SSAC2 Review

Detailed Implementation Plan

Draft

Status of This Document

Following the [Board acceptance](https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#2.d) of the Final Report and of the SSAC Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan, this Detailed Implementation Plan is being developed by the SSAC Review Implementation Work Group for consideration by the ICANN Board.

If desired, please insert a preamble and/or an Executive Summary.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 1** | |
| Recommendation | The SSAC has a clear continuing purpose within ICANN. Its existence as an Advisory Committee should continue. |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | n/a |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAAIP:  n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP:  n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) |  |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAAIP:  n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAAIP:  n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAAIP:  n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAAIP:  n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAAIP:  n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |

### 

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 2** | |
| Recommendation | The SSAC should ensure that each advisory or report provided to the ICANN Board includes a high-level summary that outlines the topic or issue in easily understandable terms and  lists the key findings with uniquely numbered recommendations. |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | The SSAC already does this, and will continue to do so. The IE’s  recommendation is a good reminder. However, some SSAC  documents, such as correspondence, are too brief to require a  high-level summary or listing of key findings. |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAAIP: SSAC  n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP: None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) | None |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAIIP: None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAIIP: Easy  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low) | According to FAIIP: Low  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAIIP: Already done.  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAIIP:  These procedures are already documented in the SSAC Operational Procedures, Section 3.2.3 which specifies that SSAC documents have “a high-level summary that outlines the topic or issue in easily understandable terms and lists, if applicable, the uniquely numbered key findings and recommendations”.  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps  (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 3** | |
| Recommendation | When providing advice, the SSAC should ensure that the Board Liaison reviews and provides feedback on both the summary and full document before submission to the Board. The SSAC should proactively discuss talking points and potential Board response timing with the SSAC Board  Liaison. |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | The procedure for ensuring Liaison review before publication is documented in the SSAC Operational Procedures in section 3.2.2, and SSAC has been following that procedure. The procedure to “proactively discuss talking points and potential Board response timing with the SSAC Board Liaison” should be adopted by adding explicit mention in the SSAC Operational Procedures. |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAIIP: SSAC  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP: None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) | According to FAIIP: None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAIIP: None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAIIP: Easy  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low) | According to FAIIP: Improved Communications  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAIIP: Shortly thereafter Board decision  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAIIP:  SSAC to add specific language to the SSAC Operational Procedures, section 3.4, to “proactively discuss talking points and potential Board response timing with the SSAC Board Liaison”. The SSAC Admin Committee, the relevant SSAC Working Party, and the Board Liaison will have responsibility for execution. |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps  (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 4** | |
| Recommendation | The SSAC Board Liaison should work with the ICANN Board and ICANN Staff to ensure that Board Action Request Register (ARR) adequately captures the information required to  understand the status of advice from when it is given through its implementation. |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | This is already being done - it may require explicit mention in the SSAC Operational Procedures. |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAIIP: ICANN Board, ICANN Staff, SSAC Board Liaison  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP: Will require assistance from ICANN staff  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) | According to FAIIP: To be determined by ICANN Board and Staff. This will require some time from Board staff support.  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAIIP: To be determined by ICANN Board and Staff.  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAIIP: TBD in discussion with ICANN Board and Staff  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low) | According to FAIIP: Improved Governance  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAIIP: TBD in discussion with ICANN Board and Staff  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAIIP:   1. ICANN Board should have ICANN Staff alter the Board Action Request Register (ARR) so that it tracks recommendations through the Implementation phase to closure -- not just to the point where the Board takes an action (passes a Resolution) on the recommendation. 2. The AAR should state additional milestone dates achieved. It is important to see how much time passes from when a recommendation is given to the Board and when the Board considers the issue (and passes a   resolution or not), and then the amount of time that passes between the Board resolution and the finished  implementation by Staff (if implementation is involved).   1. See Recommendation 5 -- SSAC to add specific language to the SSAC Operational Procedures to require periodic review of open recommendations to the Board and implementation tasks. On the SSAC side, this will be tracked by the ICANN Board Liaison and SSAC Admin Committee. |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps  (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 5** | |
| Recommendation | The SSAC should periodically review the implementation state of past and future advice provided to the ICANN Board to ensure that all action items are listed in the ARR. The SSAC should follow-up with the ICANN Board via its Board Liaison when advice has not yet been addressed or when progress is unclear. The ICANN Board should periodically review the AAR to ensure that the Board is considering SSAC advice in a timely fashion, and that the Board understands the implementation status of relevant Board resolutions by ICANN Org.” |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | Part of SSAC’s effectiveness depends on the Board considering  SSAC’s advice. While the SSAC has no power to effect change,  the Board does. SSAC realizes that the Board may not accept  SSAC’s advice. But SSAC advice loses value if not considered in  a reasonable amount of time.  Both the Board and SSAC share responsibility for ensuring that  SSAC advice is considered by the Board in a timely fashion. As  noted in the IE’s Report, it has sometimes taken the Board  years to consider SSAC advice. It can even happen that, where  there has been a significant delay in considering advice, events or developments have occurred to render the advice redundant or outdated.  At its 2017 Annual Workshop, the SSAC undertook a triage of all issued SSAC reports and identified those reports which should be followed up, potentially through the BTC by the SSAC Board Liaison. The SSAC Board Liaison and SSAC Staff are currently devoting significant effort to reviewing all SSAC  recommendations to categorize them as complete, no longer  relevant, or open.  Another goal is better communication about the implementation status of Board resolutions. |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAIIP: SSAC, ICANN Board, ICANN Board support staff  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP: None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) | According to FAIIP: None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAIIP: None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAIIP: High, easy  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low) | According to FAIIP: Improved effectiveness of SSAC and ICANN Board. Improved  governance, transparency, and Improved communications.  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAIIP: Shortly thereafter  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAIIP:    SSAC to add specific language to the SSAC Operational Procedures to:  1. require periodic (at least twice-a-year) review of open  recommendations to the Board and resulting  implementation tasks. The reviews and tracking will be  performed by the ICANN Board Liaison and SSAC Admin  Committee.  2. ICANN Board Liaison to provide the SSAC membership with  twice-yearly status updates regarding progress of SSAC  recommendations at the Board.  Internally, SSAC will consider a method of flagging internally the high priority or urgent recommendations and work this through the BTC. |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps  (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 6** | |
| Recommendation | For time sensitive issues, the SSAC should establish process and work deadlines that take into account the decision timelines of other ICANN entities. The SSAC should work with SSAC staff to ensure internal deadlines are set up to make meeting external deadlines as possible as  reasonable. |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | SSAC already endeavors to do this. For example, SSAC has been providing timely written comments during Public Comment Periods, which is the main community-standard way to provide feedback. SSAC has also provided efficient and timely participation in the recent and demanding ePDP.  SSAC will not always be able to formally join some community  efforts due to time/labor constraints -- please see also notes  regarding Recommendations 14 and 15 below. |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAIIP: SSAC  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP: None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) | According to FAIIP: None (although takes up a lot of SSAC member/volunteer time.)  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAIIP: None. Requires continued help of SSAC support staff.  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAIIP: Medium  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low) | According to FAIIP:  Community participation  Medium  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAIIP: Shortly thereafter  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAIIP:   * SSAC Admin Committee to monitor and manage as part of ongoing operations. |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps  (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 8** | |
| Recommendation | The SSAC should formalize an annual process geared towards setting research priorities and identifying relevant emerging security, stability, and resiliency (SSR) threats in the short and  medium-term. |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | SSAC does this as part of its annual workshop, where the  membership convenes to do its annual planning. |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAIIP: SSAC  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP: SSAC annual workshop  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) | According to FAIIP: Continuance of SSAC annual workshop  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAIIP: Continuance of SSAC annual workshop  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAIIP: Easy to implement  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low) | According to FAIIP: Improved service to community  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAIIP: Already underway  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAIIP:  The SSAC will memorialize its annual process geared towards  setting research priorities and identifying relevant emerging  security, stability, and resiliency (SSR) threats in the short- and  medium-term, in the Operational Procedures section 4. |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps  (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 9** | |
| Recommendation | The skills needed for tasks identified in the SSAC’s annual priority setting and emerging threat identification exercise should feed into the SSAC’s membership and recruitment  processes. |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | n/a |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAIIP: SSAC  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP: None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) | According to FAIIP: None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAIIP: None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAIIP: Medium  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low) | According to FAIIP: Medium  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP: n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAIIP: 2020 membership review process  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAIIP:  SSAC will update its Operational Procedures sections 2.3 and 2.5, so that skills needed for tasks identified in the SSAC’s annual priority setting and emerging threat identification exercise are fed into the SSAC’s membership processes and are taken into account there. |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps  (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 10** | |
| Recommendation | The SSAC should explicitly communicate the reasons for its decisions around topic selection and focus with others in ICANN. New requests should be compared to the current set of priorities and communicated about accordingly. |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | SSAC already does this in its public meetings at the thrice-a year ICANN meetings. We will look to ways to sharpen our message regarding our motivations for selecting particular  work products. |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAIIP: SSAC  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP: None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) | According to FAIIP: None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAIIP: None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAIIP: Easy to implement  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low) | According to FAIIP:  Improved communications  Easy  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP: n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAIIP: Already underway  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAIIP:  SSAC Admin Committee will look to ways to sharpen our message regarding project selection. |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps  (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 11** | |
| Recommendation | The SSAC should continue to approach the ICANN Board when additional funding, resources, or access to external contractors may be required to achieve a project in the desired timeline or at the desired scale. |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | Will do. An example in the past was the larger-than-usual NCAP project, where SSAC scoped and requested additional  resources. The IE’s recommendation assumes that there will be no unfunded mandates to SSAC from the Board or the  community. |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAIIP: SSAC  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP: None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) | According to FAIIP: N/A  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAIIP: See above.  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAIIP: Medium  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low) | According to FAIIP:  Efficient process.  Easy  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAIIP: As needed  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAIIP:  SSAC Admin Committee is responsible for tracking and  coordinating requests of this nature. |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps  (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 12** | |
| Recommendation | The SSAC should consider whether a fellowship can be used for assistance with research or specific work products. In addition, the SSAC should continue to endeavor to leverage the assistance of ICANN’s technical staff when it is appropriate to do so. |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | The problem that the IE is trying to help solve is getting more  resources for SSAC, which is stretched to capacity.  In April 2019, ICANN Org secured two Research Fellows to  support projects in SSAC and RSSAC. The ICANN Research  Fellow Program is a pilot effort designed to engage security and technical researchers to work on emerging security and  technology policy issues related to the DNS. The Research  Fellows will help fill the need expressed by the IE.  SSAC needs the assistance of people with writing skills who can help with the drafting of SSAC papers under SSAC direction. |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAIIP: SSAC and ICANN Staff  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP: None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) | According to FAIIP: Research Fellow funding from ICANN Org.  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAIIP: Research Fellow funding from ICANN Org.  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAIIP: Hard  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low) | According to FAIIP: Efficiency delivery, relieve some burden being imposed on SSAC volunteers  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAIIP: Immediately  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAIIP:  SSAC Admin Committee and ICANN staff collaborated to fill the Research Fellow position allowed under the budget;  implementation completed April 2019 and planned to continue in future years. |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps  (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 14** | |
| Recommendation | The SSAC should consider and adopt appropriate mechanisms to ensure that it is aware of policy-making efforts going on within ICANN. |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | The SSAC invites other SOs and ACs to contact SSAC if they  would like SSAC’s opinion on an upcoming matter. Proactive  communication is always appreciated, and SSAC will endeavor  to respond to requests to the best of its ability.  SSAC tracks policy-making, and when it sees an issue with  security and stability implications, SSAC comments during the  public comment periods. The public comment periods are the  officially designated times when policy-making groups solicit  feedback from the community, supposedly with enough time to digest the comments and adjust course as necessary. If public comment periods fall too late in the process, then that is an issue for the GNSO and ICANN Org to solve.  SSAC takes advantage when SSAC members are participating in policy-making groups, per their own interests, their employer’s, or on behalf of another group. These members bring back items for discussion within SSAC.  The SSAC Chair meets regularly with the GNSO Chair and other  SO/AC leaders. New and upcoming policy initiatives could be a  topic in those leadership meetings. |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAIIP: SSAC, other bodies with ICANN  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP: n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) | According to FAIIP: n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAIIP: None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAIIP: Medium  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low) | According to FAIIP:  Improved community process  Medium  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAIIP: Immediately  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAIIP: n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps  (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 15** | |
| Recommendation | As time availability allows, the SSAC should continue to have members involved as individuals in large, cross-ICANN efforts that have SSR-related components, such as the SSR2. |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | ICANN’s increasing number of cross-community efforts all require large time commitments. Some cross-community efforts are important for SSAC to participate in, and SSAC will continue to participate to the extent the topics are aligned with SSAC’s mission and capabilities.  Some of those relevant efforts have placed significant burdens  on SSAC and its members. |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAIIP: n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP: n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) | According to FAIIP: n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAIIP: n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAIIP: n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low) | According to FAIIP: n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP: n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAIIP: n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAIIP: n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps  (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 16** | |
| Recommendation | In the process of developing each SAC-series document, the SSAC should explicitly discuss who affected parties may be and whether or not affected parties should be consulted for feedback or should be notified that the SSAC plans to publish a document on a given topic. |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | SSAC already does this, per SSAC Operational Procedures  sections 3.2.3 and 3.2.4. |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAIIP: SSAC  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP: None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) | According to FAIIP: N/A  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAIIP: N/A  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAIIP: Medium  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low) | According to FAIIP:  Improved process  Medium  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP: n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAIIP: n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAIIP:  The SSAC Operational Procedures section 3.2.3, “Developing an Initial Work Draft Product”, will be updated to read: “The work party should identify the parties potentially affected, and may consult with members of the ICANN community affected by the issue under study." |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps  (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 18** | |
| Recommendation | The SSAC should post specific additional materials online in the short-term, to consolidate information and increase transparency. The SSAC’s Administrative Committee should then undertake a yearly review of the SSAC’s website to determine whether additional content should be provided or whether the website should be restructured. |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | After consulting with the Admin Committee, plans are underway to incorporate this recommendation by adding the following to the SSAC website.  • An explanation of the purpose of the SSAC-Correspondence  Series.  • A link to the most recent ICANN Board ARR.  • A clear articulation of how and when an SO/AC or Work  Party within ICANN might request feedback or comments  from the SSAC  • A clear explanation of how one can apply to join the SSAC  and high-level information regarding the types of skills that  the SSAC is looking for in members.  • Pictures of current members who are willing to include one,  to assist newer members of ICANN |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAIIP:  SSAC Admin Committee and support staff  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP: n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) | According to FAIIP: n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAIIP:  N/A  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAIIP:  Medium  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low) | According to FAIIP:  More relevant and findable SSAC publications for Board and  Community.  Low/Easy  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP: n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAIIP:  N/A  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAIIP:  SSAC Admin Committee to lead efforts to improve the content of the SSAC Web site. |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps  (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 19** | |
| Recommendation | The SSAC should remain accountable directly to the ICANN Board and through it to the wider ICANN community. |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | None |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAIIP:  ICANN Board, SSAC  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP:  N/A  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) | According to FAIIP:  N/A  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAIIP:  N/A  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAIIP:  N/A  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low) | According to FAIIP:  No new implementation needed  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation |  |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAIIP:  N/A  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAIIP:  N/A |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps  (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 20** | |
| Recommendation | The current number of SSAC members is appropriate. The SSAC should continue to work to ensure its members are engaged, in conjunction with the recruiting points made below. |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | None |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAIIP:  SSAC  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP:  None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) | According to FAIIP:  None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAIIP:  None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAIIP:  Medium, requires work by Membership Committee  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low) | According to FAIIP:  Greater membership engagement  High priority, for productivity  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAIIP:  Immediately  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAIIP:  Continue to follow membership participation and evaluation  procedures, per SSAC Operational Procedures. |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 24** | |
| Recommendation | Each year, the SSAC should develop a formalized process to  estimate the non-technical expertise required for anticipated  future work and thereby identify any skills gaps in the current  membership. These skills gaps should be widely publicized on the SSAC website and at any meetings where SSAC members are in attendance. Prospective candidates should be directed to review the published skills gaps. The Membership Committee should take non-technical expertise gaps into consideration when assessing new member applications. |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | None |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAIIP:  SSAC at its Annual Workshop  SSAC Membership Committee in considering new member  applications  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP:  In conjunction with the annual assessment of new work conducted at the SSAC Annual Workshop, identify the non-technical skills required to undertake anticipated future work and the skills gaps that may need to be filled to do so. This activity is also covered by Recommendations 8 and 9 and is related to Recommendations 21 and 25.  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) | According to FAIIP:  None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAIIP:  None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAIIP:  High priority, for productivity  Medium; requires work by all SSAC members  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low) | According to FAIIP:  Medium. Greater membership engagement, more efficient  membership application process, SSAC non-technical expertise  closely aligned to the work anticipated to be undertaken.  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAIIP:  Immediately  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAIIP:  As part of the annual assessment of new work conducted at the SSAC Annual Workshop, identify the non-technical expertise required to undertake anticipated future work.  Identify skills gaps that may need to be filled to do so.  Publicize skills gaps on the SSAC website and at any meetings  where SSAC members are in attendance.  Take non-technical expertise gaps into consideration when  assessing new member applications. |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 25** | |
| Recommendation | Each year, the SSAC should develop a formalized process to  estimate its current and desired diversity, including but not limited to geography and gender, and thereby identify any diversity gaps in the current membership. These diversity gaps should be widely publicized on the SSAC website and at any meetings where SSAC members are in attendance. Prospective candidates should be directed to review the published skills gaps. The Membership Committee should take diversity gaps into consideration when assessing new member applications. |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | N/A |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAIIP:  SSAC at its Annual Workshop  SSAC Membership Committee in considering new member  applications  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP:  In conjunction with the annual assessment of new work conducted at the SSAC Annual Workshop, identify the current and desired diversity, including but not limited to geography and gender, of its members to contribute to high quality of SSAC advice. Identify the diversity gaps that may need to be filled to do so. This activity is also covered by Recommendations 8 and 9 and is related to Recommendations 21 and 24.  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) | According to FAIIP:  None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAIIP:  None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAIIP:  Difficulty to implement: High, for productivity  Level of implementation effort: Medium; requires work by all SSAC members  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low) | According to FAIIP:  Medium. Greater membership engagement, more efficient  membership application process, increased SSAC diversity  contributing to higher quality of SSAC advice.  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAIIP:  Immediately  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAIIP:  As part of the annual assessment of the diversity of its members conducted at the SSAC Annual Workshop, identify the desired diversity, including but not limited to geography and gender, of its members to contribute to high quality of SSAC advice.  Identify diversity gaps that may need to be filled to do so.  Publicize diversity gaps on the SSAC website and at any meetings where SSAC members are in attendance.  Take diversity gaps into consideration when assessing new  member applications. |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps  (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 26** | |
| Recommendation | The SSAC should ensure that the effectiveness of an external  liaison and the individual in the role are reviewed on a regular  basis, and that a means of providing confidential feedback to the review is readily available and known. |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | SSAC believes it has processes in place to mitigate the concern  being raised. We will seek to revise our Operational  Procedures to make this more apparent.  The ICANN Board utilizes a formal mechanism in which Board  members provide feedback to other Board members. So while  the SSAC Liaison receives feedback about his or her effectiveness on the Board from other Board members, the  SSAC has no mechanism for providing feedback to its own Liaison. |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAIIP:  SSAC  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP:  None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) | According to FAIIP:  None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAIIP:  None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAIIP:  Medium  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low) | According to FAIIP:  Improved management, accountability  Low  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAIIP:  Immediately  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAIIP:  Additional text will be drafted and proposed for the SSAC  Operational Procedures during the next revision cycle. |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps  (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 27** | |
| Recommendation | The SSAC’s leadership should be limited to two, three-year terms. The SSAC should impose no term limits on non-leadership members. |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | See #28 for implementation regarding SSAC Chair.  The SSAC Vice-Chair and Board Liaison are already term-limited  to two three-year terms, via the SSAC Operational Procedures. |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAIIP:  See #28  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP:  See #28  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) | According to FAIIP:  None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAIIP:  None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAIIP:  Medium  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low) | According to FAIIP:  Improved governance and accountability  Low  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAIIP:  Immediately  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAIIP:  See #28 for implementation |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps  (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 28** | |
| Recommendation | The SSAC should work with the ICANN Board to update the ICANN Bylaws in order to allow for there to be term limits on the SSAC Chair. |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | SSAC is the only SO or AC that is not allowed to term-limit its  chair. All other SOs and ACs are allowed to decide both term  lengths and term limits for their leadership positions, and have chosen to impose both term lengths and term limits. (Except the GNSO, where the ICANN Bylaws themselves dictate term lengths and term limits for GNSO Counsellors and the GNSO Chair.) The ICANN Board, PTI, etc. also have terms limits.  The amendment has been submitted for consideration in the  next convenient round of Bylaws updates. |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAIIP:  ICANN Board  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP:  None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) | According to FAIIP:  None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAIIP:  None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAIIP:  The amendment has been submitted for consideration in the next convenient round of Bylaws updates.  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low) | According to FAIIP:  Improved governance and accountability  Low  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAIIP:  Immediately  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAIIP:  ICANN Board must update Bylaws; SSAC Board Liaison to work with Board on necessary arrangements. The amendment has been submitted for consideration in the next convenient round of Bylaws updates.  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps  (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 29** | |
| Recommendation | The SSAC should maintain its current processes and activities around disclosing potential conflicts of interest, both at the individual level and as a group of individuals. It should also  update its online disclosure of interest statements to clearly articulate when the disclosure was last submitted for each member. |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | None |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAIIP:  SSAC  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP:  None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) | According to FAIIP:  None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAIIP:  None  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAIIP:  Medium  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low) | According to FAIIP:  Improved accountability and transparency  Easy  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAIIP:  Immediately  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAIIP:  SSAC will update its Operational Procedures to make sure that  online disclosure of interest statements clearly state when the  disclosure was last submitted for each member.  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps  (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation 30** | |
| Recommendation | The SSAC should continue to nurture and build upon the SSAC’s culture that values self-improvement, including between formal reviews. |
| RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable) | N/A |
| Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other? | According to FAIIP:  SSAC  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation | According to FAIIP:  The SSAC annual workshop, and travel support for 15 SSAC  members to the thrice-yearly ICANN meetings, are essential to this goal.  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable) | According to FAIIP:  N/A  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Expected budget implications once implemented | According to FAIIP:  The SSAC annual workshop, and travel support for 15 SSAC  members to the thrice-yearly ICANN meetings, are essential to this goal.  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard) | According to FAIIP: n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low) | According to FAIIP: n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start? | According to FAIIP: n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?  Short: 0-10 months  Medium: ≤ 20 months  Long: ≤ 30 months |  |
| High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board | According to FAIIP: n/a  Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan: |
| Proposed detailed implementation steps  (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP) |  |
| Detailed implementation costing |  |