

---

ABU DHABI – RSSAC Review Session  
Sunday, October 29, 2017 – 09:00 to 10:15 GST  
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

LYMAN CHAPIN:

ICANN has a continuing purpose in the structure and if so whether any changes in its structure or operation might improve its effectiveness. And the third one is a little bit different, whether or not it's accountable to its constituencies and stakeholder groups, and we'll get into that in a minute because it's a little -- unlike some of the other pieces of ICANN, it's not intuitively obvious exactly what the constituency of RSSAC is and who its stakeholders might be.

The other thing now that we're into the second round of these reviews, the by-laws mandate that ICANN do this every -- I don't know what it is, two years, five years; anyway, there was a review of the RSSAC that was begun in 2008. It was mostly conducted during 2009 and the final report of the last review Work Party was in 2010. So this review is also expected to assess how well and to what extent the recommendations from the previous review were implemented.

So there are three categories of sort of principle actors in this process. The first are the MSSSI folks, ICANN staff members. MSSSI is the organization, the part of ICANN that is responsible for

---

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

---

overseeing the conduct of these institutional reviews, and the names you'll hear and the people you'll see are primarily Lars Hoffmann and Angie Graves.

The independent examiner is my consulting company, Interisle Consulting Group. So that's the team that we've assembled; consists of myself, Marika [inaudible] who is sitting over here, Jim Reid who is over here, and my colleague at Interisle, Colin Strutt. So the four of us will be performing the independent examiner role doing interviews, writing the report, doing the analysis and so forth.

And then within RSSAC, you folks have nominated or designated five people to be the Review Work Party which is a principle point of contact and the regular point of contact between the independent examiner and the RSSAC. So Hiro Hotta, Liman, Kaveh, Tripti and Brad are all members of the Review Work Party. We will be having regular, probably every two week conference calls with that group, either all of them or some subset of them during the course of the review so that we make sure that things are on track.

The [rssacreview2@icann.org](mailto:rssacreview2@icann.org) e-mail address will reach all the members of the Review Work Party, the relevant MSSI folks and all of the independent examiners. So anything that you wanted to say -- it's a publicly archived list -- so anything you wanted to

---

say about the review to the entire group of people that are concerned about it, would go to that list.

If you have something that you want to say just to the independent examiner, you can use the second address that's up there, [rssac-review@interisle.net](mailto:rssac-review@interisle.net). The rule that we're following with all of the information that we collect during the course of this review, whether it comes in on the e-mail list or whether it comes in through interviews or the survey, is that we will not attribute any of that information individually to a person unless that person explicitly consents to it.

So the default is confidentiality of information and you'll notice, cause we're gonna be talking to a lot of you in interviews this week and in the following weeks, that one of the things we emphasize in those interviews is that you have to tell us explicitly that you are willing for your name to be associated with any of the comments that you make, otherwise we will default to anonymity. That applies to anything that gets sent to that second e-mail address as well.

So the areas that we're going to be looking into, the scope of the review, these are pretty straightforward. This is what you would expect of an institutional review and I won't belabor them. They're in a interview guide that we've passed out to the folks

---

that we're going to be talking to and that's of course freely available to anybody who'd like to take a look at it.

The two things that are on there that maybe deserve a little bit more comment are the implementation of prior review recommendations. The RSSAC conducted its own self-assessment in which it expressed an opinion about how the previous reviews recommendations had been implemented and how successful that had been in improving things or not improving things.

So a fairly large part of this second round of review will be to look at whether or not those recommendations have been accepted, and in particular to determine which if any of them are perhaps no longer relevant to current circumstances. Because, obviously not even in internet time, just in regular times, seven years, almost eight years is a long time. So things are different now than they were then and you folks know that probably better than most parts of ICANN.

And the last bullet on there is the relationship between RSSAC and the Root Server Operators. So say we're not reviewing the RSOs either individually or collectively, but clearly the RSSAC if you just look at the statutory nature of its membership, it has a representative and an alternate from each of the Root Server Operator organizations. The relationship between those two

---

things is significant from the standpoint of whether or not RSSAC is fulfilling its role within ICANN.

Next slide. The print is getting smaller as we go along here. So RSSAC has already conducted a self-evaluation. The independent examiner, my group, has begun to assemble documents and -- okay, I can still see it. If it doesn't get any smaller, I'm okay. We've begun to assemble the background information and the documents and so forth that we're going to be reviewing. Whenever we have conversations with any of you in the course of an interview or just informally, feel free to point us to any sources of information that you think might not be obvious to us.

Some of them, obviously -- you know, the RSSAC published documents that, you know, NNN series are ones that we have no trouble discovering, but if you know of any information sources whether they're documents or anything else, we'd be happy to hear about them.

We're going to be conducting face-to-face, in-person interviews at ICANN60 at this meeting this week, and also in Singapore in two plus weeks at IETF100. We'll be conducting remote interviews, we'll use Skype or something to talk to folks that we won't have a chance to meet personally, and we will also be

---

launching an online survey to get to people who for one reason or another we can't actually interview individually.

And the highlighted italicized text in blue again, bears repeating -- you're gonna have to tell us if you want or if you're willing for any of the things that you might say in any of these environments to be personally attributable.

We've also already begun observing RSSAC and RSSAC caucus meetings and conference calls, so we're going to be just sitting in as observers. The regular RSSAC admin calls, we've had -- two of us were able to get down to the workshop in Maryland a couple weeks ago, and we'll continue to do that throughout. The objective there again is simply to observe the way the organization works in all of its different bits and pieces.

Then we'll be going through a process of analysis where we take all of that information and come up with findings and recommendations and conclusions. And then there'll be a process of report preparation and review.

The way this works, there are many levels of report presentation and both public comment, review opportunities for the Review Work Party, review opportunities for the full RSSAC. There are three or four different stages at which you'll have an opportunity to look at the process, look at the draft results of

---

the process and make comments, point out things that we may have missed, point out things that we've gotten wrong and so forth.

So where we are, you folks have completed the self-assessment. The independent examiner, we were selected at the end of September; workshop in early October down in Maryland; we've started the interviews this week. We'll be conducting interviews at IETF100. The survey will go live towards the end of November.

The first draft report for comment within the Review Work Party and RSSAC will be available on the 19<sup>th</sup> of February, and I believe that ICANN -- I think the MSI folks also intend to publish it for public comment either right in the same time frame but maybe a week later. We'll make a presentation of those draft results informed by the public comment period and by the first round of review among the RSSAC membership at ICANN61 in San Juan in March.

And the final report, actually the draft of the final report, because there will again be another public comment period and then another opportunity for RSSAC to review, will be ready at the end of April and the target for publishing the final report after it's been approved by the Review Work Party and RSSAC and also approved by ICANN will be -- the target is the 2<sup>nd</sup> of July. So it looks like a lengthy process.

---

If any of you have been through this kind of thing before, you'll know that it's front-loaded to a very great extent. Almost all the work takes place in the first half of this. The second half is a long period of allowing time for public comment and for review by interested parties, and then responding to those comments and the results of those reviews, so that by the time we get to that first draft report in mid-February, you'll have a pretty good sense of what it is the independent examiner believes are the findings of the review.

It's unlikely that there will be any sudden surprises after that point. There'll be a lot of refinement, a lot of explanation, a lot of clarification, but we'll pretty much know what the results are by mid-February, and because of the regular exchanges that we're going to have as the independent examiner with the members of the Review Work Party, you'll be hearing about anything that we discover a lot sooner than that.

So I wanted to emphasize that this isn't a process where we go off, you guys never hear from us and then all of a sudden we throw this massive thing at you with lots of recommendations that you had no way to anticipate. This is gonna be a very close iterative process. You're gonna find out about things that we're concerned about or things that we think we're seeing long before you have to deal with the idea that they might suddenly



---

show up in a published report and you had no opportunity to actually engage us to discuss the implications of it.

And that's where we stand at this point. It's going to be an extremely busy week. Many of you are on our schedule for interviews this week. We'd love to talk to any of you who'd feel like just sitting down and having a chat. We can't interview literally everybody. We'd have hundreds of people on our list if we did. We're interviewing a lot of people formally but we're also happy to talk with anybody who'd like to just sit down and find out what our thinking is or give us some suggestions. In particular, we're always eager to hear about any other sources of information or concerns that people have, areas that they think that we should be looking into that maybe wouldn't be obvious to us.

With that, Tripti, I'll let you take the floor back and you can see if people have questions for us.

TRIPTI SINHA:

All right. Does anyone have questions for Lyman? And by the way, thank you very much. I have one, but I wanted to see if anyone else would like to go first.

All right, so I'll start with my question. You said the final report is published after it's approved by the Review Committee, RSSAC

---

and you said ICANN. So when you say ICANN, who are you referring to?

LYMAN CHAPIN:

What happens is there is -- the actual formality of it is that ICANN simply agrees that the public comments have been adequately taken into account. So ICANN runs the public comment period and there are several public comment periods on the draft preliminary report and the draft final report. So they basically weigh in and they say, "Okay, you have adequately taken into account the public comments and you've explained why you've either accepted or didn't accept each one."

TRIPTI SINHA:

So do you mean, ICANN the organization not the Board, or the community you're referring to?

LYMAN CHAPIN:

Oh, I'm sorry. From a formal standpoint, it would be a recommendation from the organizational Effectiveness Committee of the Board to the full Board, and then a Board resolution.

---

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, thank you. Sorry, I didn't frame the question appropriately. Any other questions?

Kevin, you're online. Do you have any questions? There's no [inaudible]? Oh, sorry about that. Lyman, looks like that's it.

LYMAN CHAPIN: We can give you back a lot of time for your agenda.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you very much. So, question for everyone. We've essentially come to the end of this portion of the meeting, so there's no other material for this hour. So we can either take a very long break, sit in the room and discuss some other topic. Suggestions? Jeff, I know you're dying to say something. Just say it.

JEFF: Charades.

TRIPTI SINHA: You go first. Why don't we just break until -- our next session is at 10:30? 10:30. All right.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**