LARS HOFFMANN: Hi, everybody. We'll be starting in just a couple of minutes. We're just putting up the presentation, then we'll kick it off. Alright. Can we start the recording? Thank you. Welcome, everybody, to the SSAC Review Review Work Party open meeting at ICANN 63. We're going to have a quick presentation today from our MSSI team, from the ICANN Organization just about the process, and then I'm going to hand it over to Chris Llop from the Analysis Group to give an overview of the draft final report that's currently out for public comment.

The slides that we'll be talking to – I'll be talking to, my name is Lars Hoffmann, will pertain to the review process. So I know there were a couple of questions from the review working party on this, and maybe also from others in the room, so please feel free to ask me at the end of the presentation. It's just going to be four slides, it'll be quite quick.

This is the agenda, to remind everybody. And this is a very, obviously, easy to grasp and understand slide on the review process. And where we are at the moment is the red circle in the middle row on the right , at the draft final report being out for public comment.

To kind of prepare everybody what's going to happen next once the public comment closes, analysis group will take the public comments onboard, update the report and then submit the final report to ICANN.

We'll obviously share that immediately with the SSAC and publish it on the website.

And then there is another work phase here in red at the bottom there where the review working party will be asked to produce a feasibility assessment and initial implementation plan. That is going to be a document that's going to inform the Organizational Effectiveness Committee about what the SSAC thinks of the final report, whether recommendations are feasible and how the SSAC, if they are, how the SSAC thinks they can and should be implemented.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just a quick question, I think, comment. That's supposed to be SSAC, not ccNSO in that box.

LARS HOFFMANN: I'm sorry. Yeah, I see, that must have been the wrong slide that's been slotted in there. Absolutely. Endorsed by the SSAC, not the ccNSO. And once the SSAC has produced that, we usually ask the organization under review to produce that in about six months or so, but essentially, it's just a guiding timeline. If more time is needed, that is fine. If it's quick, that's even better, obviously.

And then the OEC will take the feasibility assessment and the final report, assess those two documents, and then make a recommendation to the board pertaining to the implementation process.

So here's a quick overview how we expect the timeline to go. The public comment will close at the end of next month. It's been prolonged slightly because it goes over an ICANN meeting, so it's slightly longer than the usual 40 days.

Then the staff will produce a report of the public comments. It's just a summary. And then the Analysis Group will provide more or less on the 19th of December the final report. It's plus or minus simply because if there's lots of comments, it might take a little bit longer. If there's not that many, it might be the 19th or potentially even a couple of days earlier, depending.

And then finally, a reminder here on the roles and responsibilities. Again, on the left, it says the implementation planning team. So that's something that we learned from the NomCom, that the review working party renamed itself because they're no longer supporting the review, but they're, if you want, planning the implementation, drafting the feasibility assessment. But whatever name you choose to adopt will be perfectly acceptable.

But I spoke to this briefly just on the previous slide, assess the feasibility of the recommendations. Basically, do you think they're feasible or not to implement and will lead to the improvements that are sought? Then propose alternatives if there's disagreement and provide a rationale for that, obviously. And then also give an indication of how quickly and through which means they can be implemented. That will be presented, as I said, to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee.

Usually, there's a telephone meeting with a presentation that takes place, both by the independent examiner on the final report and in this case, the SSAC on the feasibility assessment. Just a quick note on the document, as you could see from the previous slide, this document is produced by all the organizations under review.

We have templates for that, so it might make it a little bit easier to actually see what is asked of the SSAC to produce that. We'll also be happy to answer any questions you may have at the time, and also, you may want to confer with other colleague's. The RSSAC, for example, has just gone through that and submitted their [inaudible].

The NomCom will probably finish their feasibility assessment by the end of this year, and so if you wanted to look at those documents at the time to kind of see what they'll look like once they're completed, that might be a helpful thing to do as well.

And with that, unless there's any other questions, I'm going to pass it over to Chris. I will just have to switch seats to load up the other presentation. Give me just one second.

CHRISTOPHER LLOP: Thank you, Lars. Should I have the ability to – does the clicker work? No.

LARS HOFFMANN: [inaudible]

CHRISTOPHER LLOP: Yeah. Would that be alright? I could just page through that – Alright. Thank you, everyone, for coming. As Lars mentioned – [let me make sure I know how to do this.] There we go. As Lars mentioned, my name's Chris, I work with the Analysis Group. We were hired as the independent examiner for the SSAC review.

My colleague, Greg Rafert, is here at ICANN with me, but unfortunately due to a scheduling conflict, he's right next door. So he'll come by at the end too if you'd like to speak with him or myself about anything we talk about or about any other comments you have for us to take into consideration as we finalize the report.

In terms of what we'll talk about today, we'll start with a little bit of an introduction, talk about the design and scope of the review, the interviews and the survey instruments. Now, I know a lot of people in the room have heard that before, so we will hit it at a high level. If there's anyone new who has not heard about these pieces before, we're happy to stick around and talk about it.

And then we'll try and get sort of quickly into discussing the draft final report, the recommendations as they currently are, and at the end, next steps, Q&A. But if you have questions as we go, more than happy to field those as well. Please feel free.

So, at a high level, our team is myself, Greg, Shlomo Hershkop, Steven Weber, and Almudena Arcelus who's a partner with Analysis Group. So we typically partner with experts in the field for the work that we do, and Shlomo and Steve Weber are sort of the two security experts we've been working with on this matter.

So Dr. Hershkop has extensive DNS experience. He was at Columbia University for a while sort of migrating to the DNS to begin with, but then also using upgrades such as the IPv6. He also helps make their system more robust after implication attacks, so he's sort of like the engineering guy, engineering director.

Steve Weber, he's done a lot of work with governance structures of nonprofits, particularly along technical lines. So he's also the faculty director for the Center of Long-Term Cybersecurity at UC Berkeley. So they're back in the States and they've not woken up at this hour to join us, but they are very involved throughout the process as well.

In terms of the scope of the project, these four bullets were sort of the charter given to us, so [to] study the implementation state of the SSAC's prior review, which was conducted back in 2009, discuss whether or not the SSAC has a continuing purpose within ICANN, and then look into how effectively the SSAC fulfills its purposes, what changes might be needed, and then the extent to which the SSAC is accountable to the wider ICANN community or its organizations, etc.

Like all of these reviews, we do this in two steps. Phase one was an assessment that involved interviews with 42 individuals, both at and after ICANN 61, an online survey distributed to the ICANN community. We had just over 50 complete responses to that, and our own observations at ICANN meetings by sitting in on calls that the SSAC held, by sitting in on some work parties, etc.

So this assessment report was submitted for feedback. I think we got one set of comments that were looked at and taken from there, and

now in phase two, we have put forth a recommendation report for public comment, and that's what we're here now talking about.

Just to overview the scope of the interviews, these were semi-structured, they were supposed to last 45 minutes, a number went closer to an hour. Talked about a number of topics as you can see on the slide, and really, interviewees were encouraged to share both strengths and weaknesses of the SSAC. And they definitely did.

There were some very positive interviews, there were a couple more negative, there were a lot in the middle, just honest impressions as you would expect. You can see here the sort of breakdown of affiliations. So a lot of SSAC members opted to be interviewed, which was great. We also had eight board members, some ICANN staff and fellows, and members of SOs and ACs, predominantly male, and also predominantly North America and Europe. This took place in Puerto Rico, so a little bit easier access for people from that region. But we did remote interviews with some people abroad as well.

In terms of the survey, this was an information gathering tool, had a number of questions on it to basically pose questions that we were wondering or seek clarification to see if people agreed with things we heard about in interviews. So this gives us some numbers that are throughout the assessment and recommendation report. And there are also freeform responses that we looked through and thought about, and actually had a couple of follow-up interviews in response to just to make sure we understood things.

So, 52 complete responses, 80 partial or complete responses. We looked at all our figures with both of those groups, and nothing changed as a result. The figures here will show the larger – whoever completed the question as opposed to just the people who completed the whole survey, but you can see it's across a wide variety of parts of ICANN.

Some SOs or ACs are a little bit underrepresented. We did our part to work with MMSI to reach out to leadership of all the different SOs and ACs, so it's a little bit up to them if they choose to respond. Gender, male dominated, but 11 or so females, a number that preferred not to say, or one other. Again, sort of North America-focused, Europe-focused, but I'd say maybe as much Asia, Australia, Pacific as Europe, but Latin America.

Yeah, so that's sort of the process that we followed for the interviews and the survey. To get into the recommendations, I'll first just sort of give an overview of the assessment report on one slide. The big picture conclusion is that the SSAC is performing very well and does a very valuable service for ICANN, but of course, like all organizations, the purpose of this is not just to say that but to find ways to improve and refine.

The assessment report had 22 assessment points. These points can also be found in the final report, and they were on a variety of topics from the overall effectiveness of the SSAC to topic selection, interaction with SO/ACs, size and membership, transparency and accountability, and

then the prior review's implementation and efforts to improve the SSAC.

So that was the assessment report. It's available online if you're interested in that, but again, you could get most of that information by reading the recommendation report. And basically, reflecting on the assessment, we've come up with in the draft final report 30 recommendations structured across five different categories. And we'll sort of walk through those here.

This slide deck does not have all of the recommendations in it, just in the interest of time having a little bit something like 25 minutes at this point to talk and wanting to get questions and answers. But if you have questions on things that are not in this deck, we're happy to stick around after and talk about it, and we'd welcome your comments as part of the process as we go.

But as you see here, recommendations are on continuing purpose of the SSAC, the advice generation and provision process, integration with SO/ACs and the ICANN community, the size, membership, term limits and lengths, and then the prior review and self-improvement. So that is the structure of the report.

To jump into the first item here – and I'm going to just pull up my phone so I can check on time as we go. Great. Thank you. So, the SSAC is widely acknowledged to be very important. This particular graph we showed last time, only one person even said it was neutral in terms of its importance. And based on this – this is sort of anecdotal, but just everything that we've heard from people, the SSAC has a clear,

continuing purpose in ICANN, we recommend its existence as an advisory committee should continue, we found absolutely no opinions anywhere of people saying the SSAC should be disbanded or doesn't have a purpose, and we agree with that.

In terms of assessment – and as I mentioned, we'll only have some findings that we mention here in this deck – one of the central tensions that came up in talking with people is that there's some concern among members of the SSAC that advice provided to the board is not acted upon in a timely manner. And similarly, some on the board were saying, "Well, hey, the SSAC can't give us advice quickly if we need to make a decision at a high speed."

So there's a section of the report sort of focusing on this tension, and recommendations along this line fall in a number of sort of categories. I think one is this idea that each SSAC document should of course be clear in its summary, talking about the issue, talking about the key findings. But we think it's important to uniquely number recommendations.

This is something that the SSAC itself has started to do in a very recent publication. I think it was SAC 101 did this. And it's easy to provide a global unique number because the SAC series documents are themselves unique, creating an identifier that can be sort of tracked and talked about for the recommendation throughout the process. So that's sort of the first recommendation. Well, I guess number two.

The third here is really something that happens to some extent already, and we've seen it, the sort of discussion with the board liaison that

happens before advice is provided to the board, and this recommendation is really just to proactively discuss with the liaison what the talking points are that will be put in front of the board. And we've heard from many board members that they love the talking points, that it's very helpful and very useful. And also to talk about response timing so that expectations are aligned for advice moving forward.

Now, that's only a part of things, of course. There's also historic advice and advice that becomes historic, and that's where we get at the board's action request registrar, which a lot of people had comments on throughout this process. And so our recommendation with the ARR is first for the SSAC's board liaison to work with the board to sort of think about what's captured in that document, that dataset, and think about if there are additional things that need to be captured or changes that need to be made.

And this really comes out for the SSAC more so than other ACs because of the amount of SSAC advice that is in the implementation phase. So if you look here on this table, you can see the SSAC has 27 pieces of advice that are currently being implemented. The current ARR is not really designed to track advice once it hits the implementation phase, it tracks it up until the board makes a decision and then it says, "Oh, hey, this is being implemented."

And so the goal here is to add some columns to that to make it clear who the implementation owner is, what the status of that implementation is, split that out from the action taken by the SSAC

board, and potentially include a date last updated or something like that so that if something becomes stagnant or stale, it's easy for someone to filter and see, "Hey, it's been a year, let's check in on this."

So of course, this is a document used by other advisory committees as well, so there needs to be some discussion there, but this recommendation is really for the liaison to start that conversation and see what kind of adjustments could be made to make this process of tracking historic advice easier.

Once that's done, the goal would be for it to be easy for the SSAC to look at the ARR and know the status of any piece of advice. So here, we're saying the recommendation is that the SSAC should feel empowered to follow up via its board liaison and say, "Hey, have you made a decision on this yet?" Talk to the person implementing, "IS something in progress?"

The goal here is not to give the SSAC a large burden to hound and tie out all of its advice, but rather to have the ability to check in when it chooses to do so and when it thinks it's appropriate to do so and to have all the information needed to do that. So that's this recommendation.

You can see in this figure we're just showing the survey question asking about the timeliness of the board and reacting to SSAC advice, and you can see no one says it's very timely. A bunch of people say it's somewhat timely, and then there's a lot more mixed views. And so hopefully, this can go to at least having transparency about what's going on in that process. And I should say people much prefer the ARR than whatever happened before it, so not just throwing it totally under the bus at all.

In terms of the other side of this, the bit where the board is saying we'd like the SSAC t o be able to get back to us more quickly on things, the first recommendation on this page is really something that we've seen evidence of the SSAC doing in meetings, but to sort of formally say, "Okay, when you ask us for something, we will take the deadlines you've given us into consideration and we will think about if we can do them and how they can be done,"

But that said, I think we recognize that the SSAC needs to put security first, and sometimes things cannot happen as quickly as a stakeholder would want. Right? So the way we're wording this is make meeting those deadlines as possible as reasonable. And feel free to refer back to this and say, "Look, the request you're giving would require a certain amount of effort. We can potentially do something slightly different in less time, but these are the things we have going on." And I'll talk more about that in a second.

The other part of this is something that multiple board members sort of asked us about and said they would like to have be possible, which is for certain issues, the SSAC to produce some sort of quick look at an issue. Noting that that might not be a consensus-driven process, but it might say, "Hey, this is a topic, here are some ways to think about it, we don't agree on this yet but these are some opinions to keep in mind."

So this is something that I know there will be mixed feedback to, but we wanted to include it because it was a strong signal we were hearing of something that would be useful. And as part of this, again, if a quick look request is unreasonable, the liaison should feel free to say, "Hey,

we can't do this" or, "Hey, here are some resources on this topic," or anything like that. The goal is not to take autonomy away from the SSAC in making that decision.

So, another finding that we had is the SSAC really has a lot of deep expertise, it's well prepared to deal with a lot of threats. Some interviewees told us basically, "Hey, we don't have a formal process around this. Should we have one? Should we do a little bit more?"

So right now, the SSAC annually does reflect on sort of what the work will be for the next year. I think that typically happens at the in-person meeting, and think about it. We would recommend that this process just be slightly more formalized. Maybe come up with a short-term and more medium-term, a one-year and a five-year plan of things that maybe will be worked on. In no way are you beholden to that, but the goal is to sort of have this medium-term horizon that can then flow into other planning processes.

And that's what we get at with the second item here, the need for tasks identified in this priority-setting exercise to flow into membership and recruitment efforts. And we'll talk more about that in a moment, but basically, seeing what's on the horizon, being able to assess current skills versus that in just a written way without overparameterizing or creating too much of a burden in the process.

Another key thing from the assessment was really the amount of work that the SSAC has to do, and there's a figure in the assessment report that shows just how many reports and advisories and items like that the

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

SSAC has provided over time. And a lot is being asked of the SSAC, and people can't of course have everything they want.

Another reason we like this idea of sort of a one- or five-year planning horizon document to point back to is it gives the SSAC something to point to if you were getting requests that don't quite make sense and that might misalign with what important security-related work you feel needs to be done. So the goal is to be able to communicate around that, "Hey, we understand you want this thing, we are working on these other things, we can't do this all at once." If it's the ICANN board, there can be a discussion around sort of pace or timing, but it shows a responsiveness to the board, but at the same time doesn't necessarily get pushed around for items that may not be as critical.

And with that, I think something we heard that went over quite well – at least – so with the NCAP project, being able to go back and ask for funding, I think that was an appropriate thing that the SSAC did, and there's a world where the board could potentially make more such large requests of the SSAC, and it could be unreasonable for volunteers to be able to take it on. And that kind of going back and asking for funding or asking for contractors, asking for staff assistance, things like that are, in our world, our mind, definitely appropriate. And we want a recommendation here that can be pointed to in that situation to be able to do that.

Now, interactions within ICANN is something that we heard a lot about, especially from members of SOs and ACs that we spoke with. The satisfaction with the current level of interaction is something that some

people were somewhat satisfied, a couple were very, but there's also a large amount sort of very unsatisfied or somewhat unsatisfied.

At the same time, there appears to be a lot of sort of unknown, that yellow bar at the top, on the question of how often advice given by the SSAC is incorporated into the policy development of SOs and ACs. That was something we talked about a little bit last time. A lot of people think it is sometimes, some people say very often, but there's a lot of sometimes, not often, rarelies.

One thing that we do think would be important to address this is for the SSAC to designate an outward liaison to each SO and AC if they're willing to have one. But we feel like the role there should be structured to really add a minimal burden. It's a touchpoint, it's someone to talk to, maybe to attend a meeting at the ICANN events, but not to really overburden it.

This is something that we thought about for a while, and there were a number of situations that people would say something along the lines of we wish we had known about a topic sooner, we wish we had been better – that's not the right way to say it. So the goal here is really to have a way to communicate proactively, to be in touch with one of the SOs or ACs. We saw this a little bit with the RSSAC combined meeting, with the ALAC combined meeting. Yeah.

Part of this as well, I think, is to make sure that with each SAC series document, the SSAC explicitly discussed who affected parties may be. We've seen this happen in some of the meetings that we've been at.

We've also seen some reflection saying, "Maybe we should have thought about this a little earlier."

There are members of the ICANN community who are saying we want to know about certain things before the SSAC releases its advice, and so the recommendation here is just to make sure that it's a box that's thought about and checked off early in the process so that the SSAC has sufficient time to consider the advice, think about if there's something to do with it that's given by the other party, and just part of this too is that then the organization that the advice pertains to will be thinking more about SSR issues, will be more aware of what's going on, which we think is generally a good thing.

Some other items on this issue, so prior to the ICANN meetings, we recommend the administrative committee of the SSAC send a quick e-mail update to the chairs of the SOs and ACs just providing useful links, sort of an update on what has been happening on the SSAC's website so that – basically, to sort of increase transparency. We see this as a low-effort way to start more conversations, to have people go into ICANN meetings thinking about the SSAC, thinking about what has happened recently and deciding if they want to try and learn more or approach someone to talk to them.

Here we have a chart showing there's sort of an even split between people who think the level of transparency of the SSAC is correct and those who think it should be more transparent, and this is just one little way to be more present and to seem less off to the side in meetings.

Similarly, I think there's some information that we feel like would be useful to post on the SSAC's website. We listed some of that in the report. These are the things that people have asked us for or said they wished they knew, things like an explanation of the SSAC correspondence series or a link to the most recent board ARR, and in addition to that, we think it'd be worth once a year maybe spending 20, 30 minutes thinking about the website and asking this question, should additional content be provided, are there changes we need to make? For the most part, the website is very good and has a lot of the information that you'd want to find, but sort of that continuing evolution making that part of the process.

In terms of accountability, something we thought about a bit, and right now, the process by which the SSAC is accountable is directly to the ICANN board which elects people to the SSAC. Well, based on the SSAC's recommendation. And honestly, the SSAC needs to be able to be an organization that can disagree with others in ICANN, and so we feel like it wouldn't be appropriate for the SSAC to be accountable directly to anyone other than the board.

Now, that said, there are ways that the SSAC is informally accountable to others within ICANN, be it through comment processes, ways that people – I mean, people definitely have made their thoughts be known about the SSAC. For example, there was some disagreement with the ccNSO at one point, and those things got sorted out and the parties were aligned at the end. So we find that the current mechanism is appropriate and don't suggest any changes there.

In terms of membership, so one of our findings is that the SSAC's method of recruiting people right now is fairly informal. People know other people in the industry, everyone on the SSAC is very well-networked, and that sort of serves as the primary means by which people come into the organization.

While this has worked [fairly] well for a long time, I think one dialog we had with a number of people is, should there be something more formal? But if we did that, we'd have to be cautious about the burden it might place on volunteers.

So, we do think there should be something more formal. I'll get to that in a second. I think the recommendation before that is more simply that the current number of SSAC members is appropriate. It seems like more members would cause administrative burden. At the same time, it seems as though fewer members would potentially lead to skill gaps, which is something we don't currently see.

So we do feel as though the current number of members is appropriate. That said, there still should be a flow of individuals on to and off of the SSAC. Just because you have the target number of people doesn't mean you have to stop thinking about who would be good to have in the future or who's getting tired of doing this or who wants to have an opportunity to do something different.

So this figure is just sort of showing that a lot of people feel as though the SSAC effectively covers all areas of expertise. There were some neutral, some ineffective. And these are the kind of things that people can discuss and think about with the yearly flow of individuals.

But as I sort of alluded to before, we do recommend that the SSAC develop a light, formalized recruiting plan. On a yearly basis, have the membership committee do it. This could be a couple-page document, it doesn't necessarily need to be large. But in that, you can reflect on the upcoming roles for the SSAC, current skills based on things like the skill survey, items such as, "Well, do we have a lot of administrative work that no one wants to do? Well, maybe there's someone who would want to do more of that."

And in that process, think about, "Okay, how will we network, how will we meet with people to try and find new candidates to join the SSAC?" So this chart sort of shows how effective or ineffective do you believe the SSAC's recruiting operations are. It skews very heavily towards neutral or ineffective. A lot of the responses there state, "Well, we don't really have anything right now." And we do think it's important to have something so there's a process in place.

These are two more minor items recommending sort of ways to meet people as part of this. And one is to approach the ICANN board to get funding to attend some major security conferences. This is a place where Steve and Shlomo for example meet a lot of their extended contacts, meet people around the world, and we think it'd be great if the SSAC was encouraged to potentially, I don't know, talk about SAC series documents, maybe not an academic conference but a professional, and really increase the presence within the wider security landscape.

And as people [are met] who might be good future SSAC members, that can be referred back to the membership committee to keep a list of, to think about in the future, along with some skills that that person may have and be able to bring to the table in the future.

At the same time, one thing that we talked about quite a bit was sort of the number of academics on the SSAC, and there are certainly a few. It does skew more towards professional members, which is absolutely fine, there's no problem there. But in recent years, there have been a lot more academic institutions or other efforts to sort of consolidate cyber security knowledge at particular locations, and we think having the SSAC membership committee spend a little bit of time thinking about those areas and thinking about who from those institutions might be useful to partner with could potentially be a useful way to think about members that might be interested down the road.

Diversity. This is something we definitely heard a lot about from various people that we interviewed, and I think there's a strong feeling on the SSAC that diversity for diversity's sake is not really necessary. What's important for the SSAC is technical diversity, people who can think through a wide range of technical issues, come to consensus and really be qualified to be saying what goes into that final document.

And we tend to agree. We have two diversity- related recommendations. And really – so this one up here is about geographical and gender diversity, right? We don't necessarily think that the SSAC should be establishing quotas or targets or anything like

that. That does not seem appropriate. It seems as though technical diversity is what's important.

That said, we do suggest the SSAC endeavor to, where possible, recruit a broad set of geographical locations and a reasonably balanced set of genders. And when we say that ,we talk about this a bit in the report. The SSAC by itself cannot fix gender imbalance in the security community, but there should be processes in place that either help or that if there are candidates of the diversity that would be desired, that can be found and that will be brought into the SSAC.

So basically, here, we're basically saying that this is an issue that should be discussed lightly in that yearly recruiting plan so that it's focused on something that matters.

In terms of size and membership, one of the things that we heard in our interviews was that for the most part ,the SSAC is very comfortable being upfront and direct with each other, but that might not always apply to people's thoughts about external liaisons. And then a couple people said ,"You know what? If I didn't think a liaison was doing the best job, I don't know if I'd feel comfortable saying that." And that's sort of a disservice to the liaisons in a way, because then you don't get feedback on what would be useful or what people are thinking.

So we'd like to recommend that – the membership committee already does this yearly review process of people rolling off. Just one thing to think about in that process is what the external liaisons have been doing. If someone has a concern, having the opportunity for them to approach the chair and sort of informally just let someone know and

sort of resolve any information asymmetries that could potentially happen there.

We're not hearing that there definitely are information asymmetries, it's more just it's a part of the process where there's no sort of feedback loop in place currently.

In terms of t erm limits, two, three-year terms for SSAC leadership, that matches what's currently in place for everything but the SSAC chair. We have a separate recommendation that the SSAC liaison work with the board to remove the current lack of ability to have a term limit on the chair. That's not shown, but that will need to be done to do this. And we do not think it's appropriate to have term limits on non-leadership members. There's important expertise. Showing it the door for sort of an arbitrary, "Oh, your time is up" reason, we think, would be very detrimental.

Conflict of interest. The SSAC has a number of mechanisms to disclose conflict of interest currently, and we've seen a lot of members, one, tell us they're comfortable identifying each other's conflict of interest and calling people out on it, but also sitting in on meetings, we've seen certain meetings where everyone goes around the room and says, "Hey, this is my prior just so you all know so that you know where I'm coming form and I'm disclosing anything to you."

So at a high level, an organization like the SSAC to have the required expertise to be in the room ,you have to have gathered that expertise somewhere, and you're going to have a potential conflict of interest. A lot of people will. What's important is not to remove that but rather to

have systems in place such that it can be disclosed, it can be talked about, and [that it's] ultimately is not impacting decision making. Right?

So we find that the current processes and activities are appropriate. We do have this minor suggestion here on the website where we have disclosure of interest statements. We think it'd be valuable to post for each one the last time it was updated. So according to the operating procedures, these are to be updated no less frequently than yearly, and whenever a change in position takes place. And it's a little bit hard now just to tell if that's happening.

You can sort of go through the way back machine and try and figure out when things changed, but we think a little more clarity there would just be reassuring that this is happening. From our look through things, we definitely see people being added over time and whatnot. So that's the recommendation there. And this something we're also thinking about a little bit more. We've had some comments on conflict of interest.

Finally, self-improvement. One thing that's shown here – the SSAC pretty much did the things that it was supposed to do from the 2009 review. There are a couple of things around the edges that – we talk about it in the report that to some extent made sense not to do. But the other thing that really stood out to us about the SSAC is that it values self-improvement. It was very excited to go through a review process. And it undertakes a lot of activities to proactively refine behaivors over time.

And this is something that really is a cornerstone of effective organizations, right? You don't only change when someone tells you to change, but you're actively looking for ways to refine.

So this final recommendation is just to continue to nurture and build upon that culture, because it's not every organization that seeks to do that, and I think sort of being able to say, "We do this, it's a value of ours" is a valuable thing.

So that's sort of the overview. There are a couple things in there that we skipped. In terms of next steps – this is just a project timeline – these dates actually match the dates on the website, which I think, Lars, are a little different than the dates that were in your presentation. I don't know if you know which ones are the more valid ones.

LARS HOFFMANN: I think actually – I think the spectrum is correct that you have on there.

CHRISTOPHER LLOP: Okay.

LARS HOFFMANN: So the plus minus that we use in the slides –

CHRISTOPHER LLOP: They get into that.

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL 63
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

LARS HOFFMANN: Yeah.

CHRISTOPHER LLOP: Perfect. Okay. Great. Thank you, Lars. But the final report should be published around December 17th or so, and of course, we are very much looking forward to comments that come in. We'll think about them, we will potentially make adjustments based on it, so we'd encourage that. Yeah.

So with that in mind, any – and this is just a link to the page, but any specific questions, comments? I see we're sort of over time. I'm happy to stick around to talk. Also to talk offline or whatever people would like.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] 1:15.

CHRISTOPHER LLOP: Oh, are we scheduled to 1:15? That's great. We have ten minutes. How excellent. Yeah.

JOHN LEVINE: I think these recommendations are good. I think there are a few places where the SSAC's necessary opacity makes things sort of – like for example, for looking for diversity, I mean I'm on the membership committee and I can't tell you who we've reviewed, but man, we would love to bring in more people from Africa and Asia. And not just for

political reason but because they see issues that we don't. And so – yeah, I guess my question is, is there somebody that we can say, "Yes, you're telling us what we know, but we need help?"

CHRISTOPHER LLOP: Yeah. No, that's fair. Part of our hope is some of the recommendations around, "Hey, let's give the SSAC funding to go to some conferences and meet people, try and put boots on the ground," can help to make that happen. And if you feel like you've been doing that and it's not working, I think that's something we should definitely take into consideration and think about.

JOHN LEVINE: Yeah. [There's a] separate issue of how much work you can ask a bunch of unfunded volunteers to do.

CHRISTOPHER LLOP: Yeah. Completely agree. Yeah. I think –

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah. I've done a number of liaison roles for SSAC over time and have been the RSSAC liaison for an extended length of time, and I find the recommendation about establishing more liaisons an interesting one, because I can say from personal experience, it's very challenging to get the degree of engagement in the group that you're liaisoning to and still maintain your engagement with SSAC as a whole. That's extremely challenging, and the more people that we have doing that role,

particularly at SSAC meetings, since now almost everyone is meeting for large parts of the ICANN meetings, will decrease the resources that are directly engaged in doing direct SSAC work.

So it's a challenge to try to balance that and not take too much of the expertise and engage them directly in the ongoing meetings with the other groups, because I think you said in that recommendation to at least attend one meeting during ICANN meetings. Well, from what I've seen, you basically have to attend 60 to 100% of the other groups' meetings if you're really going to do that liaison between the two groups. So that's a difficult recommendation.

CHRISTOPHER LLOP: Yeah, that makes sense, and that matches things that we've heard elsewhere. I think one of the goals with the way that recommendation is worded is to allow the SSAC to sort of say up front, "Hey, we're not going to jump in all the way on this. This is a point of contact that you can go to who'll have a general idea of what's going on, but we'll not necessarily maybe be as engaged as you've been sort of with the RSSAC or other groups over the years," just because I don't know that it's necessarily feasible to have that and continue moving forward with the work that exists.

I think in the more medium- or long-term, perhaps there'll be people who get excited about the liaison role as you may feel and sort of want to do that and dedicate time to that. That might be people currently on the SSAC, it might not be. It might be when screening a potential candidate, you find out, "Oh, hey, this person both has the required

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

skills for the SSAC and is very interested in going and socializing and understanding policy, so therefore, maybe they're a good fit for once they've been on the SSAC for a while." But sort of a thought there.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, Chris, quick question for you. Thank you for all this. On the liaison topic, I seem to interpret that the board liaison, there was a request in the process that the board liaison would brief the board on the paper topics before the paper is published?

CHRISTOPHER LLOP: Oh, sorry. No, it was not meant to be before the paper was published.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

CHRISTOPHER LLOP: Before the publication, the board liaison speak with the SSAC about how that briefing will go and what it will look like.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Oh, okay. Thank you.

CHRISTOPHER LLOP: Yes. Thanks.

ROD RASMUSSEN: So, on the one – so again, thanks for all that. And Robert, I'm just speaking on this particular topic, because I think this is going to be the one you're going to get the most pushback on from SSAC. And it's a manpower issue, person power issue. We have increasing demands for review teams, other obligations, and we have 39 members. And at some point, we can't really liaison with everybody or nobody's going to be in the room left to talk to.

We we've even gotten a request recently for an informal liaison to the subsequent procedure thing was like, "Hey, we need a point of contact we can reach out and ask questions to within SSAC and all the other SOs and ACs." And I see that as problematic in that you have the established process that we actually can manage the workflow coming into SSAC and going back out, so that one recommendation does concern me, because I think people are going to latch onto that in the broader ICANN community and go, "Yeah, I want an SSAC liaison." And we're going to say no.

CHRISTOPHER LLOP: Yeah. So that's a fair point, and I think that's something – if you asked me which one I thought was most likely to get pushed back, that would be the one I would pick as well. I do think we're hearing a clear enough signal from people that it's something that would be desired and think it would be useful, but at the same time, certainly agree it may be one where you look at it and say this really isn't feasible.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. And my thought when I'm looking at that was there might be alternative communication processes which you've outlined in other recommendations that would help alleviate that need that people think they need at least a liaison because they're not getting enough information flow back and forth. So I think that may be how our response to that might go. I'm sorry to step in front of you there, Robert.

CHRISTOPHER LLOP: No. Robert, may I just respond to that quickly? And then – sorry. Unless you want to – you know what? I'll respond to that later. Please go ahead.

ROBERT GUERRA: NO, I was just going to say that I was going to comment on this as well, and I think it's just if we appoint, say, someone to the GNSO, that person, [we'll] never see them again. And so I think it's just trying to – just the amount of time and effort that it would take. That happens to the NomCom. So the NomCom, the first couple of meetings, it's fine, but then they get [inaudible] and we don't see them for a meeting or two. And so I think it's just – whether you in your recommendation want to give SSAC the ability for them to appoint stuff and whether they will do it or not, which hi think that's the case for the ALAC, is that they can appoint, but whether they do that or not is their choosing, or whether it should be more specified. Not necessarily another SO/AC as a whole, but on issues related to the mandate and remit of SSAC, and then that request could be much more targeted and focused, and we may choose to take that up or not.

But I think they should know what our remit is, because otherwise, again, as others have said, we're not paid, we're a small group. We spend a lot of time working together, and over the last couple of years, that's actually improved things. And so if you start removing people – but also then they would have to brief everyone on what's going on, and that would also add to the time.

And so that reporting back is something that wasn't there, and that would also take up very valuable time that we have.

CHRISTOPHER LLOP: Understood. Julie, yes.

JULIE HAMMER: Just following on on this same point, I quite liked the language that you used when you said this could just be seen as a touchpoint. And in my mind, if the recommendation was more in that guise, it would be much easier to accept, because without going the route of full-blown liaisons, it actually happens that we do have a number of members who were already engaged in some of these other groups. And while they might not be willing to be a liaison, it might be that some of those members that we already have might be willing to be a point of contact.

CHRISTOPHER LLOP: Yeah. Thank you.

EN

JULIE HAMMER:	So I'm just really thinking if the language reflected what you've conveyed here, that you actually see that this is perhaps a more lightweight approach than a full-blown liaison.
CHRISTOPHER LLOP:	Yeah. So maybe the phrase "external liaison" is tied to too much baggage of what that means [to the very intensive and involved] role, and really, there's a different language such that a person is designated to be – you know, if someone on the ccNSO has a question, this is the first person to sort of talk to. Okay, we'll definitely think about that. Am I sort of characterizing it correctly, the way that – the feedback there?
JULIUE HAMMER:	[No, that's right.]
CHRISTOPHER LLOP:	Okay, thank you. Not sure who was first. Lyman?
LYMAN CHAPIN:	Thanks, Chris. At the risk of belaboring this point beyond – I mean obviously, you understand the things that we're concerned about, I do want to point out that in the case of SSAC, it isn't just a manpower or resources problem. The people who participate in SSAC are in many respects not fungible resources. The unique contribution that some of these people make to our discussions means that if you remove a particular person from SSAC deliberations, it's a meaningful diminishment of SSAC's ability to do useful work. So it isn't just that

ICANN 63 ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

you've taken a resource of five people and now you have a resource of four people, and obviously with four people, it's harder to get something done. It's that the removal of the particular person who has been taken off to go to other places as a liaison has a meaningful impact on SSAC's ability to do its work. Not just because they're a one-person resource, because of the unique contribution they make to SSAC.

CHRISTOPHER LLOP: Definitely. Understood. Thank you.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Hi. I'm Anne Aikman-Scalese, I'm with the IPC, and I just wanted to weigh in very briefly on the comment about the request for a liaison to Subsequent Procedures, because I heard yesterday I think it was, or Saturday, in our Subsequent Procedures meeting, "Well, we've requested the SSAC to send somebody to us and they're not responding" and this kind of stuff, but then at the same time, I hear, "Well, as far as subjects like name collisions, we're barging ahead."

So the concern of several of us within the IPC in particular is that – I don't know if this issue of budgeting has been addressed, but does the SSAC have sufficient funds to do what it needs to do, to produce the studies that it needs to produce and how we can assure – and I know that the ALAC has also weighed in on this as far as the necessity of producing name collisions work before proceeding to a next round, so I think that it might be good to make some kind of quote unquote informal response to subsequent procedures saying – and I know you

guys filed public comment, but sort of the position in subsequent procedures is, "Well, we've asked them to participate and they won't." So it's a matter of concern to many of us within IPC because of the issues that arise in name collisions with the interception issue and abuse in the DNS. So I don't know what kind of response you can make to SubPro, but it would be great if we, SubPro, were not barging ahead. And this was raised in our meeting on Saturday.

ROD RASMUSSEN: So, thanks, [inaudible] to the review process discussion here, but sounds like I [may need to] have a word with the chair of the Subsequent procedures PDP, because that saying that we're not participating because we don't want to follow their rules and send a liaison is not acceptable. I'll just put it that way.

GREG AARON: One of the things that the SSAC has done, as you mentioned, is we have participated in the public comment period. Now, that's a community-wide opportunity, and they're supposed to be planned such that that input can be used to shape the process and inform it going forward. So we're using that process because it's designed to provide input at the right time.

We may have a manpower problem trying to have a formal liaison who's tracking it. That doesn't mean we're not paying attention to it, and we've done our job to respond at the time the community said we were supposed to.

CHRISTOPHER LLOP: Yeah. If I can just comment on the bigger picture sub-context here of the SSAC having a lot to do and not necessarily being able to do everything, I think that's something that we've very clearly seen in all the conversations we've had, and I think there's a real and reasonable concern of what if we keep getting asked to do more. This'll stop being fun. Right? And for a volunteer committee, that's a bad situation to be in.

And I think some of our recommendations are things that may seem more obvious, such as go to the ICANN board if additional resources are needed, but the goal of having those in here is that there's something that can be pointed to and said, "Look, our independent assessment said that we are at capacity. We're doing everything we can. You want us to do more, we think we need to have a conversation about resources or prioritization or something like that."

And at the end of the day, I think the SSAC trying to do everything for everyone just isn't feasible or sustainable, and so that's one of the goal of some of the recommendations that are along those lines. So I think we're at time. I'm happy to stick around. I think Greg Rafert, who I work with, will be coming in at some point if he hasn't already. But thank you so much for listening and for your comments. We've taken notes and we'll be sure to act accordingly.

EN

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you for all the great feedback. We really appreciate the really proactive recommendations you've given us.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]