RSSAC review WG final report: implementation steps

December 2010, v2

1. Chronology

✓ June 2010: final report delivered and published.
✓ 5 August 2010: Board acknowledged receipt of the report, requesting action suggestions from SIC for October meeting

2. This document

This document presents a synoptic table for the WG report, summarizing conclusions/recommendations, actions required, involved actors, timeline and comments. This is a high-level analysis of what needs to be done, detailed action plans shall be developed by staff once so requested. The envisaged timeline is expressed in a proxy form as short (<=6 months), medium (>6 months & <=12 months) or long time-to-completion (>12 months).

The mapping to the original reviewers' recommendations is given in the WG's report.

3. Recommendations, actions needed

Similarly to what has been done for recent reviews, the process can be as follows:
- SIC discusses about the endorsement of each recommendation and agrees on proposed actions, to be reflected in this document
- SIC presents proposed actions (this document edited) for Board approval at the October Board meeting
- Board requests staff to develop a detailed implementation plan, for approval
- Staff presents implementation plan for SIC and Board approval
- Once approved, implementation plan is executed and staff reports progress to SIC (each 3-4 months)

WG Conclusions	Action needed	Actors involved	Timeline	Comments
The WG concluded points 1-3 by: **Recommending the Board of ICANN not to implement any structural changes to RSSAC, in the absence of Root Operators' consent.** **Asking the Board of ICANN via the Structural Improvements Committee to invite Root**	1-3. Establish a suitable dialogue format (e.g. in conjunction with RSSAC meetings). Initiate a dialogue between ICANN and the Root Server Operators to consider the structural changes suggested. Pursue the dialogue to reach	1-3. SIC - Board - Staff - Root Server Operators	1-3. Long	1-3. To be considered together with Recommendation 4

WG Conclusions	Action needed	Actors involved	Timeline	Comments
Operators to consider the structural changes suggested by external reviewers and to formulate to the Board of ICANN, a coherent set of proposals for addressing the recommendations of reviewers, in order to initiate a dialogue with ICANN on the implementation of measures that could be accepted by both parties. This coherent set of proposal needs to be endorsed by all Root Operators.	agreement on a coherent set of proposals to implement, endorsed by all Root Server Operators. Formulate this set for approval by the Board, as appropriate. Implement the approved set of proposals.			2. Requires Bylaws changes
4. RSSAC to appoint its Chair from among the members for two years and with a limit of three consecutive two-year terms. **WG Conclusion: ICANN Bylaws stipulate that the initial Chair of the RSSAC is to be elected by the ICANN Board, and that subsequent Chairs shall be elected by the RSSAC, based on procedures to be adopted by RSSAC members. In reality the second part of this Bylaws provision was never implemented, and the same initial Board-nominated RSSAC Chair is still in function since 1999. This reviewers' recommendation puts into practice the provision of ICANN Bylaws, and as such is endorsed by the WG. Suggested length of tenure and maximum number of terms for the future RSSAC Chair are based on standard practices, and RSSAC is invited to consider them when setting its own operating procedures.**	4. Invite RSSAC to consider the recommendation, to be part of the approach for 1-3 above	4. SIC - Board - Staff -Root Server Operators	4. Long	4. To be considered together with 1-3

5. On inward and outward Liaisons:
    a) To keep the current Liaison from the RSSAC to the Board;
    b) To establish both an inward and an
	5.
	a) No action required
	
	b) Appointment of RSSAC liaison
		5.
		a) -
		
		b) RSSAC, SSAC
			5.
			a) -
			
			b) short
				5.

WG Conclusions	Action needed	Actors involved	Timeline	Comments
outward Liaison to/from SSAC;	to SSAC, filling the current vacancy			
c) To establish an inward Liaison from IETF/IAB so as to obtain additional technical input;	c) Dialogue between RSSAC and IETF/IAB, appointment if agreed	c) RSSAC, IETF/IAB, (staff)	c) medium-long	
d) To dismiss the current outward Liaison to the NomCom because of the new suggested structure of RSSAC.	d) Any action to be taken will depend on the outcome of 1-4 above. To be included in that approach.	d) Board, RSSAC, staff	d) long	d) Requires Bylaws changes
WG's Conclusion: The WG agrees with the rationale behind reviewers' proposals aimed at strengthening the relations between RSSAC, SSAC and IETF via the introduction of inward and outward Liaisons, and remarks that: **•　An inward Liaison from SSAC to RSSAC is regularly appointed, and this process shall be maintained;** **•　An outward RSSAC Liaison to SSAC used to be appointed, but the position is currently vacant; the WG recommends to fill this vacancy, in coordination with SSAC;** **•　It is indubitably worth discussing/analyzing the recommendation in favor of the establishment of an inward Liaison from IETF/IAB, in dialogue with the IETF/IAB. The WG agrees furthermore with the recommendation to keep the current RSSAC Liaison to the Board. It does not address the recommendation to dismiss the present Liaison to the NomCom, as reviewers presented it as a consequence of their envisaged restructuring of RSSAC, which is not discussed in the present report. This recommendation should be analyzed when discussing the overall structure and function of the RSSAC.**				

WG Conclusions	Action needed	Actors involved	Timeline	Comments
6. RSSAC meetings: a) RSSAC to meet at each ICANN meeting with provision for it to hold additional meetings in between; b) Sessions to be public unless a majority of the members believe it appropriate to have a closed session for part of a meeting; c) All Root Server Operators and members of the Board to be invited and to have speaking rights at the discretion of the Chair; d) Other attendees may be granted speaking rights at the discretion of the Chair; If RSSAC went into closed session under exceptional circumstances and at the discretion of the Chair, the Root Server Operators, ICANN Board, appointed Liaisons and technical staff would be invited to join. **WG's Conclusion: The WG agrees with reviewers that the conducting of RSSAC meetings at IETF meetings and the low participation of RSSAC members in ICANN meetings is one of the reasons why several ICANN community members have poor knowledge of RSSAC operations. However, it is aware that there are operational reasons which suggest the running of RSSAC meetings in parallel with IETF meetings. On balance of these remarks, and in view of ensuring a higher level of visibility of RSSAC work to the ICANN communities, it recommends that RSSAC should consider organizing at least one of its yearly meetings in parallel with an ICANN meeting. The WG agrees with all the residual measures**	6 a-d. Dialogue between RSSAC and SIC/Board/staff. To be included in approach for 1-3	6 a-d. SIC, Board, RSSAC, staff	6 a-d. Medium-long	6 a-d. May require change of RSSAC rules of operation

WG Conclusions	Action needed	Actors involved	Timeline	Comments
suggested in this recommendation, aimed at achieving a greater transparency of the work of RSSAC.				
7. ICANN to nominate two members of staff to support the RSSAC: • One technical fellow to perform research and drafting of reports; this support, initially, would be part-time, with perspective of growing demand. Role to be separated from L-root operations; • One administrative, part-time support for tasks such as meeting support, logistics, website maintenance, support to Chair between meetings etc. **WG's Conclusion: The WG considers that this recommendation is well-motivated, and recommends that –should RSSAC request in this sense, ICANN would deliver the required two part-time resources so as to support RSSAC works. The role of this supporting staff should be separated from the managing of the 'L' Root and the IANA function.** **From a broader perspective, the WG considers that the very coordination of the relation between ICANN and the Root Server Operators deserves further analysis.** **In general, one remarks that Root Server Operators are committed to serving the data provided to them by IANA, but otherwise they consider themselves to be independent from, and only partially related to ICANN.** **ICANN currently has two structural relationships with RSSAC: one via IANA, and another one via the 'L' Root Server operation. Due to their**	7 a-b. Specify RSSAC needs, develop job descriptions, selection/recruitment of suitable staff members, work planning, induction with RSSAC	7 a-b. RSSAC, senior staff	7 a-b. Short - Medium	7 a-b. Preferably synchronized with the discussions for 1-3, to specify RSSAC needs. NOTE: One staff person needs to be identified very early, for developing the implementation plan.

WG Conclusions	Action needed	Actors involved	Timeline	Comments
specific focus and fields of activity, none of these operational relations however represents ICANN as a whole, to the Root Server Operators. **The RSSAC review WG recommends that ICANN identify a member of the senior management team with the duty to represent the whole Organization in communications with RSSAC, particularly with regard to the operational implementation of ICANN policies in the areas of new TLDs (new gTLDs, ccTLDS, and IDN TLDs), and the continued roll-out of DNSSEC and IPv6. This senior contact would then coordinate ICANN interaction with RSSAC, either by direct involvement or through others, including but not necessarily limited to the 'L' Root Operator and the IANA staff.**				
8. Fund travel and accommodation for RSSAC members to and from ICANN meetings and other relevant technical meetings. **WG's Conclusion: The WG recommends that ICANN funds travel and accommodation for RSSAC members to participate in ICANN meetings, whenever a RSSAC meeting is organized during an ICANN meeting.**	8. Planning and agreeing extent with RSSAC, budgeting, communication to RSSAC	8. Finance staff, RSSAC staff, travel support staff	8. Medium - long	8. Not foreseen in FY 2011 budget