

# RSSAC Review Work Party Feedback on the Draft Recommendations

20 April 2018

## General Comments

The RWP welcomes the opportunity to provide a response on the draft recommendations of the independent examiner as part of the ongoing organizational review of the RSSAC.

These draft recommendations, like the assessment report preceding them, diverge from the scope of an organizational review. As stated in [RSSAC032](#), the RSSAC understood that the independent examiner would consider “the *organization* – its chairs, its procedures, its guiding documents including charter and bylaws, its meetings, and the publications it has produced.” The RSSAC also identifies the conflation of RSSAC matters and issues relevant to root-ops/root server operators (RSOs). This tendency continues in the draft recommendations.

Furthermore, the draft recommendations are framed too negatively. Based on our interactions with the independent examiner and public presentations by the independent examiner, we understand that interviews and survey results also captured positive feedback for areas of improvement since the first RSSAC organizational review or areas where the status quo is acceptable. The draft recommendations could benefit from this context.

The RSSAC looks forward to the publication of the draft final report. This will inform its continuous evolution and development as an advisory committee to the ICANN Board and community.

## Recommendation 1

RSSAC membership mechanisms currently allow the RSSAC to recruit a variety of skills, perspectives, and interests that include but are not limited to those available from the root server operator organizations into the RSSAC Caucus. Indeed, effective advice can only be drafted by those who know the reality of the work. The RSSAC Caucus is composed of a very diverse pool of participants. The recommendation could be modified to state that the RSSAC Caucus should be engaged more effectively.

**First bullet** - The independent examiners should provide more evidence that RSSAC is perceived as an association and what "encourages" it. The RWP recommends that “perception that the RSSAC is an ‘association’ of RSOs” be changed to “distinction between RSSAC and a group of RSOs.”

**Second bullet** - The RSSAC Caucus brings a wealth of skills to the RSSAC.

**Fifth bullet** - The independent examiners should provide more evidence of how they concluded that RSOs are compelled to participate.

**Last paragraph** - The RSSAC is composed of representatives from the RSOs, liaisons from the root zone management partners, and now DNS and root server system experts via the RSSAC Caucus.

**1a** - The RSSAC regularly seeks input from the RSSAC Caucus about potential work items. This guides the decision-making and prioritization of the RSSAC.

**1b** - For RSSAC advice to be effective, all root server operators must have a final say in endorsing the advice.

### **Recommendation 2**

The independent examiners should provide more evidence of the “expectations of the ICANN Board and community for interaction with the root server system.” The RWP would like the independent examiner to clarify the use of the word “target.” The independent examiners should also provide more evidence of the "expectations of the ICANN Board and community for interaction with the root server system" and identify what kind of interaction is expected.

**2a** - This recommendation is out of scope for this organizational review.

### **Recommendation 3**

The recommendation should end after “periodically reviewed and published”. As a volunteer group, the RSSAC adjusts its work to reflect the availability of its members and allocation of supporting resources from the ICANN organization.

**3a** - The RWP welcomes this recommendation and looks forward to discussing next steps with the RSSAC.

**3b** - This recommendation is out of scope for this organizational review.

**3c** - This recommendation (specifically RSO compliance with RSSAC advice) is out of scope for this organizational review.

### **Recommendation 4**

The RWP welcomes this recommendation and looks forward to discussing next steps with the RSSAC.

### **Recommendation 5**

The RWP welcomes this recommendation and looks forward to discussing next steps with the RSSAC.

**Recommendation 6**

Comparing the charters of RSSAC, RZERC, and SSAC is out of scope for this organizational review.