RSSAC

Lars (Chair) – RSSAC work is typically “out of view”; mainly technical experts; typically in conjunction with the IETF meetings; there may be a sense that it is not working well; glacial pace of work; not communicating with other parts of the Community; Bylaws changed – elected new steering group; want to increase transparency and visibility of RSSAC.

New document on roles of various committees and the wider community; new document on working methodologies; Also in listening mode; want to hear from other organs within ICANN and understand how they work. Looking a lot at SSAC and understanding how they work

RSSAC holds closed sessions for security reasons.

Suzanne – as liaison from RSSAC to ICANN Board – liaison gets overloaded; feel very strongly about this point– it is very difficult for small and narrow group that has powerful input to offer – hard to see how to engage effectively – is a question of resources; disclosures and conflicts of interest – adds overhead to participation for a small group of people; as Advisory Committee should provide input to other groups; looking carefully at how other groups do that; getting up to speed – understanding their processes

Issue identification occurs but there is a vicious cycle – Board is arbiter of last resort but Board wouldn’t have to do that if cross constituency work happened – trying to stay aware of policy processes

Trying to build on what SSAC has built. Staff resources significant; mission + pool of DNS expertise – try to provide specific perspective having to do with infrastructure and deal with administrator for root zone.

Elise Gerich – RSSAC populated with core reps from organization that operate infrastructure of the Internet – SSAC is different and a broader pool of expertise

Advisory Committee - not binding advice

Avri – concerns about RSSAC not connecting with other ACs/SOs?

Suzanne – yes, sounds very familiar

Lars – looking for opportunities to get engaged at an earlier stage;

I personally share view of default setting of “open” for activities; Sweden has default open policy for government documents; would like to see as more open but not carte blanche – not great in the past with respect to publishing documents; published minutes from last two meetings; (personal view) – should probably have meetings that are closed to the group to achieve a final a resting point where we can make statements – wants openness –

Question: would there be a value at the policy initiation phase to have expert identification of issues *before* policy process is launched.

Lars – makes sense but humans find problems as you go along – designed DNSSEC in 2000 – then operators said can’t handle the load – education and outreach to other ACs and SOs so they understand when they are getting close to our input – will take resources from ACs and SOs and ICANN – and other bodies will need to be open/receptive

David Conrad– have you done a resource requirements outline and communicated it to ICANN?

David Olive – we are looking at resource support for them – 2014 budget – looking at travel support – part of restructuring process

Suzanne – not to the point of doing that analysis – basic identification of “where do the work items come from” and structure/resources and doing the meaningful work. – how much structure and process do you need to have a credible analysis?