To: ATRT2

From: Brian Cute

Re: Meeting with SSAC

Date: November 18, 2014

Summary of points from SSAC members regarding Draft Recommendations”

1. Support Recommendations concerning Financial accountability. Specifically, concerned about budget and extraordinary expense approval process. Recurring extraordinary expenses that are not treated as part of the budget affect planning for SSAC activities.
2. Recommendation regarding the Board reacting to AC/SO advice resonated well.
3. Volunteer funding is important to SSAC. Both for inter-sessional meetings and ICANN meetings. (SSAC produced 4 reports per year when Patrick began participating (get the year); will produce 9 reports this year.

Notes from SSAC meeting:

Patrick Falstrom - In general, lack of reaction to the Report is an indication that we have done a good job. (Because of David.) SSAC will work with all the Recommendations including SSR-RT. Will take on action to take a careful look at that. Different issue: page 61 Financial Transparency and Accountability – finding #3 – prioritization of ICANN. Difficulty for community to review additional expenditures; approval process – difficult to understand what is being approved. SSAC has asked for shorter list. Distinguish between recurring expenses from one off expenses. If approved for 3 years in a row, why is an extraordinary expense not moved into ICANN’s budget? Difference between stopping and starting expenses. Inter-sessional SSAC meetings expense not approved one year. Had serious impact for SSAC. Now it has been moved into budget. Should be a higher barrier to take something out of the budget. Planning impacts.

Barbara Roseman – every year starts with zero budget; no possibility that something be added in. There are extraordinary requests that are approved every year. Fast track budget done for the first fiscal quarter, then actual budget is completed.

Patrick Falstrom - Reduce new extraordinary requests. That is where the bloat occurs. Operational issues hit in the 1st quarter. Theory that review by the Community will be easier.

David Conrad – p. C11 Recommendation in SSR-RT. ICANN should publish paper for roles of SSAC and RSSAC. Appropriate resourcing for demands put upon them. Steve Crocker has noted that it inappropriately implies that there should be public comments on the operating procedures. Feels it is an internal document not a policy document.

Patrick Falstrom - Input of RSSAC – haven’t reached out because of restructuring. Feedback from liaison. Restructuring is following a good path. Don’t want to complicate it. Let them reform/redefine themselves and then we will address overlap and gaps between the two. SSAC doesn’t mind if there is Public Comment. Output could be at least made available. Disagree re: Public Comment.

Suzanne Woolf - RSSAC work should be done near the end of this years. Caucus start by end of the year and into 2014. Work on caucus being complete will allow SSAC to review RSSAC and be able to identify gaps.

Jim Galvin: Operating procedures document – I view as internal, but available to the Community. Interested to hear ATRT2’s view. Issues or concerns should be drawn from the Charter and SSAC’s relationship with the Board.

Avri - I understand self determination aspect of operating procedures, but what’s the downside of Community comment?

Jim – Question I would ask is “do other groups in ICANN have their operating procedures subject to Public Comment”?

Avri – what’s the issue?

David – within SOP of SSAC & RSSAC – to satisfy Rec. 6, perhaps they need to be broken out.

Larry – With regard to the ATRT2 Report, are there Recommendations that we made that strongly resonate or did we get it wrong somewhere?

Don – Board responding to ACs/SOs resonated as very good.

Patrick – writing our recommendations as much more clear, ICANN’s staff has created a tracker for SSAC recommendations. That tool has made it much easier for SSAC and the leadership committee thinks it really helps. Difficulty is that SSAC Recommendations are only tracked until they are complete. What happens if Board decides *not* to do something…?

Brian - State a clear rationales as to why not?

Patrick Falstrom – What if two AC’s have overlapping and different views: variant TLDs – SSAC comments re: TMCH from technical angle: ALAC – social usability – Staff compiles into one action; how should it be reflected in that tool; or should it show that they were merged? Aspect of the tool (whether Board decided not to follow recommendation); effectively 2 aspects of the tracking tool that could be improved.

Alan – participation of “funded” members v. “non-funded” meetings.

Patrick – SSAC meeting at IETF; not interacting with ICANN meeting (not good); why aren’t people attending ICANN meetings? Funding; SSAC has asked for funding for SSAC members (has increased) – 10 SSAC members funded by ICANN; just under 50%; tracking very carefully; For Beijing ICANN meeting, had to say no to 1 attendee because of lack of funding. Fadi - If looking at only one person saying no to, come in and ask for funding; planning is that they can get 10 people – if that changed significantly, that would be an issue. The inter-sessional meeting is funded. That is VERY important. Some SSAC members refuse funding because of employment (intersessional meeting is “opt out” of funding mechanism. ICANN meeting funding is “opt-in.”) Funding allows us to do more work. SSAC will produce 9 reports this year. When Patrick first joined, SSAC produced 4 reports per year.

Jim Galvin - PDP process question - what was your question?

Alan – funding for participation – footnote: considering widening to other aspects of ICANN.

Barbara – ask the question of the RSSAC as well. As part of reorganization of RSSAC, wanted to have funding for at least one meeting (Singapore?). Most members will choose to not use the funding. Many academics will use.

Alan – Reconsideration – if, after the fact, SSAC says they got it wrong, there is no remediation.

Patrick - SSAC does technical advice, not value judgment. How to design the scale you use when calculating risk but we don’t’ do the calculation. Change of contract, there is an RSTEP process. We have seen that our recommendations are referred to in RSTEP processes. Value judgment of change in terms for contracting parties, happens in RSTEP.

Jim – remediation for Conficker – reservation of names – had to buy the names - $ took years to get the money back.

Barbara – caution of Board decisions and corporate decisions.