RSSAC. 38 RSSAC Caucus members have contributed to ten RSSAC publications² since its founding.</p> <p>The RSSAC reiterates that it regularly seeks input from the RSSAC Caucus about potential work items. This guides the decision-making and prioritization of the RSSAC. The RSSAC recognizes the need to evolve its structure and membership.</p>	

¹ <https://www.icann.org/groups/rssac-caucus>

² RSSAC001, RSSAC002, RSSAC002v2, RSSAC002v3, RSSAC003, RSSAC023, RSSAC024, RSSAC026, RSSAC028, and RSSAC040 available here: <https://www.icann.org/groups/rssac/documents>

	<p>Since its first organizational review, and in light of the IANA stewardship transition, the RSSAC has carefully examined its structure, accountability, and transparency. These discussions have resulted in significant progress to evolve its operations and procedures.</p> <p>This evolution complements RSSAC work on a proposed governance model of functions for the RSS and RSOs found in RSSAC037³. In RSSAC037, the RSSAC defines 11 principles for the operation and evolution of the DNS Root Server System, proposes an initial governance model (the Model) for the DNS Root Server System and its operators, and demonstrates how the Model works through a set of scenarios on designation and removal of operators. This proposed governance model would alter the current structure and roles of the RSSAC and RSSAC Caucus.</p> <p>RSSAC038⁴ complements the proposed governance model. In RSSAC038, the RSSAC recommends the ICANN Board initiate a process to produce a final version of the Model based on RSSAC037, estimate the cost of the DNS Root Server System and developing the Model (the initial effort should focus on developing a timeline), and implement the final version of the Model based upon the principles of accountability, transparency, sustainability, and service integrity.</p>
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.	As stated in RSSAC038, the RSSAC recommends that the model started in RSSAC037 be finalized and implemented, which will likely address the details in this recommendation.
RWP comments	
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	ICANN Board implementation of RSSAC038
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	ICANN Board, RSSAC, other (stakeholders of the DNS Root Server System)
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	
Expected budget implications	Outlined in section 5.5.3 of RSSAC037 and recommendation 2 of RSSAC038
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	Current Membership Model: Low priority, low implementation effort Future Membership Model: High priority, complex implementation effort
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	Current Membership Model: N/A Future Membership Model: 2-3 years
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	Implementing a future membership model is linked to the ICANN Board response to RSSAC037 and RSSAC038.

³ <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-037-15jun18-en.pdf>

⁴ <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-038-15jun18-en.pdf>

Issue 1b

Issue identified by the independent examiner: RSSAC is not involved in any aspect of root server operations and does not require the attention of every RSO (p54).

Recommendation 1b

Independent examiner's final recommendation: Let individual RSOs decide whether or not to participate in the RSSAC.

	Y/ N	Level of Consensus* (*As defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines)
Does RWP support the issue?	N	N/A
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	N/A
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	N/A
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N	N/A
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		<p>The RSSAC does not understand the premise of this recommendation. This organizational review offers little evidence to back up claims that some RSOs would rather not participate in the RSSAC. Attendance by RSOs at RSSAC meetings in recent years indicates that all are able to regularly contribute. Per its operational procedures,⁵ the RSSAC operates on consensus and voting. The evidence that RSSAC relies on is the very engaged participation from all RSOs in its meetings and workshops in order to develop and recommend policies that affect the entire Root Server System captured in RSSAC minutes.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is a clear self-interest for every RSO to participate in the RSSAC. Even though RSSAC is not involved in root server operations, it does offer advice to the ICANN Board and community that has an impact on the obligations of every RSO and on the relationship of every RSO with ICANN, including influence over decisions about commitment of organizational resources.</p>
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
RWP comments		
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		
Expected budget implications		
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies		
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?		

⁵ <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-000-op-procedures-23oct17-en.pdf>

High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	
---	--

Issue 2

Issue identified by the independent examiner: RSSAC is the default target for every root service issue that arises within ICANN—whether or not the issue is properly within its scope—simply because it appears to be the only available interface between ICANN and the root server operators (p55).

Recommendation 2

Independent examiner’s final recommendation: Resolve the apparent mismatch between the charter and operational procedures of the RSSAC and the requirements and expectations of the ICANN Board and Community for interaction with the root server system.

	Y/ N	Level of Consensus* (*As defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines)
Does RWP support the issue?	N	N/A
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	N/A
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	N/A
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N	N/A
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner’s final recommendation, please provide rationale.	The set of negative perceptions about the RSSAC charter reflected in the final report have not been articulated to the RSSAC, either directly by the ICANN Board, or through its liaison, or from any other part of the ICANN community. Based on these experiences, the RSSAC concludes that neither the ICANN Board nor the ICANN community harbor the mismatch raised in the final report. The RSSAC expects that unfulfilled expectations be brought to the attention of the RSSAC and the ICANN Board through existing processes if the ICANN community believes that the RSSAC charter needs to be modified.	
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
RWP comments		
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		
Expected budget implications		
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies		
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?		
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps		

Issue 2a

Issue identified by the independent examiner: The RSSAC could improve the quality of discussions about the ICANN/RSS relationship by clearly documenting the rationale for the current RSS architecture, particularly with respect to RSO diversity and independence (p55).

Recommendation 2a

Independent examiner's final recommendation: Document the rationale for the architecture of the root server system.

	Y/ N	Level of Consensus* (*As defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines)
Does RWP support the issue?	N	N/A
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	N/A
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	N/A
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N	N/A
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.	The RSSAC believes this recommendation has already been met, in part due to recent work that was published after the first RSSAC organizational review took place. The RSSAC has published RSSAC023 ⁶ which documents the history of the DNS Root Server System and its architecture as it has changed over time. The recently published RSSAC037 document further identifies the strengths of the current architecture by defining important characteristics that the RSSAC believes need to be carried forward. Various other RSSAC publications also discuss the basic nature of the service and its operation. Furthermore, oversight of the Root Server System and Root Server Operators is likely to change if the development and implementation of the RSSAC037 model progresses.	
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
RWP comments		
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		
Expected budget implications		
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies		
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?		
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps		

⁶ <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-023-04nov16-en.pdf>

Issue 3

Issue identified by the independent examiner: The Board and Community generally do not know what advice to expect or solicit from the RSSAC (p56).

Recommendation 3

Independent examiner's final recommendation: Formalize the responsibilities of the RSSAC to the ICANN Board and Community in a work plan that is periodically reviewed and published; and hold the RSSAC accountable for work plan deliverables.

	Y/ N	Level of Consensus* (*As defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines)
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	N/A
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	N/A
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	N/A
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N	N/A
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
RWP comments		The RSSAC welcomes this recommendation and looks forward to discussing next steps. The RSSAC reiterates, though, that from its perspective, there is no misalignment between the understanding and expectations of the ICANN Board and RSSAC in regard to its advice and work. As with any other group within ICANN, the RSSAC adjusts its work to reflect the availability of its members and allocation of supporting resources from the ICANN organization, so it is not clear what "hold the RSSAC accountable" means in this context. The RSSAC takes several steps, on a regular basis, to share its work with the community and solicit input on where it might need to engage: The RSSAC regularly meets with the ICANN Board at every ICANN public meeting to discuss its work and items of mutual interest; provides updates on its work at ICANN public meetings; and works closely with the RSSAC liaison to the ICANN Board to make sure the ICANN Board knows when RSSAC input is relevant to its work. Since ICANN62, RSSAC work sessions have been open to observation by default.
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		It would be particularly helpful to have an example of another ICANN community group that uses such a work plan.
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		RSSAC
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		Web and publication support
Expected budget implications		Minimal
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies		Low priority, low implementation effort
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?		3 months

High-level summary of proposed implementation steps

1. The RSSAC would develop a work plan template and share with ICANN Board/community for feedback.
2. The RSSAC would publish its work plan and regularly update it.

Issue 3a

Issue identified by the independent examiner: According to its charter, the RSSAC should “Engage in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the Root Server System and recommend any necessary audit activity to assess the current status of root servers and the root zone” (p57).

Recommendation 3a

Independent examiner’s final recommendation: Engage in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the Root Server System and recommend any necessary audit activity to assess the current status of root servers and the root zone.

	Y/ N	Level of Consensus* (*As defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines)
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	N/A
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	N/A
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	N/A
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N	N/A
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner’s final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
RWP comments		This recommendation asks the RSSAC to execute the mission in its charter. As such, the RSSAC welcomes this recommendation and looks forward to discussing next steps. The RSSAC continues to be engaged in threat assessment and risk analysis and looks forward to receiving detailed items where the ICANN community believes increased focus is needed.
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		RSSAC
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		Research support
Expected budget implications		Moderate
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies		Medium priority, moderate implementation effort
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?		1 year
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps		Upon realizing the need for focused efforts on specific issues: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The RSSAC would develop a statement of work and launch a work party. 2. The RSSAC would review the outcomes of the threat assessment and develop a document. 3. The RSSAC would publish the document.

Issue 3b

Issue identified by the independent examiner: RSSAC has recommended that individual RSOs collect and publish data in a standard format for a standard set of metrics, defined in RSSAC002. Both the extent and the quality of compliance with this recommendation in aggregate falls short of what academic and industry researchers advised they would need in order to conduct meaningful analyses of the root server system.

Recommendation 3b

Independent examiner's final recommendation: Coordinate the gathering and publishing of meaningful data about the root server system.

	Y/ N	Level of Consensus* (*As defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines)
Does RWP support the issue?	N	N/A
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	N/A
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	N/A
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N	N/A
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.	This recommendation is out of scope ⁷ for an organizational review. The RSSAC notes that RSSAC002v3 ⁸ identifies data regarding the RSS that should be collected and published, and that RSSAC002 has evolved and will continue to do so. Since 2013, the RSOs have been publishing their own data on their respective websites. Each RSO provides a link to their data on www.root-servers.org . Additionally, most RSOs participate in Day-in-the-Life (DITL) captures from time to time and make that data available to researchers, including the ICANN Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO), for analysis.	
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments	If there is an assertion that the data collected is not meaningful, the assertion is not supported, either by evidence or a statement of what might be more meaningful. Moreover, the RSSAC would welcome specific suggestions via the RSSAC Caucus on how this data could be improved. The RSSAC welcomes academics, researchers, and others to join the RSSAC Caucus and work on an improved set of metrics in an RSSAC Caucus work party.	
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		
Expected budget implications		
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource		

⁷ <https://community.icann.org/display/ACCRSSAC/Scope+of+the+review>

⁸ <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-002-measurements-root-06jun16-en.pdf>

requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	

Issue 3c

Issue identified by the independent examiner: It is not clear whether or to what extent individual RSOs have complied with either of the two recommendations of RSSAC001 (p58).

Recommendation 3c

Independent examiner's final recommendation: Assess and report on the status of compliance with the recommendations of RSSAC001.

	Y/ N	Level of Consensus* (*As defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines)
Does RWP support the issue?	N	N/A
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	N/A
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	N/A
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N	N/A
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.	This recommendation, specifically, RSO compliance with RSSAC advice, is out of scope ⁹ for an organizational review. Nonetheless, we encourage individual RSOs to publish such assessments, and note that RSSAC038 specifies accountability mechanisms that will probably supercede RSSAC001.	
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
RWP comments		
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		
Expected budget implications		
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies		
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?		
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps		

⁹ <https://community.icann.org/display/ACCRSSAC/Scope+of+the+review>
Approved by the RSSAC on 2 October 2018

Issue 4

Issue identified by the independent examiner: To secure improvements in the management and operation of RSSAC that followed the 2013-14 RSSAC restructuring, the RSSAC should deliberately plan for succession in its leadership roles (p58).

Recommendation 4

Independent examiner's final recommendation: Develop and implement a leadership training and succession plan.

	Y/ N	Level of Consensus* (*As defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines)
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	N/A
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	N/A
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	N/A
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N	N/A
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
RWP comments		The RSSAC welcomes this recommendation and looks forward to discussing next steps. As agreed upon with the ICANN Board, the establishment of the current leadership structure in 2014 was a direct result of the first organizational review of the RSSAC. The RSSAC recognizes the importance of evolving its leadership structure. Discussions about the RSSAC leadership structure are already underway. The topics of succession and training can be addressed in this context.
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		RSSAC, ICANN Board
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		Drafting support
Expected budget implications		Limited
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies		Low priority, moderate implementation effort
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?		6 months-1 year
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The RSSAC would discuss its leadership structure and agree on revisions to current model or on a new model. 2. If the RSSAC revises current model, the RSSAC would implement it. 3. If the RSSAC approves a new model, the ICANN Board would adopt Bylaw changes, then the RSSAC would implement the new model.

Issue 5

Issue identified by the independent examiner: The RSSAC could fulfill its charter mandate to “[c]ommunicate on matters relating to the operation of the Root Servers and their multiple instances with the Internet technical community and the ICANN community” more effectively if it engaged more visibly with other ICANN Advisory Committees, Supporting Organizations, review teams, and task forces (p58).

Recommendation 5

Independent examiner’s final recommendation: Engage more actively with the rest of ICANN and its Community.

	Y/ N	Level of Consensus* (*As defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines)
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	N/A
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	N/A
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	N/A
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N	N/A
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner’s final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
RWP comments		<p>The RSSAC believes its engagement is generally appropriate given its charter and role as an advisory committee. The RSSAC welcomes this recommendation and looks forward to discussing next steps. The RSSAC recognizes the importance of improving its engagement with the ICANN community while remaining focused on its core mission and welcomes input on how to best balance between these priorities. As a path toward increased engagement, since ICANN62 the RSSAC has made its work sessions open to observation by default and regular update and information sessions will continue to be arranged. However, the RSSAC respectfully suggests that “engagement” is not an end in itself and should serve a purpose.</p> <p>The RSSAC notes that it currently maintains liaison relationships with the ICANN Board, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC), the Internet Architecture Board, the IANA Functions Operator, the Root Zone Maintainer (RZM), the Customer Standing Committee (CSC), and the Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC). The RSSAC would be willing to consider establishing additional mutually beneficial liaison relationships, too. Furthermore, the RSSAC invites the ICANN community to attend its sessions at ICANN public meetings and observe its various joint meetings (e.g., ICANN Board, OCTO, Nominating Committee, etc.).</p>
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	RSSAC	
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		

Expected budget implications	Minimal
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	Low priority, low implementation effort
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	Next ICANN public meeting
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	The RSSAC will proactively engage with ICANN community groups about its publications. The RSSAC will continue to seek input on other possible steps toward greater engagement.

Issue 6

Issue identified by the independent examiner: Although their charter and operating procedure documents attempt to define the roles and responsibilities of these groups clearly, our research found both *de facto* and *de jure* confusion and ambiguity that affect the RSSAC's ability to effectively fulfill its role (p59).

Recommendation 6

Independent examiner's final recommendation: Clarify the role and responsibility of the RSSAC with respect to other groups with adjacent or overlapping remits, including the SSAC, the RZERC, and the RSSAC Caucus.

and

Issue 6b

Issue identified by the independent examiner: Because the SSAC's scope includes the security and stability of the root zone (along with the rest of "the Internet's naming and address allocation systems"), the RSSAC's role is often misunderstood as a subset of the SSAC's (p60).

Recommendation 6b

Independent examiner's final recommendation: In cooperation with the SSAC, develop and publish a statement that clearly distinguishes the roles and responsibilities of the RSSAC and the SSAC, describes how they **are** complementary with respect to their shared interests in security and stability, and establishes a framework for collaboration on issues of mutual concern.

and

Issue 6c

Issue identified by the independent examiner: There is some concern that the RZERC might encroach on the work of the RSSAC and the SSAC or be expected to resolve conflicts and differences of opinion between those committees (p60).

Recommendation 6c

Independent examiner's final recommendation: In cooperation with the RZERC and the SSAC, develop and publish a statement that clearly distinguishes the roles and responsibilities of the RSSAC, the RZERC, and the SSAC with respect to the evolution of the DNS root system (within the scope of ICANN's mission).

	Y/ N	Level of Consensus* (*As defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines)
Does RWP support the issue?	N	N/A
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	N/A
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	N/A
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N	N/A
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.	While the subject of this recommendation is within scope for an organizational review, the RSSAC finds that the actual recommendation affects more than just the RSSAC and its relationship to the ICANN Board. On its own, the RSSAC cannot fulfill the recommendation, and therefore it has to be made in a different forum. The RSSAC agrees that clarification of the roles of the RSSAC, RZERC, and SSAC would be useful to the ICANN community and could make all three groups more effective. The RSSAC is willing to work with SSAC and RZERC with this recommendation. Ultimately, this is the responsibility of the ICANN Board and community.	

If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.	
RWP comments	Though potentially valuable, comparing the charters of RSSAC, RZERC, and SSAC is out of scope ¹⁰ for an organizational review. This organizational review comments on the overlap of the charters of the RSSAC, RZERC, and SSAC, and this comparison of the charters of multiple ICANN bodies deviates from the scope ¹¹ of an organizational review. Moreover, the RSSAC feels strongly that this organizational review should have disclosed that one of the independent examiners is a member of the RZERC and another of the SSAC. Though serving in multiple roles and functions is not uncommon in the ICANN community, the lack of disclosure could potentially raise questions about the impartiality of this recommendation.
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	
Expected budget implications	
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	

¹⁰ <https://community.icann.org/display/ACCRSSAC/Scope+of+the+review>

¹¹ <https://community.icann.org/display/ACCRSSAC/Scope+of+the+review>

Issue 6a

Issue identified by the independent examiner: The work of the RSSAC Caucus is poorly defined and lacks effective guidance and oversight from the RSSAC (p59).

Recommendation 6a

Independent examiner's final recommendation: Develop a more effective and transparent process for defining RSSAC Caucus projects, engaging its members and managing its membership, managing its work, and promoting its output.

	Y/ N	Level of Consensus* (*As defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines)
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	N/A
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	N/A
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	N/A
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N	N/A
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
RWP comments		The RSSAC recognizes the importance of developing the projects, engagement, management, and output of the RSSAC Caucus and regularly seeks input from it about potential work items. This guides the decision-making and prioritization of the RSSAC. Currently, the RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee ¹² is evaluating the engagement and contributions of each RSSAC Caucus member. The RSSAC also reviews its operational procedures ¹³ on annual basis, making adjustments as necessary to improve its function as an advisory committee and its relationship with the RSSAC Caucus.
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		RSSAC
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		Drafting support
Expected budget implications		Minimal
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies		High priority, moderate implementation effort
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?		6 months-1 year

¹² <https://www.icann.org/groups/rssac-caucus>

¹³ <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-000-op-procedures-23oct17-en.pdf>

High-level summary of proposed implementation steps

1. The RSSAC, RSSAC Caucus, and RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee discuss how to better define, initiate, track, complete, and track work items and how to better recruit, onboard, engage, and offboard its members.
2. RSSAC operational procedures are modified/updated accordingly.

ANNEX 1: Background

An independent review of ICANN's Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) is mandated by ICANN's Bylaws, [Section 4.4](#), and is part of ICANN's commitment to its own evolution and improvement, accountability and transparency.

Timeline

In September 2017, the ICANN Board appointed Interisle Consulting Group, LLC (Interisle) to perform the second review of the RSSAC. Interisle issued its assessment report for community input on 27 February 2018. The goal of the assessment report is to achieve a maximum agreement between the wider ICANN community and the independent examiner as to which areas of the RSSAC work well and which may benefit from improvements. No recommendations are included in the assessment report.

On 1 May 2018, Interisle published its [draft final report](#) for [public comment](#) for a period of 40 days. [Eight comments](#) were submitted to the public comment forum. Interisle published its [final report](#) on 10 July 2018. The [final report](#) includes an assessment of the RSSAC and six primary recommendations for improving its operations. Based on the [final report](#), this Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan has been prepared by the RWP and will be presented to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the ICANN Board (OEC) to inform its recommendation to the Board on next steps.

Scope of Review

In addition to assessing the effectiveness of the improvements resulting from the previous RSSAC Review conducted in 2009 - 2010, the [scope](#) of this RSSAC review was to:

1. Assess whether the RSSAC has a continuing purpose within the ICANN structure;
2. Assess how effectively RSSAC fulfills its purpose and whether any change in structure or operations is needed to improve effectiveness, in accordance with the ICANN-provided objective and quantifiable criteria;
3. Assess the extent to which RSSAC as a whole is accountable to the wider ICANN community, its organizations, committees, constituencies, and stakeholder groups to make effective selections.

Role of the RWP

The RSSAC2 Review Work Party (RWP), acting as a steering committee, serves as the primary group working on the RSSAC2 review. RWP membership information can be found [here](#). The roles and responsibilities of the RWP include:

- Share input into review scope and IE selection criteria
- Provide community outreach support
- Share input into data collection – online survey and interviews
- Provide clarification and factual corrections throughout the review

Once the independent examiner's final report is submitted, the RWP is responsible for:

- Establishing the RWP's level of agreement with the final report
- Assessing feasibility of recommendations
- Providing proposed alternatives if there is a disagreement with the feasibility of the IE's recommendations
- Providing detailed rationale for each rejected assessment or recommendations
- Based on the above work, compiling a Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan (FAIIP)
- Presenting FAIIP to the OEC