ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SSAC Review Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan

13 May 2019

Status of This Document

This is the SSAC approved feasibility assement and initial implementation plan for the second organizational review of the SSAC.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

On 17 December 2018, the independent examiner for the 2nd SSAC organizational review, Analysis Group, published its final report.

The final report includes an assessment of the SSAC and 30 recommendations for improving its operations. The independent examiner presented its findings and resulting recommendations for improvement in four categories:

- Continuing purpose and effectiveness of the SSAC
- SSAC and SO/AC/community relationships and interconnectedness
- SSAC membership and structure
- SSAC1 Review implementation state

Based on its detailed review of the final report, the SSAC Review Work Party (RWP) has prepared this Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan (FAIIP). This plan includes an analysis of recommendations made in the final report for usability and prioritization, provisional budget implications, anticipated resources and proposed implementation timeline. The RWP has noted any objections or proposed modifications to recommendations where applicable, along with supporting rationale.

Once finalized, the RWP will present this document to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the ICANN Board (OEC) to inform its recommendation to the Board of next steps.

2. Overview of Recommendations

The Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) advises the ICANN community and the ICANN Board of Directors (ICANN Board) on issues concerning the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems. The ICANN Bylaws stipulate that the SSAC be independently reviewed at least once every five years. In accordance with this requirement, the independent examiner's review included an assessment of:

- Whether the SSAC has a continuing purpose within the ICANN structure.

- How effectively the SSAC fulfills its purpose and whether any change in structure or operations is needed to improve effectiveness.

- The extent to which the SSAC as a whole is accountable to the wider ICANN community, its organizations, committees, constituencies, and stakeholder groups.

- The implementation state of the SSAC's prior review.

The independent examiner's report provided 30 recommendations and associated findings based on interviews with, and a survey of, ICANN community members, the independent examiner's observations of the SSAC, and the independent examiner's experience with ICANN and extensive work with other nonprofit and volunteer-based organizations to improve their effectiveness. In addition, an Assessment Report was published on 20 June 2018, and feedback reflected upon in the preparation of the report was solicited from the ICANN community via a public session at ICANN62, a public webinar, and a public comment period.

A draft final report was released on 15 October 2018 and was open for public comment through 3 December 2018. The draft final report was presented for discussion in person at ICANN63 and via webinar on 20 November 2018. The conversations and comments from this public comment period were helpful to the independent examiner, who conducted its assessment of the SSAC from February through July of 2018. That assessment found the SSAC to be a productive and effective organization, with room to improve in certain areas. The report provided 22 findings (reported as 23 findings for convenience of discussion) across a broad set of topic areas, including:

- The effectiveness of the SSAC, such as the amount of work asked of and accomplished by the SSAC, the mechanisms in place to understand the implementation of SSAC's advice by the ICANN Board, and the timing with which the SSAC's advice is provided and acted upon.

- The relationship and interconnectedness between the SSAC and both other SO/ACs and the broader ICANN Community, including on issues of transparency.

- The existing membership and structure of the SSAC, including its size, membership recruitment, and term limits.

- The implementation state of the SSAC's prior review, the results of which were released in 2009.

3. Feasibility Assessment & Initial Implementation Plan

Recommendation #1: The SSAC has a clear continuing purpose within ICANN. Its existence as an Advisory Committee should continue.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

	Y/ N	RWP RESPONSE
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N/A	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments	N/A	
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		
Expected budget implications		
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies		
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)		
Expected level of implementation effort		
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?		
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	N/A	

Recommendation #2: 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 Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N/A	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		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.
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	None	
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	SSAC	
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	None	
Expected budget implications	None	
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	Easy	
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)		
Expected level of implementation effort	Low	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	Already done	

High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	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".

Recommendation #3: 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 Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N/A	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		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.
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		None
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		SSAC
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		None
Expected budget implications		None
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies		Easy
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)		Improved communications

Expected level of implementation effort	Easy
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	Shortly thereafter
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	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.

Recommendation #4:   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 Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N/A	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		This is already being done - it may require explicit mention in the SSAC Operational Procedures.
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		Will require assistance from ICANN staff
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		ICANN Board, ICANN Staff, SSAC Board Liaison
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		To be determined by ICANN Board and Staff. This will require some time from Board staff support.
Expected budget implications		To be determined by ICANN Board and Staff
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies		
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)		Improved governance
Expected level of implementation effort		TBD in discussion with ICANN Board and Staff
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?		TBD in discussion with ICANN Board and Staff

High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	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). 3. 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.

Recommendation #5: 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.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	Y	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		Add this sentence to the recommendation: "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."
Review Working Party comments		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.
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	None
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	SSAC, ICANN Board, ICANN Board support staff
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	None
Expected budget implications	None
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	High; easy
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)	Improved effectiveness of SSAC and ICANN Board. Improved governance, transparency, and Improved communications.
Expected level of implementation effort	Easy
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	Shortly thereafter
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	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.

Recommendation #6: 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 Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N/A	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		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.
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		None
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		SSAC
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		None (although takes up a lot of SSAC member/volunteer time.)
Expected budget implications		None. Requires continued help of SSAC support staff.
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies		Medium

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)	Community participation
Expected level of implementation effort	Medium
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	Shortly thereafter
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	SSAC Admin Committee to monitor and manage as part of ongoing operations.

Recommendation #7: The SSAC should develop a process to, when possible, provide a "quick look" at a particular issue for the Board. Such "quick looks" might not be the result of a consensus-driven process, but rather would disclose differing opinions.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?		
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.	SSAC has always done its best to meet the requests of the Board in a timely manner when given a deadline. It is challenging at best to impose short deadlines on volunteers. SSAC is reticent about the concept of "quick looks" because: 1. SSAC's value to the community derives in part from the high quality of the SSAC's advice. This is achieved by research and professional consideration of the issues. "Quick looks" do not allow the expected level of diligence. 2. "Quick looks" may provide poor communication and mixed messages. The community generally understands that SSAC documents are the result of SSAC consensus. The SSAC is unsure whether the "quick look" idea is from one or a few individual Board members who were interviewed by the IE, or is an expression of more widespread interest on the Board. The need and interest level behind the recommendation are undocumented.	
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments	If the Board is seeking briefings on technical subjects, for example as a way of educating Board members, then SSAC suggests that the Board consider making use of ICANN's Office of the CTO team in situations where tight timelines are an essential constraint. In addition, if OCTO is in need of subject matter experts, SSAC has a close relationship with OCTO and	

	we would expect it to be more likely to be able to support OCTO.
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	N/A
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	N/A
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	N/A
Expected budget implications	N/A
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	N/A
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)	N/A
Expected level of implementation effort	N/A
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	N/A
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	N/A

Recommendation #8: 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 Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N/A	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		SSAC does this as part of its annual workshop, where the membership convenes to do its annual planning.
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		SSAC annual workshop
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		SSAC
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		Continuance of SSAC annual workshop
Expected budget implications		Continuance of SSAC annual workshop
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies		Easy to implement
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)		Improved service to community
Expected level of implementation effort		Already assumed
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?		Already underway

High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	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.

Recommendation #9: 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 Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N/A	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	None	
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	SSAC	
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	None	
Expected budget implications	None	
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	Medium	
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)		
Expected level of implementation effort	Medium	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	2020 membership review process	

High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	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.

Recommendation #10: 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 Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N/A	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		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.
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		None
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		SSAC
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		None
Expected budget implications		None
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies		Easy to implement
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)		Improved communications
Expected level of implementation effort		Easy

How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	Already underway
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	SSAC Admin Committee will look to ways to sharpen our message regarding project selection.

Recommendation #11: 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 Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N/A	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		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.
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		None
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		SSAC
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		N/A
Expected budget implications		See above.
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies		Medium
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)		Efficient process
Expected level of implementation effort		Easy

How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	As needed
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	SSAC Admin Committee is responsible for tracking and coordinating requests of this nature.

Recommendation #12: The SSAC should consider whether an internship can be offered to graduate students in cybersecurity or data analytics programs 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 Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?		
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.	"Internship" is probably not the right model, because: 1. We have been advised that under California law ICANN is probably not allowed to use unpaid internships. 2. Internships are not practical in that SSAC members do not have the time to interview, train, or manage interns, and that burden would fall on our support staff, who already have full plates. More seasoned help would avoid those problems.	
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.	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.	
Review Working Party comments	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.	
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	None	
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	SSAC and ICANN Staff	

Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	Research Fellow funding from ICANN Org.
Expected budget implications	Research Fellow funding from ICANN Org.
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	High
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)	Efficiency delivery, relieve some burden being imposed on SSAC volunteers
Expected level of implementation effort	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	Immediately
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	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.

Recommendation #13: The SSAC should work with ICANN Staff to obtain a dedicated, secure, data storage location for use in SSAC analyses.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	N	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?		
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.	The SSAC sees no need for a dedicated facility; our usual projects do not require it. Specific projects may require storage, but these are few and far between, and the storage needs may be determined by the nature of the project. For example, the NCAP work party may need to examine data sets but will determine that during the course of its work and will make any arrangements it needs with OCTO once the needs have been defined.	
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.	N/A	
Review Working Party comments	See above	
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	None	
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	N/A	
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	N/A	
Expected budget implications	See above -- specific future projects may require resourcing.	
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	N/A	
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)	N/A	
Expected level of implementation effort	N/A	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	N/A	
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	N/A	

Recommendation #14: The SSAC advises the ICANN Board and Community on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems. To do this effectively, the SSAC needs to be aware of policymaking that is ongoing within ICANN. We recommend the SSAC designate an outward representative to each SO/AC that is willing to have one. These roles should be structured to add minimal burden to the SSAC's already large set of responsibilities.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

	RWP RESPONSE	
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	Y	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.	The SSAC agrees that it needs to be aware of policy-making that is ongoing within ICANN. It disagrees that additional outward liaisons are the best or only way to accomplish this, for the following reasons: 1. SSAC's volunteer membership has been stretched to the limit by the increasing scope and complexity of the work being carried out in the ICANN community, plus the projects that the Board has requested our involvement in, and projects that SSAC wishes to work on of its own choosing. Additional formal liaison positions will add unsupportable burden to the SSAC's already large workload, no matter how it is managed. 2. It is difficult for SSAC members to "speak for the SSAC" or "represent the SSAC" to other bodies, especially during an ongoing working group, where new topics come up regularly and discussions are a moving target. SSAC does sometimes take positions or make recommendations, but it does so after discussing those as a group, to ensure the correctness of the statement and to give those statements weight.	
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.	The SSAC should consider and adopt appropriate mechanisms to ensure that it is aware of policy-making efforts going on within ICANN.	
Review Working Party comments	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.
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	SSAC, other bodies with ICANN
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	
Expected budget implications	None
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	Medium
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)	Improved community process
Expected level of implementation effort	Medium
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	Immediately
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	

Recommendation #15: 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 Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N/A	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		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
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		
Expected budget implications		
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies		
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)		
Expected level of implementation effort		

How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	

Recommendation #16: 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 Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N/A	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments	SSAC already does this, per SSAC Operational Procedures sections 3.2.3 and 3.2.4.	
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	None	
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	SSAC	
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	N/A	
Expected budget implications	N/A	
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	Medium	
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)	Improved process	
Expected level of implementation effort	Medium	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?		

High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	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."

Recommendation #17: The SSAC's Administrative Committee should provide an email update to the leadership of ICANN's SOs/ACs one month prior to each ICANN meeting with links to relevant SSAC documents/proceedings from the SSAC's website.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]

*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

	RWP RESPONSE	
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	N	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?		
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.	SSAC prepares an update for every ICANN Meeting and delivers this at the meeting. Anything produced a month in advance will be out of date by the meeting. These include notes about projects underway and their potential delivery dates. The publication of SSAC work products are announced via ICANN communications, such as the weekly and monthly e-newsletters. In the end, we are concerned about this being extra, duplicative work for a very limited audience.	
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.	N/A	
Review Working Party comments		
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	N/A	
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	N/A	
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	N/A	
Expected budget implications	None	
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	N/A	
Potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient	None	

process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	
Expected level of implementation effort	N/A
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	N/A
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	N/A

Recommendation #18: 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 Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N/A	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		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 in identifying SSAC members at ICANN meetings.
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		SSAC Admin Committee and support staff
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		

Expected budget implications	N/A
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	Medium
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)	More relevant and findable SSAC publications for Board and Community.
Expected level of implementation effort	Low/ Easy
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	N/A
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	SSAC Admin Committee to lead efforts to improve the content of the SSAC Web site.

Recommendation #19: The SSAC should remain accountable directly to the ICANN Board and through it to the wider ICANN community.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N/A	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments	None	
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	N/A	
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	ICANN Board, SSAC	
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	N/A	
Expected budget implications	N/A	
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	N/A	
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)	No new implementation needed	
Expected level of implementation effort	None	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	N/A	
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	N/A	

Recommendation #20: 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 Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]

*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE	
	Y/ N		
Does RWP support the issue?	Y		
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y		
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N		
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N/A		
Additional Details & Comments			
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.			
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.			
Review Working Party comments	None		
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	None		
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	SSAC		
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	None		
Expected budget implications	None		
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	High priority, for productivity		
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)	Greater membership engagement		
Expected level of implementation effort	Medium; requires work by Membership Committee		
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	Immediately		
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	Continue to follow membership participation and evaluation procedures, per SSAC Operational Procedures.		

Recommendation #21: Each year, the SSAC should develop a formalized recruiting plan with goals, potential recruiting targets, meetings to attend, messaging for prospective candidates, and any other items that are deemed useful. Similarly, it should maintain a list of potential future members, even if those individuals are not currently applying to the SSAC.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	N	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	Y	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.	As a voluntary technical advisory committee, the SSAC is primarily interested in skills and expertise and is uncomfortable with the concept of a formal recruiting program. Interest in the SSAC is fostered through SSAC members engaging in a number of forums and through the SSAC itself engaging actively as a Committee within the ICANN community. It would be more useful for SSAC to perform a regular assessment of its skills inventory—a "gap analysis"—and to publicize the outcome of that assessment drive rather than any deliberate and direct search for new members.	
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.	Each year, the SSAC should develop a formalized process to estimate the 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 technical expertise gaps into consideration when assessing new member applications.	
Review Working Party comments		
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	In conjunction with the annual assessment of new work conducted at the SSAC Annual Workshop, identify the 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 24 and 25.	
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	SSAC, at its Annual Workshop. SSAC Membership Committee in considering new member applications	

Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	None
Expected budget implications	None
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	High priority, for productivity
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)	Medium. Greater membership engagement, more efficient membership application process, SSAC technical expertise closely aligned to the work anticipated to be undertaken.
Expected level of implementation effort	Medium; requires work by all SSAC members
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	Immediately
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	As part of the annual assessment of new work conducted at the SSAC Annual Workshop, identify the technical expertise required to undertake anticipated future work. Identify skills gaps that may need to be filled to do so. Publicize skills gap son the SSAC website and at any meetings where SSAC members are in attendance. Take technical expertise gaps into consideration when assessing new member applications. Make process for applying for SSAC membership clearer on Web site.

Recommendation #22: The SSAC should work with the ICANN Board to secure funding to present its work at and/or attend two or three major security conferences outside of ICANN meetings annually, where members may meet new interested applicants.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	N	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?		
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		SSAC has limited funding to send a very small number of members to relevant conferences for exposure of SSAC Work Products, but not with a specific goal to identify new applicants. SSAC has work products and undertakes a relatively small levels of outreach for the work products, mainly in conjunction with activities in which members are already participating. The availability of volunteer members to undertake additional SSAC outreach is limited. SSAC members go major conferences already, and would unlikely have time or interest to attend more conferences.
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		This is dependent on the overall financial environment within which ICANN operates.
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		
Expected budget implications		
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies		
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)	
Expected level of implementation effort	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	

Recommendation #23: The SSAC Membership Committee should generate a list of academic or other institutions with research efforts in fields related to SSR. The Membership Committee should keep this list up to date, and consider if academics may bring useful perspectives as either Invited Guests or full SSAC members.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

	RWP RESPONSE	
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	N	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?		
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.	The SSAC is not convinced that the effort to generate and maintain such a list would generate a commensurate level of benefit to SSAC. The SSAC would be happy to avail itself of such a resource, particularly in terms of member recruitment, were it to be available to SSAC, but is of the view that it is not reasonable to add to the existing volunteer workload of SSAC members the task of generating and maintaining this resource.	
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		
Expected budget implications		
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies		
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)		

Expected level of implementation effort	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	

Recommendation #24: The SSAC should continue efforts to recruit individuals with a strong technical background but who also have legal/policy expertise. Discussion of the need for individuals with legal, policy, and law enforcement expertise should be codified in each year's recruiting plan.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	Y	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.	As a voluntary technical advisory committee, the SSAC is primarily interested in skills and expertise and is uncomfortable with the concept of a formal recruiting program. Interest in the SSAC is fostered through SSAC members engaging in a number of forums and through the SSAC itself engaging actively as a Committee within the ICANN community. It would be more useful for SSAC to perform a regular assessment of its skills inventory—a "gap analysis"—and to publicize the outcome of that assessment rather than drive any deliberate and direct search for new members.	
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.	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.	
Review Working Party comments		
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	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.	
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	SSAC at its Annual Workshop SSAC Membership Committee in considering new member applications	
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	None	

Expected budget implications	None
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	High priority, for productivity
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)	Medium. Greater membership engagement, more efficient membership application process, SSAC non-technical expertise closely aligned to the work anticipated to be undertaken.
Expected level of implementation effort	Medium; requires work by all SSAC members
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	Immediately
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	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.

Recommendation #25: The SSAC should endeavor to recruit individuals with a strong technical background who also represent a broad set of geographical locations and reasonably balanced set of genders. Discussion of how to do so should be codified in each year's recruiting plan.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	Y	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		As a voluntary technical advisory committee, the SSAC is primarily interested in skills and expertise but is also supportive of increasing the diversity of its members in such a way that the quality of SSAC advice will be improved. The SSAC is uncomfortable with the concept of a formal recruiting program but rather fosters interest through SSAC members engaging in a number of forums, through the SSAC itself engaging actively as a Committee within the ICANN community and through targeted outreach by members and ICANN staff. It would be more useful for SSAC to perform a regular assessment of its current diversity, including but not limited to geography and gender, identify any diversity gaps, and publicize the outcome of that assessment rather than drive any deliberate and direct search for new members.
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		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.
Review Working Party comments		
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		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.

Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	SSAC at its Annual Workshop SSAC Membership Committee in considering new member applications
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	None
Expected budget implications	None
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	High, for productivity
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)	Medium. Greater membership engagement, more efficient membership application process, increased SSAC diversity contributing to higher quality of SSAC advice.
Expected level of implementation effort	Medium; requires work by all SSAC members
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	Immediately
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	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.

Recommendation #26: The SSAC's membership review process should include a yearly review process for the SSAC's external Liaisons.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	Y	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.	Liaisons are ordinarily nominated for a term and thus the performance of the liaison role is reviewed regularly, according to the term which may not be annual. We note that in the textual explanation there was a concern about being able to provide confidential feedback regarding liaisons that is not captured in the recommendation. We do agree with this issue. Also, we note that a more important issue for SSAC is the effectiveness of the liaison relationship itself rather than the performance of an individual in the role. Finally, the engagement of SSAC members is reviewed by the membership committee in the final year of their respective term of membership. The performance of an individual as a liaison is considered during this review.	
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.	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.	
Review Working Party comments	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.	

Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	None
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	SSAC
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	None
Expected budget implications	None
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	Medium
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)	Improved management, accountability
Expected level of implementation effort	Low
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	Immediately
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	Additional text will be drafted and proposed for the SSAC Operational Procedures during the next revision cycle.

Recommendation #27: The SSAC's leadership should be limited to two, three-year terms. The SSAC should impose no term limits on non-leadership members.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N/A	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		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.
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		See #28
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		See #28
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		None
Expected budget implications		None
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies		Medium
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)		Improved governance and accountability
Expected level of implementation effort		Low
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?		Immediately

High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	See #28 for implementation.

Recommendation #28: 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 Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N/A	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments	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.	
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	None	
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	ICANN Board	
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	None	
Expected budget implications	None	
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	The amendment has been submitted for consideration in the next convenient round of Bylaws updates.	
Potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient	Improved governance and accountability	

process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	
Expected level of implementation effort	Low
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	Immediately
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	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.

Recommendation #29: 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 Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]

*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N/A	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments	None	
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	None	
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	SSAC	
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	None	
Expected budget implications	None	
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	Medium	
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)	Improved accountability and transparency	
Expected level of implementation effort	Easy	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	Immediately	

High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	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.

Recommendation #30:   The SSAC should continue to nurture and build upon the SSAC's culture that values self-improvement, including between formal reviews.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]
*Level of Consensus, as defined by the GNSO Working Group Guidelines

	RWP RESPONSE	
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N/A	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		The SSAC annual workshop, and travel support for 15 SSAC members to the thrice-yearly ICANN meetings, are essential to this goal.
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		SSAC
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		
Expected budget implications		The SSAC annual workshop, and travel support for 15 SSAC members to the thrice-yearly ICANN meetings, are essential to this goal.
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies		
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)		
Expected level of implementation effort		
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?		
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps		

ANNEX 1: Background

Timeline
22 February 2018 – start of review
20 June 2018 – IE assessment report published for public consultation
15 October 2018 – IE draft final report published for public comment
17 December 2018 – IE delivery of final report

Review Scope
Acting on ICANN Bylaws' stipulated requirements, an independent review of the SSAC is mandated to occur at least once every five years. In accordance with this requirement, the independent examiner's review included an assessment of:

- Whether the SSAC has a continuing purpose within the ICANN structure.

- How effectively the SSAC fulfills its purpose and whether any change in structure or operations is needed to improve effectiveness.

- The extent to which the SSAC as a whole is accountable to the wider ICANN community, its organizations, committees, constituencies, and stakeholder groups.

- The implementation state of the SSAC's prior review.

Role of the RWP
The SSAC Review Work Party (RWP), acting as a steering committee, serves as the primary group working on the SSAC review. The roles and responsibilities of the RWP include:

- Sharing input into review scope and IE selection criteria
- Providing community outreach support
- Sharing input into data collection – online survey and interviews
- Providing clarification and factual corrections throughout the review

Once the independent examiner's final report is submitted, the RWP is responsible for:

- Establishing the RWP's level of agreement with the final report
- Assessing feasibility of recommendations
- Providing proposed alternatives if there is a disagreement with the feasibility of the independent examiner's recommendations
- Providing detailed rationale for each rejected assessment or recommendations
- Based on the above work, compiling a Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan (FAIIP)
- Presenting the FAIIP to the OEC