

ICANN BOARD PAPER NO. 2020.03.12.1b

TITLE: Appointment of Independent Auditors for FY20

PROPOSED ACTION: For Board Consideration and Approval

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Section 22.2 of the ICANN Bylaws (<http://www.icann.org/general/bylaws.htm>) requires that after the end of the fiscal year, the books of ICANN must be audited by certified public accountants, which shall be appointed by the Board.

As the Audit Committee has recommended that the Board approve BDO LLP and BDO member firms as independent auditors for the fiscal year ended 30 June 2020 for any annual ICANN independent audit requirements, the Board is now being asked to approve the Audit Committee's recommendation.

AUDIT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

The Audit committee has recommended that the Board authorize the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to take all steps necessary to engage BDO LLP and BDO member firms as ICANN's annual independent auditor for the fiscal year ended 30 June 2020 for any annual independent audit requirements in any jurisdiction.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION:

Section 22.2 of the ICANN Bylaws (<http://www.icann.org/general/bylaws.htm>) requires that after the end of the fiscal year, the books of ICANN must be audited by certified public accountants, which shall be appointed by the Board.

Whereas, the Board Audit Committee has discussed the engagement of the independent auditor for the fiscal year ending 30 June 2020 and has recommended that the Board authorize the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to take all steps necessary to engage BDO LLP and BDO member firms.

Resolved (2020.03.12.XX), the Board authorizes the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to take all steps necessary to engage BDO LLP and BDO member firms as the auditors for the financial statements for the fiscal year ending 30 June 2020.

RATIONALE FOR RESOLUTION:

The audit firm BDO LLP and BDO member firms have been ICANN's independent auditors since the audit of fiscal year 2014. In 2019, there was a partner rotation and a new partner was assigned to the ICANN engagement. Based on the report from the organization and the Audit Committee's evaluation of the work performed, the committee has recommended that the Board authorize the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to take all steps necessary to engage BDO LLP and BDO member firms as ICANN's annual independent auditor for fiscal year 2020 for any annual independent audit requirements in any jurisdiction.

This furthers ICANN's accountability to its Bylaws and processes, and the results of the independent auditors' work will be publicly available. Taking this decision is both consistent with ICANN's Mission and in the public interest as the engagement of an independent auditor is in fulfilment of ICANN's obligations to undertake an audit of ICANN's financial statements and helps serve ICANN's stakeholders in a more accountable manner.

This decision will have a fiscal impact on ICANN as is intended. This should not have any direct impact on the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system.

This is an Organizational Administrative Function not requiring public comment.

Submitted by:	Xavier Calvez
Position:	SVP & CFO
Date Noted:	05 March 2020
Email:	Xavier.calvez@icann.org

ICANN BOARD SUBMISSION No. 2020.03.12.1c

TITLE: **June 2022 ICANN Meeting Venue Contracting**

PROPOSED ACTION: **For Board Consideration and Approval**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Board is being asked to authorize the organization to take all steps necessary to complete contracting for the host venue in The Hague, Netherlands for the June 2022 ICANN Public Meeting, which requires Board approval as it will exceed US\$500,000. The Reference Materials for this paper summarizes the steps taken to locate a site for the June 2022 Public Meeting and outlines the facility costs.

As adopted in the November 2016 modifications to ICANN's Delegation of Authority Guidelines, it is the responsibility of the ICANN President and CEO, and Senior Management to identify and select sites for ICANN's Public Meetings within the budget and meetings strategy approved by the Board.

ICANN ORGANIZATION RECOMMENDATION:

ICANN organization recommends that the Board delegate to the President and CEO, or his designee(s), the authority to take all actions necessary to enter into a contract, and make expense disbursements pursuant to that contract, for the host venue in The Hague, Netherlands, where ICANN will hold the June 2022 Public Meeting.

BOARD FINANCE COMMITTEE (BFC) RECOMMENDATION

The BFC recommends that the Board delegate to the President and CEO, or his designee(s), the authority to take all actions necessary to enter into a contract, and make expense disbursements pursuant to that contract, for the host venue in The Hague, Netherlands, where ICANN will hold its June 2022 Public Meeting.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION:

Whereas, ICANN intends to hold its second Public Meeting of 2022 in the Europe region.

Whereas, ICANN organization has completed a thorough review of the available venues in the Europe region and finds the one in The Hague, Netherlands to be the most suitable.

Resolved (2020.03.12.xx), the Board authorizes the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to engage in and facilitate all necessary contracting and disbursements for the host venue for the June 2022 ICANN Public Meeting in The Hague, Netherlands, in an amount not to ^{Confidential Negotiation information}

Resolved (2020.03.12.xx), specific items within this resolution shall remain confidential for negotiation purposes pursuant to Article 3, section 3.5(b) of the ICANN Bylaws until the President and CEO determines that the confidential information may be released.

PROPOSED RATIONALE:

As part of ICANN's Public Meeting strategy, ICANN seeks to host a meeting in a different geographic region (as defined in the ICANN Bylaws) three times a year. ICANN74 is scheduled for 13-16 June 2022. Following a search and evaluation of available venues, the organization identified The Hague, Netherlands as a suitable location for the ICANN Public Meeting.

The organization performed a thorough analysis of the available locations and prepared a paper to identify those that met the Meeting Location Selection Criteria (see <http://meetings.icann.org/location-selection-criteria>). Based on the proposals and analysis, ICANN has identified The Hague, Netherlands as the location for ICANN74. Selection of this Europe location adheres to the geographic rotation guidelines established by the Meeting Strategy Working Group.

The Board reviewed the organization's briefing for hosting the meeting in The Hague, Netherlands and the determination that the proposal met the significant factors of the Meeting Location Selection Criteria, as well as the related costs for the facilities selected, for the June 2022 ICANN Public Meeting. ICANN conducts Public Meetings in support of its mission to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems, and acts in the public interest by providing free and open

access to anyone wishing to participate, either in person or remotely, in open, transparent and bottom-up, multistakeholder policy development processes.

There will be a financial impact on ICANN in hosting the meeting and providing travel support as necessary, as well as on the community in incurring costs to travel to the meeting. But such impact would be faced regardless of the location and venue of the meeting. This action will have no impact on the security or the stability of the DNS.

This is an Organizational Administrative function that does not require public comment.

Submitted by:	Nick Tomasso
Position:	VP, Global Meeting Operations
Date Noted:	20 February 2020
Email:	nick.tomasso@icann.org

ICANN BOARD PAPER NO. 2020.03.12.2a

TITLE: **Acceptance of the Second Organizational Review of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC2) Detailed Implementation Plan**

PROPOSED ACTION: **For Board Consideration and Approval**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) has adopted the second Security and Stability Advisory Committee Review (SSAC2) [Detailed Implementation Plan](#) ('Plan' hereafter) with full consensus. The ICANN Board is being asked to accept the Plan and instruct the SSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party to continue the implementation process.

The Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the ICANN Board (OEC) recommends that the Board accepts the Plan and that the Board instructs the SSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party to continue the implementation with the understanding that the SSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party will provide details on the implementation as part of six-monthly implementation progress reports to be presented to the OEC.

BACKGROUND:

The second Security and Stability Advisory Committee Review began on 19 April 2017, in accordance with the ICANN Bylaws, Article 4, Section 4.4, which requires the ICANN Board to "cause a periodic review of ... each Advisory Committee ... to determine (i) whether that organization, council or committee has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure, (ii) if so, whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness and (iii) whether that organization, council or committee is accountable to its constituencies, stakeholder groups, organizations and other stakeholders."

The independent examiner that conducted the second SSAC Review produced a [Final Report](#), published on 7 January 2019. The SSAC2 Review Implementation Planning

Team drafted the [SSAC2 Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment & Implementation Plan](#), which was completed with full consensus on 13 May 2019, and submitted to the OEC for consideration.

Subsequently, based on the OEC's recommendation, the ICANN Board resolved on 23 June 2019 [[link](#)] to:

Resolved (2019.06.23.15), the Board accepts the final report from the independent examiner.

Resolved (2019.06.23.16), the Board accepts the Feasibility Assessment.

Resolved (2019.06.23.17), the Board directs the SSAC to convene an SSAC review implementation work group that drafts a detailed implementation plan of the recommendations, as presented in the Feasibility Assessment, including appropriate implementation costing.

Resolved (2019.06.23.18), the detailed implementation plan shall be submitted to the Board as soon as possible, but no later than six (6) months after the adoption of this resolution. The detailed implementation plan should contain a realistic timeline for the implementation, a definition of desired outcomes, an explanation of how the implementation addresses underlying issues identified in the final report, and a way to measure current state as well as progress toward the desired outcome. The Work Party shall also work with the ICANN organization to include expected budgetary implications for each of the implementation steps into its detailed implementation plan. The implementation plan shall incorporate a phased approach that allows for easy-to-implement and least costly improvements to be implemented first, with those items with more significant budget implications to be addressed later in the implementation process.

Resolved (2019.06.23.19), the Board directs the SSAC Review implementation work group to oversee the implementation process, once the Board has accepted

the detailed implementation plan. Any budgetary requests resulting from the implementation shall be made in line with the ICANN organization's annual budgeting processes.

Resolved (2019.06.23.20), the Board directs the SSAC review implementation work group to provide the OEC with implementation reports every six (6) months on progress against the implementation plan, including, but not limited to, progress toward metrics detailed in the implementation plan and use of allocated budget.

Subsequently, the SSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party was formed and developed the SSAC2 Review Detailed Implementation Plan, which the SSAC approved it with full consensus. The SSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party forwarded that to the Board for its consideration

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE (OEC)

RECOMMENDATION:

In its capacity of overseeing the organizational review process, having reviewed all relevant materials, the OEC recommends that the Board accept the Plan and that the Board instruct the SSAC2 implementation Work Party to continue with the implementation, as outlined in the Plan without delay.

The OEC acknowledged the note included on the cover pages of the Plan that states: “SSAC notes regarding the sections labelled “Detailed implementation costing”:
specific costs are noted in these sections only if yearly budget allocations are needed, or if a project is needed to execute. Otherwise, the document’s “Detailed implementation costing” sections are marked “n/a.” However, such recommendations do require the help of SSAC’s ICANN support staff to execute. The SSAC support staff estimates that additional ¼ FTE should be added to existing staffing level to implement these various recommendations. The SSAC expects ICANN to provide resources in support of the implementation work, or to repurpose and refocus current support staff for the implementation of these recommendations.” The OEC recommends to the Board to

direct the SSAC that all budgetary implications resulting from the implementation shall be considered as part of the applicable annual budgeting processes.

The OEC recommends, in accordance with the previous [Board resolution](#) from 23 June 2019, that the SSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party provide the OEC with six-monthly written implementation reports on progress against the Plan, including, but not limited to, progress toward metrics detailed in the Plan and use of allocated budget. It is during these updates that the SSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party shall provide more details on the measurability of implementation progress including resource needs and budgetary implications. The Board, through the OEC will continue to review those detailed plans when released.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION:

Whereas, [ICANN Bylaws Article IV, Section 4.4](#) calls on the ICANN Board to "cause a periodic review of the performance and operation of each [...] Advisory Committee [...] by an entity or entities independent of the organization under review. The goal of the review, to be undertaken pursuant to such criteria and standards as the Board shall direct, shall be to determine (i) whether that organization has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure, and (ii) if so, whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness."

Whereas, the independent examiner of the second Security and Stability Advisory Committee ("SSAC2") Review produced a [Final Report](#) in January 2019. That report was received by the Board in May 2019, and at the same time the Board accepted the SSAC2 Review Work Party's [Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan](#).

Whereas, in response to that May 2019 resolution, the SSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party was created. That Work Party developed and approved with full consensus the SSAC2 Review Detailed Implementation Plan on 22 December 2019.

Resolved (2020.03.12.xx), the Board acknowledges the SSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party's work and thanks the members of that Group for their efforts.

Resolved (2020.03.12.xx), the Board accepts the SSAC2 Review Detailed Implementation Plan, including the implementation approach contained within.

Resolved (2020.03.12.xx), the Board directs the SSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party to continue implementation in accordance with the SSAC2 Review Detailed Implementation Plan and to provide updates to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the ICANN Board (OEC) through six-monthly written implementation reports on progress. Those progress reports should include, but not be limited to progress toward metrics and use of allocated budget. Where necessary, the updates shall include more details on the measurability of implementation progress including resource needs and budgetary implications. The update reports shall also cover all other relevant information pertaining to the SSAC's implementation planning and progress, including but not limited to timing, duration, dependencies and non-fiscal resources for all recommendations. The Board, through the OEC will review those detailed plans when released.

Resolved (2020.03.12.xx), that any budgetary implications of the second SSAC Review implementation, including those noted on the cover page of the SSAC Detailed Implementation Plan, shall be considered as part of the applicable annual budgeting processes.

PROPOSED RATIONALE:

Why is the Board addressing the issue?

To ensure ICANN's multistakeholder model remains transparent and accountable, and to improve its performance, the ICANN Bylaws mandate independent reviews of each Supporting Organization, each Supporting Organization Council, each Advisory Committee (other than the Governmental Advisory Committee), and the Nominating Committee, as detailed in Article IV, Section 4.4 of the ICANN Bylaws. The independent examiner conducting the SSAC2 Review produced a [final report](#) that was published in January 2019. Based on its detailed review of the independent examiner's findings and recommendations, the SSAC2 Review Work Party prepared a [Feasibility](#)

[Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan](#), adopted with full consensus on 13 May 2019. Subsequently, the SSAC2 Review Work Party drafted and submitted on 22 December 2019 the SSAC2 Review Detailed Implementation Plan (Plan).

The SSAC2 Review recommendations have the potential to advance ICANN's and SSAC's effectiveness, transparency and accountability objectives and have been considered carefully by the Board's Organizational Effectiveness Committee as well as by the full Board.

The Board resolution will have a positive impact on ICANN as it reinforces ICANN's commitment to maintaining and improving its accountability, transparency and organizational effectiveness throughout the implementation process.

Why is the Board addressing the issue?

This resolution moves the SSAC2 Review formally into the implementation phase. Following the assessment of the Plan and the feedback from the OEC, the Board is now in a position to consider the Plan, including the fact that the SSAC has already begun some of the implementation. The Board is now in a position to instruct the SSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party to continue the implementation process as set out in the Plan. This step is an important part of the Organizational Review process of checks and balances, to ensure that the Board-accepted recommendations will be implemented, while being mindful of all relevant resources' constraints.

What is the proposal being considered?

The proposal the Board is considering is the Organizational Effectiveness Committee's recommendation of the adoption of the Plan, drafted by the SSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party and adopted by the SSAC.

What significant materials did the Board review?

The Board reviewed the Plan, as adopted by the SSAC. The Board had previously considered the [relevant Bylaws provisions](#), the independent examiner's final report, the Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan, and community feedback on

the independent examiner's assessment report and draft final report, and took onboard the OEC's considerations in making this recommendation.

Are there fiscal impacts or ramifications on ICANN, the Community, and/or the Public (strategic plan, operating plan, or budget)?

This Board action will have some fiscal implications and this resolution does not authorize any specific funding for those implementation efforts. As detailed in the Plan, implementation of some recommendations requires specific costs but only if yearly budget allocations are needed, or if a project is needed to execute, while some recommendations involve additional SSAC's ICANN staff support needed in support of the implementation work. All fiscal implications shall be considered as part of the applicable annual budgeting processes.

How is this action within ICANN's mission and what is the public interest served in this action?

The Board's action is consistent with ICANN's Mission and its commitment pursuant to Section 4.4 of the Bylaws to ensure ICANN's multistakeholder model remains transparent and accountable, and to improve the performance of its supporting organizations and advisory committees.

This action will serve the public interest by contributing to the fulfillment of ICANN's commitment to maintaining and improving its accountability and transparency.

Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS?

This Board action is not expected to have a direct effect on security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS.

Is public comment required prior to Board action?

The independent examiner's draft final report was published for [public comment](#). No additional public comment prior to Board action is required.

Signature Block:

Submitted by:

Theresa Swinehart

Position: SVP, Multistakeholder Strategy and Strategic Initiatives

Date Noted:

Email: Theresa.swinehart@icann.org

SSAC2 Review
Detailed Implementation Plan

Draft 19 December 2019

Status of This Document

Following the Board acceptance of the Final Report and of the SSAC Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan, this Detailed Implementation Plan is being developed by the SSAC Review Implementation Work Group for consideration by the ICANN Board.

SSAC notes regarding the sections labelled “Detailed implementation costing”: specific costs are noted in these sections only if yearly budget allocations are needed, or if a project is needed to execute. Otherwise, the document’s “Detailed implementation costing” sections are marked “n/a.” However, such recommendations do require the help of SSAC’s ICANN support staff to execute. The SSAC support staff estimates that additional ¼ FTE should be added to existing staffing level to implement these various recommendations. The SSAC expects ICANN to provide resources in support of the implementation work, or to repurpose and refocus current support staff for the implementation of these recommendations.

Recommendation 1	
Recommendation	The SSAC has a clear continuing purpose within ICANN. Its existence as an Advisory Committee should continue.
RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable)	N/A
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	
Expected budget implications once implemented	
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)	
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed	

implementation plan can the implementation start?	
What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months	Ongoing
High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board	
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP)	n/a
Detailed implementation costing	n/a

Recommendation 2	
Recommendation	The SSAC should ensure that each advisory or report provided to the ICANN Board includes a high-level summary that outlines the topic or issue in easily understandable terms and lists the key findings with uniquely numbered recommendations.
RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)	The SSAC already does this, and will continue to do so. The IE's recommendation is a good reminder. However, some SSAC documents, such as correspondence, are too brief to require a high-level summary or listing of key findings.
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> SSAC
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
Expected budget implications once implemented	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Easy
How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Low

process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Already done.
What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months	
High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> 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”.
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIP)	See High-level implementation steps above.
Detailed implementation costing	n/a

Recommendation 3	
Recommendation	When providing advice, the SSAC should ensure that the Board Liaison reviews and provides feedback on both the summary and full document before submission to the Board. The SSAC should proactively discuss talking points and potential Board response timing with the SSAC Board Liaison.
RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)	The procedure for ensuring Liaison review before publication is documented in the SSAC Operational Procedures in section 3.2.2, and SSAC has been following that procedure. The procedure to “proactively discuss talking points and potential Board response timing with the SSAC Board Liaison” should be adopted by adding explicit mention in the SSAC Operational Procedures.
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> SSAC
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
Expected budget implications once implemented	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Easy

<p>How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)</p>	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Improved Communications</p>
<p>How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?</p>	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Shortly thereafter Board decision</p>
<p>What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months</p>	
<p>High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board</p>	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> 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.</p>
<p>Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIP)</p>	<p>Work to update the SSAC Operational Procedures per the above is currently underway; expected to be completed by end of February 2020.</p>
<p>Detailed implementation costing</p>	<p>n/a</p>

Recommendation 4	
Recommendation	The SSAC Board Liaison should work with the ICANN Board and ICANN Staff to ensure that Board Action Request Register (ARR) adequately captures the information required to understand the status of advice from when it is given through its implementation.
RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)	This is already being done - it may require explicit mention in the SSAC Operational Procedures.
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> ICANN Board, ICANN Staff, SSAC Board Liaison
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Will require assistance from ICANN staff
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> To be determined by ICANN Board and Staff. This will require some time from Board staff support.
Expected budget implications once implemented	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> To be determined by ICANN Board and Staff.
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> TBD in discussion with ICANN Board and Staff
How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Improved Governance

accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> TBD in discussion with ICANN Board and Staff
What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months	
High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
Proposed detailed implementation steps	Work to review the structure of the Board ARR has been completed and additional columns have been added to record implementation information. The SSAC ARR Tracker, a

<p>(should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP)</p>	<p>document which is based on the Board ARR and which the SSAC uses internally to monitor the progress of SSAC recommendations, has also been updated in its format to record additional information. The SSAC is satisfied that the information recorded in these documents is sufficient to enable the status of SSAC recommendations to be effectively monitored.</p>
<p>Detailed implementation costing</p>	<p>Staff time</p>

Recommendation 5	
Recommendation	The SSAC should periodically review the implementation state of past and future advice provided to the ICANN Board to ensure that all action items are listed in the ARR. The SSAC should follow-up with the ICANN Board via its Board Liaison when advice has not yet been addressed or when progress is unclear. The ICANN Board should periodically review the AAR to ensure that the Board is considering SSAC advice in a timely fashion, and that the Board understands the implementation status of relevant Board resolutions by ICANN Org.
RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Another goal is better communication about the implementation status of Board resolutions.</p>
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> SSAC, ICANN Board, ICANN Board support staff
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None

Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
Expected budget implications once implemented	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> High, easy
How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Improved effectiveness of SSAC and ICANN Board. Improved governance, transparency, and Improved communications.
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Shortly thereafter
What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months	Primary work completed' see below
High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> 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

	<p>performed by the ICANN Board Liaison and SSAC Admin Committee.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP)</p>	<p>Significant effort has been devoted within the past year to reviewing the relevance, currency and implementation state of all advice to the ICANN Board. In October 2019 the SSAC Board Liaison and SSAC members worked with ICANN Org staff to review all open items on AAR; have provided updates and questions regarding them. An update regarding the status of all advice was provided to the SSAC by the SSAC Board Liaison at ICANN66 in Montreal.</p> <p>Work to update Operational Procedures per the above is currently underway; this will provide for ongoing reviews.</p>
<p>Detailed implementation costing</p>	<p>n/a</p>

Recommendation 6	
Recommendation	For time sensitive issues, the SSAC should establish process and work deadlines that take into account the decision timelines of other ICANN entities. The SSAC should work with SSAC staff to ensure internal deadlines are set up to make meeting external deadlines as possible as reasonable.
RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)	SSAC already endeavors to do this. For example, SSAC has been providing timely written comments during Public Comment Periods, which is the main community-standard way to provide feedback. SSAC has also provided efficient and timely participation in the recent and demanding ePDP. SSAC will not always be able to formally join some community efforts due to time/labor constraints -- please see also notes regarding Recommendations 14 and 15 below.
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> SSAC
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None (although takes up a lot of SSAC member/volunteer time.)
Expected budget implications once implemented	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None. Requires continued help of SSAC support staff.
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Medium

<p>How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)</p>	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Community participation Medium</p>
<p>How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?</p>	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Shortly thereafter</p>
<p>What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months</p>	<p>done</p>
<p>High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board</p>	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSAC Admin Committee to monitor and manage as part of ongoing operations.
<p>Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIP)</p>	<p>See High-level implementation steps above</p>
<p>Detailed implementation costing</p>	<p>n/a</p>

Recommendation 8	
Recommendation	The SSAC should formalize an annual process geared towards setting research priorities and identifying relevant emerging security, stability, and resiliency (SSR) threats in the short and medium-term.
RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable)	SSAC does this as part of its annual workshop, where the membership convenes to do its annual planning.
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> SSAC
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> SSAC annual workshop
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> Continuation of SSAC annual workshop
Expected budget implications once implemented	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> Continuation of SSAC annual workshop
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> Easy to implement
How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> Improved service to community

<p>How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?</p>	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Already underway</p>
<p>What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months</p>	
<p>High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board</p>	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> 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.</p>
<p>Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIP)</p>	<p>The SSAC has memorialized its annual process geared towards setting research priorities and identifying relevant emerging security, stability, and resiliency (SSR) threats, and is formally incorporating into the Operational Procedures section 4.</p> <p>At September 2019 SSAC Workshop, SSAC executed the new process and spent notable time on it. This resulted in a document containing threat categorizations and research priorities for the coming year.</p>
<p>Detailed implementation costing</p>	<p>n/a</p>

Recommendation 9	
Recommendation	The skills needed for tasks identified in the SSAC's annual priority setting and emerging threat identification exercise should feed into the SSAC's membership and recruitment processes.
RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)	n/a
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> SSAC
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
Expected budget implications once implemented	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Medium
How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Medium

<p>Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation</p>	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None</p>
<p>How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?</p>	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> 2020 membership review process</p>
<p>What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months</p>	
<p>High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board</p>	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> 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.</p>
<p>Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIP)</p>	<p>Update to Operational Procedures drafted and underway. At the September 2019 SSAC Workshop, the SSAC performed work per Recommendation 8 and mapped skills of current membership and required skills to the research priorities. In December 2019 the SSAC and its Membership Committee identified some resulting skills it wishes to bolster in its 2020 membership cycle.</p>
<p>Detailed implementation costing</p>	<p>n/a</p>

Recommendation 10	
Recommendation	The SSAC should explicitly communicate the reasons for its decisions around topic selection and focus with others in ICANN. New requests should be compared to the current set of priorities and communicated about accordingly.
RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable)	SSAC already does this in its public meetings at the thrice-a year ICANN meetings. We will look to ways to sharpen our message regarding our motivations for selecting particular work products.
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> SSAC
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> None
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> None
Expected budget implications once implemented	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> None
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> Easy to implement
How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies::</u> Improved communications Easy

accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Already underway
What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months	See below
High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> SSAC Admin Committee will look to ways to sharpen our message regarding project selection.
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIP)	SSAC Admin Committee has been working with ICANN Org communications staff about messaging, and they are finding specific additional ways to communicate about SSAC project selection and work products.
Detailed implementation costing	n/a; needs participation of ICANN Org comms staff.

Recommendation 11	
Recommendation	The SSAC should continue to approach the ICANN Board when additional funding, resources, or access to external contractors may be required to achieve a project in the desired timeline or at the desired scale.
RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)	Will do. An example in the past was the larger-than-usual NCAP project, where SSAC scoped and requested additional resources. The IE's recommendation assumes that there will be no unfunded mandates to SSAC from the Board or the community.
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> SSAC
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> N/A
Expected budget implications once implemented	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> See above.
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Medium
How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Efficient process. Easy

process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> As needed
What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months	
High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> SSAC Admin Committee is responsible for tracking and coordinating requests of this nature.
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIP)	Will be executed if and when needed.
Detailed implementation costing	TBD depending on future requests.

Recommendation 12	
Recommendation	The SSAC should consider whether a fellowship can be used for assistance with research or specific work products. In addition, the SSAC should continue to endeavor to leverage the assistance of ICANN's technical staff when it is appropriate to do so.
RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)	The problem that the IE is trying to help solve is getting more resources for SSAC, which is stretched to capacity. In April 2019, ICANN Org secured two Research Fellows to support projects in SSAC and RSSAC. The ICANN Research Fellow Program is a pilot effort designed to engage security and technical researchers to work on emerging security and technology policy issues related to the DNS. The Research Fellows will help fill the need expressed by the IE. SSAC needs the assistance of people with writing skills who can help with the drafting of SSAC papers under SSAC direction.
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> SSAC and ICANN Staff
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Research Fellow funding from ICANN Org.
Expected budget implications once implemented	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Research Fellow funding from ICANN Org.
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Hard

and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)	
How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Efficiency delivery, relieve some burden being imposed on SSAC volunteers
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Immediately
What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months	
High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> SSAC Admin Committee and ICANN staff collaborated to fill the Research Fellow position allowed under the budget; implementation completed April 2019 and planned to continue in future years.
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIP)	Per high-level implementation steps, SSAC has obtained Research Fellow assistance, and will maintain it; Research Fellows are currently engaged in SSAC work.
Detailed implementation costing	Cost of SSAC Fellows is in ICANN budget; that budget item needs to be provided for yearly.

Recommendation 14	
Recommendation	The SSAC should consider and adopt appropriate mechanisms to ensure that it is aware of policy-making efforts going on within ICANN.
RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> SSAC, other bodies with ICANN
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> n/a
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	

Expected budget implications once implemented	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Medium
How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Improved community process Medium
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Immediately
What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months	ongoing
High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIP)	n/a as above
Detailed implementation costing	Significant volunteer time cost. Requires continued SSAC travel support to ICANN meetings, at at least the current levels.

Recommendation 15	
Recommendation	As time availability allows, the SSAC should continue to have members involved as individuals in large, cross-ICANN efforts that have SSR-related components, such as the SSR2.
RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)	<p>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.</p> <p>Some of those relevant efforts have placed significant burdens on SSAC and its members.</p>
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	
Expected budget implications once implemented	
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)	
How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of	

<p>this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)</p>	
<p>Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation</p>	
<p>How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?</p>	
<p>What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months</p>	
<p>High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board</p>	
<p>Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIP)</p>	<p>FYI: As time availability allows, the SSAC will continue to have members involved as individuals in large, cross-ICANN efforts that have SSR-related components, such as the SSR2.</p>
<p>Detailed implementation costing</p>	<p>Significant volunteer time cost. Requires continued SSAC travel support to ICANN meetings, at at least the current levels.</p>

Recommendation 16	
Recommendation	In the process of developing each SAC-series document, the SSAC should explicitly discuss who affected parties may be and whether or not affected parties should be consulted for feedback or should be notified that the SSAC plans to publish a document on a given topic.
RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)	SSAC already does this, per SSAC Operational Procedures sections 3.2.3 and 3.2.4.
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> SSAC
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> N/A
Expected budget implications once implemented	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> N/A
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Medium
How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Improved process Medium

accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	
What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months	
High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> The SSAC Operational Procedures section 3.2.3, “Developing an Initial Work Draft Product”, will be updated to read: “The work party should identify the parties potentially affected, and may consult with members of the ICANN community affected by the issue under study.”
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIP)	Update to Operational Procedures underway as per above.
Detailed implementation costing	n/a

Recommendation 18	
Recommendation	The SSAC should post specific additional materials online in the short-term, to consolidate information and increase transparency. The SSAC's Administrative Committee should then undertake a yearly review of the SSAC's website to determine whether additional content should be provided or whether the website should be restructured.
RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)	<p>After consulting with the Admin Committee, plans are underway to incorporate this recommendation by adding the following to the SSAC website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An explanation of the purpose of the SSAC-Correspondence Series. • A link to the most recent ICANN Board ARR. • A clear articulation of how and when an SO/AC or Work Party within ICANN might request feedback or comments from the SSAC • A clear explanation of how one can apply to join the SSAC and high-level information regarding the types of skills that the SSAC is looking for in members. • Pictures of current members who are willing to include one, to assist newer members of ICANN
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> SSAC Admin Committee and support staff
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	
Expected budget implications once implemented	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> N/A
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Medium

<p>recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)</p>	
<p>How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)</p>	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> More relevant and findable SSAC publications for Board and Community. Low/Easy</p>
<p>Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation</p>	
<p>How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?</p>	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> N/A</p>
<p>What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months</p>	
<p>High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board</p>	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> SSAC Admin Committee to lead efforts to improve the content of the SSAC Web site.</p>
<p>Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIP)</p>	<p>SSAC Admin Committee to consult with support staff and create a plan by end of February 2020 to improve the content per the above. See also Recommendation 24.</p>
<p>Detailed implementation costing</p>	<p>TBD. May require at least a revamp of the SSAC section of the ICANN web site. All other SOs and ACs (except RSSAC) have</p>

	full, dedicated websites to support content and effective communications, and SSAC may need support to create and maintain something similar.
--	---

Recommendation 19	
Recommendation	The SSAC should remain accountable directly to the ICANN Board and through it to the wider ICANN community.
RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable)	None
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> ICANN Board, SSAC
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> N/A
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> N/A
Expected budget implications once implemented	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> N/A
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> N/A
How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> No new implementation needed

Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies: N/A</u>
What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months	N/A
High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies: N/A</u>
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIP)	N/A
Detailed implementation costing	N/A

Recommendation 20	
Recommendation	The current number of SSAC members is appropriate. The SSAC should continue to work to ensure its members are engaged, in conjunction with the recruiting points made below.
RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)	None
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> SSAC
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
Expected budget implications once implemented	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Medium, requires work by Membership Committee
How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Greater membership engagement High priority, for productivity

How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Immediately
What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months	N/A
High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Continue to follow membership participation and evaluation procedures, per SSAC Operational Procedures.
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIP)	N/A
Detailed implementation costing	N/A

Recommendation 24	
Recommendation	Each year, the SSAC should develop a formalized process to estimate the non-technical expertise required for anticipated future work and thereby identify any skills gaps in the current membership. These skills gaps should be widely publicized on the SSAC website and at any meetings where SSAC members are in attendance. Prospective candidates should be directed to review the published skills gaps. The Membership Committee should take non-technical expertise gaps into consideration when assessing new member applications.
RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)	
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> SSAC at its Annual Workshop SSAC Membership Committee in considering new member applications
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> 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.
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
Expected budget implications once implemented	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> High priority, for productivity Medium; requires work by all SSAC members

<p>How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)</p>	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Medium. Greater membership engagement, more efficient membership application process, SSAC non-technical expertise closely aligned to the work anticipated to be undertaken.</p>
<p>How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?</p>	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Immediately</p>
<p>What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months</p>	
<p>High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board</p>	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> 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.</p>
<p>Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIP)</p>	<p>SSAC Admin Committee and SSAC Membership Committee followed up on September 2019 SSAC Workshop by identifying the non-technical expertise required to undertake anticipated future work. SSAC Admin Committee to create a plan by end of February 2020 to publicize skills gaps on the SSAC website and at any meetings where SSAC members are in attendance. SSAC to update SSAC Operational Procedures section 2.3 to take non-technical expertise gaps into consideration when assessing new member applications. Work required to update SSAC web site to be bundled with work in Recommendation 18.</p>
<p>Detailed implementation costing</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Recommendation 25	
Recommendation	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)	
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> SSAC at its Annual Workshop SSAC Membership Committee in considering new member applications</p>
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> 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.</p>
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None</p>
Expected budget implications once implemented	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None</p>
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Difficulty to implement: High, for productivity Level of implementation effort: Medium; requires work by all SSAC members</p>

and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)	
How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Medium. Greater membership engagement, more efficient membership application process, increased SSAC diversity contributing to higher quality of SSAC advice.
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Immediately
What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months	
High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> As part of the annual assessment of the diversity of its members conducted at the SSAC Annual Workshop, identify the desired diversity, including but not limited to geography and gender, of its members to contribute to high quality of SSAC advice. Identify diversity gaps that may need to be filled to do so. Publicize diversity gaps on the SSAC website and at any meetings where SSAC members are in attendance. Take diversity gaps into consideration when assessing new member applications.
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIP)	Task of taking diversity gaps into consideration when assessing new member applications is incorporated in SSAC Operational Procedures section 2.3. SSAC will update its Operational Procedures section 3.1 to incorporate an annual assessment of the diversity of its members to be conducted at the SSAC Annual Workshop, and identify the desired diversity and gaps, including but not

	<p>limited to geography and gender.</p> <p>In all annual membership cycles, SSAC Admin Committee and SSAC Membership Committee to identify diversity gaps that may need to be filled; SSAC to discuss at each annual SSAC workshop. Admin Committee will be responsible for publicizing diversity gaps on the SSAC website, and create plan for publicizing at any meetings where SSAC members are in attendance.</p>
Detailed implementation costing	N/A

Recommendation 26	
Recommendation	The SSAC should ensure that the effectiveness of an external liaison and the individual in the role are reviewed on a regular basis, and that a means of providing confidential feedback to the review is readily available and known.
RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable)	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> SSAC
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> None
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> None
Expected budget implications once implemented	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> None
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> Medium

<p>How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)</p>	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Improved management, accountability Low</p>
<p>How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?</p>	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Immediately</p>
<p>What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months</p>	
<p>High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board</p>	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Additional text will be drafted and proposed for the SSAC Operational Procedures during the next revision cycle.</p>
<p>Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIP)</p>	<p>SSAC Admin Committee to propose language for update to Operational Procedures by end of February 2020</p>
<p>Detailed implementation costing</p>	

Recommendation 27	
Recommendation	The SSAC's leadership should be limited to two, three-year terms. The SSAC should impose no term limits on non-leadership members.
RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)	See #28 for implementation regarding SSAC Chair. The SSAC Vice-Chair and Board Liaison are already term-limited to two three-year terms, via the SSAC Operational Procedures.
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> See #28
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> See #28
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
Expected budget implications once implemented	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Medium
How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Improved governance and accountability Low

accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Immediately
What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months	Within three months
High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> See #28 for implementation
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIP)	In December 2019, SSAC membership voted to amend the SSAC Operational Procedures thusly: “The Chair will be elected to a three-year term of office and can serve for two consecutive three-year terms. More than two consecutive terms are allowed, but should be considered exceptional. Having the same person return as Chair after a relatively short break should similarly be considered exceptional.”
Detailed implementation costing	N/A

Recommendation 28	
Recommendation	The SSAC should work with the ICANN Board to update the ICANN Bylaws in order to allow for there to be term limits on the SSAC Chair.
RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable)	SSAC is the only SO or AC that is not allowed to term-limit its chair. All other SOs and ACs are allowed to decide both term lengths and term limits for their leadership positions, and have chosen to impose both term lengths and term limits. (Except the GNSO, where the ICANN Bylaws themselves dictate term lengths and term limits for GNSO Counsellors and the GNSO Chair.) The ICANN Board, PTI, etc. also have terms limits. The amendment has been submitted for consideration in the next convenient round of Bylaws updates.
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> ICANN Board
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> None
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> None
Expected budget implications once implemented	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> None
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIIP applies:</u> The amendment has been submitted for consideration in the next convenient round of Bylaws updates.

<p>How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)</p>	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Improved governance and accountability Low</p>
<p>How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?</p>	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Immediately</p>
<p>What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months</p>	
<p>High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board</p>	<p><u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> 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.</p>
<p>Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIP)</p>	<p>The required update to the ICANN Bylaws were made via Board Resolution 2019.05.03.13.</p>
<p>Detailed implementation costing</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Recommendation 29	
Recommendation	The SSAC should maintain its current processes and activities around disclosing potential conflicts of interest, both at the individual level and as a group of individuals. It should also update its online disclosure of interest statements to clearly articulate when the disclosure was last submitted for each member.
RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)	None
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> SSAC
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
Expected budget implications once implemented	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> None
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Medium
How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Improved accountability and transparency Easy

accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> Immediately
What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months	
High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> 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.
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIP)	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.
Detailed implementation costing	N/A

Recommendation 30	
Recommendation	The SSAC should continue to nurture and build upon the SSAC’s culture that values self-improvement, including between formal reviews.
RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)	
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> SSAC
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> The SSAC annual workshop, and travel support for 15 SSAC members to the thrice-yearly ICANN meetings, are essential to this goal.
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	
Expected budget implications once implemented	<u>No update, the following statement in the FAIP applies:</u> The SSAC annual workshop, and travel support for 15 SSAC members to the thrice-yearly ICANN meetings, are essential to this goal.
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources, increased budget, Bylaws changes and other dependencies (easy/medium/hard)	
How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom	

accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	
What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months	Ongoing
High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board	
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP)	N/A
Detailed implementation costing	N/A

REFERENCE MATERIALS - BOARD PAPER NO. 2020.03.12.2a

TITLE: **Acceptance of the Second Organizational Review of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC2) Detailed Implementation Plan**

The Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) has adopted the second Security and Stability Advisory Committee Review (SSAC2) [Detailed Implementation Plan](#) ('Plan' hereafter) with full consensus. The ICANN Board is being asked to accept the Plan and instruct the SSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party to continue the implementation process. The Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the ICANN Board (OEC) recommends that the Board accepts the Plan and that the Board instructs the SSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party to continue the implementation with the understanding that the SSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party will provide details on the implementation as part of six-monthly implementation progress reports to be presented to the OEC, as detailed in the 23 June 2019 Board resolution [\[link\]](#).

▪ **Background**

The second Security and Stability Advisory Committee Review began on 19 April 2017. The independent examiner that conducted the second SSAC Review produced a [Final Report](#), published on 7 January 2019. The SSAC2 Review Implementation Planning Team drafted the [SSAC2 Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment & Implementation Plan](#), which was completed with full consensus on 13 May 2019, and submitted to the OEC for consideration. Based on the OEC's recommendation, the ICANN Board resolved on 23 June 2019 [\[link\]](#) to accept the final report and directed the SSAC to convene an SSAC review implementation work party that drafts a detailed implementation. Subsequently, the SSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party was formed and developed the SSAC2 Review Detailed Implementation Plan.

▪ **What are the key issues addressed?**

The SSAC2 Review recommendations have the potential to advance ICANN's and SSAC's effectiveness, transparency and accountability objectives and have been considered carefully by the Board's Organizational Effectiveness Committee as well as by the full Board. The Board resolution will have a positive impact on ICANN as it

reinforces ICANN's commitment to maintaining and improving its accountability, transparency and organizational effectiveness throughout the implementation process.

- **Consultations undertaken/results (internal or external)**

The independent examiner's draft final report was published for [public comment](#). No additional public comment prior to Board action is required.

Signature Block:

Submitted by: Theresa Swinehart

Position: Senior Vice President, MSSSI

Date Noted:

Email: theresa.swinehart@icann.org

ICANN BOARD PAPER NO. 2020.03.12.2b

TITLE: **Acceptance of the Second Organizational Review of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC2) -Detailed Implementation Plan**

PROPOSED ACTION: **For Board Consideration and Approval**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) has adopted the second Root Server System Advisory Committee Review (RSSAC2) [Detailed Implementation Plan](#) ('Plan' hereafter) with full consensus. The ICANN Board is being asked to accept the Plan and instruct the RSSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party to continue the implementation process.

The Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the ICANN Board (OEC) recommends that the Board accepts the Plan and that the Board instructs the RSSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party to continue the implementation with the understanding that the RSSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party will provide details on the implementation as part of six-monthly implementation progress reports to be presented to the OEC.

BACKGROUND:

The second Root Server System Advisory Committee Review began on 19 April 2017, in accordance with the ICANN Bylaws, Article 4, Section 4.4, which requires the ICANN Board to "cause a periodic review of ... each Advisory Committee ... to determine (i) whether that organization, council or committee has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure, (ii) if so, whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness and (iii) whether that organization, council or committee is accountable to its constituencies, stakeholder groups, organizations and other stakeholders."

The independent examiner that conducted the second RSSAC Review produced a [Final Report](#), published on 2 October 2018. The RSSAC2 Review Work Party drafted the [RSSAC2 Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan](#), which was completed with full consensus on 2 October 2018, and submitted to the OEC for consideration.

Subsequently, based on the OEC's recommendation, the ICANN Board resolved on 3 May 2019 [[link](#)] to:

- (1) Accept the final report;
- (2) Accept the Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation as produced by the RSSAC Review Work Party;
- (3) Directed the RSSAC to convene an RSSAC review implementation working group that drafts a detailed implementation plan of the recommendations;
- (4) The Board directed the implementation plan *“should contain a realistic timeline for the implementation, a definition of desired outcomes, an explanation of how the implementation addresses underlying issues identified in the final report, and a way to measure current state as well as progress toward the desired outcome. The working group shall also work with the ICANN organization to include expected budgetary implications for each of the implementation steps into its detailed implementation plan. The implementation plan shall incorporate a phased approach that allows for easy-to-implement and least costly improvements to be implemented first, with those items with more significant budget implications to be addressed later in the implementation process.*

Subsequently, the RSSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party was formed and developed the Plan and approved it with full consensus on 7 January 2020. The RSSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party forwarded that to the Board for its consideration.

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE (OEC)

RECOMMENDATION:

In its capacity of overseeing the organizational review process, having reviewed all relevant materials, the OEC recommends that the Board accept the Plan and that the Board instruct the RSSAC2 implementation working group to continue with the implementation, as outlined in the Plan.

The OEC recommends, in accordance with the previous [Board resolution](#) from 3 May 2019, that the RSSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party provide the OEC with six-monthly written implementation reports on progress against the Plan, including, but not limited to, progress toward metrics detailed in the implementation plan and use of allocated budget. It is during these updates that the RSSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party shall provide more details on the measurability of implementation progress including resource needs and budgetary implications. The Board, through the OEC will continue to review those detailed plans when released.

The OEC also notes the connection between the implementation of the RSSAC Review recommendations and the new governance model for the DNS root server system (RSSAC037 and RSSAC038), referenced also in the [Board resolution](#) from 3 May 2019. The OEC recommends to the Board to direct the RSSAC to provide relevant updates, as they related to the RSSAC Review implementation, as part of the six-monthly review implementation progress reports.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION:

Whereas, [ICANN Bylaws Article IV, Section 4.4](#) calls on the ICANN Board to "cause a periodic review of the performance and operation of each [...] Advisory Committee [...] by an entity or entities independent of the organization under review. The goal of the review, to be undertaken pursuant to such criteria and standards as the Board shall direct, shall be to determine (i) whether that organization has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure, and (ii) if so, whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness."

Whereas, the independent examiner of the second Root Server System Advisory Committee ("RSSAC2") Review produced a [Final Report](#) in July 2018. That report was received by the Board in May 2019, and at the same time the Board accepted the RSSAC2 Review Work Party's [Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan](#).

Whereas, in response to that May 2019 resolution, the RSSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party was created. That Work Party developed and approved with full consensus the [RSSAC2 Review Detailed Implementation Plan](#) on 7 January 2020.

Whereas, the RSSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party has already started with some implementation work, as reported in the RSSAC2 Review Detailed Implementation Plan.

Resolved (2020.03.12.xx), the Board acknowledges the RSSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party's work and thanks the members of that Group for their efforts.

Resolved (2020.03.12.xx), the Board accepts the RSSAC2 Review Detailed Implementation Plan, including the implementation approach contained within.

Resolved (2020.03.12.xx), the Board directs the RSSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party to continue implementation in accordance with the RSSAC2 Review Detailed Implementation Plan, and to provide updates to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the ICANN Board (OEC) through six-monthly written implementation reports on progress. Those progress reports should include, but not be limited to, progress toward metrics and use of allocated budget. It is during these updates that the RSSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party shall provide, if necessary, more details on the measurability of implementation progress including resource needs and budgetary implications. The Board, through the OEC will review those detailed plans when released.

Resolved (2020.03.12.xx), that any budgetary implications of the second RSSAC Review implementation shall be considered as part of the applicable annual budgeting processes.

Resolved (2020.03.12.xx), the Board directs the RSSAC to provide updates to the progress on the new governance model for the DNS root server system (RSSAC037 and RSSAC038), as they relate to the Review implementation efforts, as part of the six-monthly review implementation progress reports.

PROPOSED RATIONALE:

Why is the Board addressing the issue?

To ensure ICANN's multistakeholder model remains transparent and accountable, and to improve its performance, the ICANN Bylaws mandate independent reviews of each Supporting Organization, each Supporting Organization Council, each Advisory Committee (other than the Governmental Advisory Committee), and the Nominating Committee, as detailed in Article IV, Section 4.4 of the ICANN Bylaws. The independent examiner conducting the RSSAC2 Review produced a [final report](#) that was published in July 2018. Based on its detailed review of the independent examiner's findings and recommendations, the RSSAC2 Work Party prepared a [Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan](#), adopted with full consensus on 2 October 2018. Subsequently, the RSSAC2 Review Work Party drafted the Plan, which was adopted by the RSSAC and submitted to the OEC on 7 January.

The RSSAC2 Review recommendations have the potential to advance ICANN's and RSSAC's effectiveness, transparency and accountability objectives and have been considered carefully by the Board's Organizational Effectiveness Committee as well as by the full Board.

The Board resolution will have a positive impact on ICANN as it reinforces ICANN's commitment to maintaining and improving its accountability, transparency and organizational effectiveness throughout the implementation process.

Why is the Board addressing the issue?

This resolution moves the RSSAC2 Review formally into the implementation phase. Following the assessment of the Plan and the feedback from the OEC, the Board is now in a position to consider the Plan, including the fact that the RSSAC has already begun some of the implementation. The Board is now in a position to instruct the RSSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party to continue the implementation process as set out in the Plan. This step is an important part of the Organizational Review process of checks and balances, to ensure that the Board-accepted recommendations will be implemented, while being mindful of all relevant resources' constraints.

What is the proposal being considered?

The proposal the Board is considering is the Organizational Effectiveness Committee's recommendation of the adoption of the Plan, drafted and adopted by the RSSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party.

What significant materials did the Board review?

The Board reviewed the Plan, as adopted by the RSSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party. The Board had previously considered the [relevant Bylaws provisions](#), the independent examiner's final report, the Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan, and community feedback on the independent examiner's assessment report and draft final report, and took onboard the OEC's considerations in making this recommendation.

Are there fiscal impacts or ramifications on ICANN, the Community, and/or the Public (strategic plan, operating plan, or budget)?

This Board action may have some fiscal implications and this resolution does not authorize any specific funding for those implementation efforts. As detailed in the Plan, implementation of some recommendations is already assumed in standard community support from the ICANN org Policy Development Support function, and the Plan outlines which recommendations are impacted.

How is this action within ICANN's mission and what is the public interest served in this action?

The Board's action is consistent with ICANN's Mission and its commitment pursuant to Section 4.4 of the Bylaws to ensure ICANN's multistakeholder model remains transparent and accountable, and to improve the performance of its supporting organizations and advisory committees.

This action will serve the public interest by contributing to the fulfillment of ICANN's commitment to maintaining and improving its accountability and transparency.

Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS?

This Board action is not expected to have a direct effect on security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS.

Is public comment required prior to Board action?

The independent examiner's draft final report was published for [public comment](#). A status update on the work of the RSSAC2 review implementation working group was provided during a webinar prior to ICANN65. No additional public comment prior to Board action is required.

Signature Block:

Submitted by: Theresa Swinehart

Position: SVP, Multistakeholder
Strategy & Strategic Initiatives,

Date Noted:

Email:

theresa.swinehart@icann.org

REFERENCE MATERIALS - BOARD PAPER NO. 2020.03.12.2b

TITLE: **Acceptance of the Second Organizational Review of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC2) -Detailed Implementation Plan**

The Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) has adopted the second Root Server System Advisory Committee Review (RSSAC2) [Detailed Implementation Plan](#) (hereafter: Plan) with full consensus. The ICANN Board is being asked to accept the Plan and instruct the RSSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party to continue the implementation process.

The Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the ICANN Board (OEC) recommends that the Board accepts the Plan and that the Board instructs the RSSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party to continue the implementation with the understanding that the RSSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party will provide details on the implementation to the OEC as part of six-monthly implementation progress reports, as detailed in the 3 May 2019 Board resolution [[link](#)].

▪ **Background**

The second Root Server System Advisory Committee Review began on 19 April 2017. The independent examiner that conducted the second RSSAC Review produced a [Final Report](#), published on 2 October 2018. The RSSAC2 Review Implementation Planning Team drafted the [RSSAC2 Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan](#), which was completed with full consensus on 2 October 2018, and submitted to the OEC for consideration. Based on the OEC's recommendation, the ICANN Board resolved on 3 May 2019 [[link](#)] to accept the final report and directed the RSSAC to convene an RSSAC review implementation work party to draft a detailed implementation plan of the recommendations. The RSSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party was formed and developed the Plan and approved it with full consensus on 7 January 2020.

What are the key issues addressed?

The RSSAC2 Review recommendations have the potential to advance ICANN's and RSSAC's effectiveness, transparency and accountability objectives and have been considered carefully by the Board's Organizational Effectiveness Committee as well as

by the full Board. The Board resolution will have a positive impact on ICANN as it reinforces ICANN's commitment to maintaining and improving its accountability, transparency and organizational effectiveness throughout the implementation process.

- **Consultations undertaken/results (internal or external)**

The independent examiner's draft final report was published for [public comment](#). A status update on the work of the RSSAC2 review implementation working group was provided during a webinar prior to ICANN65. No additional public comment prior to Board action is required.

Signature Block:

Submitted by: Theresa Swinehart

Position: Senior Vice President, MSSI

Date Noted:

Email: theresa.swinehart@icann.org

RSSAC2 Organizational Review: Detailed Implementation Plan

This Detailed Implementation Plan has been developed
by the RSSAC for consideration by the ICANN Board.

Recommendation 1a

<p>Recommendation</p>	<p>As stated in RSSAC038, the RSSAC recommends that the model started in RSSAC037 be finalized and implemented, which will likely address the details in this recommendation.</p>
<p>RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?</p>	<p><u>According to FAIP:</u> ICANN Board, RSSAC, other (stakeholders of the Root Server System)</p> <p><u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:</u> The ICANN Board and community continue to make progress toward implementation of a new governance model for the Root Server System as envisioned in RSSAC037. This development will affect the membership model of the RSSAC and RSSAC Caucus.</p>
<p>Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation</p>	<p><u>According to FAIP:</u> ICANN Board implementation of RSSAC038</p> <p><u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:</u> Whatever governance model the Root Server System Governance Working Group develops will likely contain a new membership model for the RSSAC and RSSAC Caucus. Therefore, this work will determine how RSSAC implements this recommendation.</p>
<p>Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.)</p>	<p>ICANN org support (Legal and Finance)</p>
<p>How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?</p>	<p>It will likely take roughly one year after the stakeholders of the Root Server System, including the ICANN Board, adopt a new governance model for the Root Server System to implement a new membership model for the RSSAC and RSSAC Caucus.</p>
<p>What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?</p>	<p><u>According to FAIP:</u> Current Membership Model: N/A Future Membership Model: 2-3 years</p>

<p>Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months</p>	<p><u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:</u> Per the work plan of the Root Server System Governance Working Group, it will take roughly a year (2020) to develop the final governance model for the Root Server System and then another year of review and approval (2021). Therefore, implementation of a new membership model for the RSSAC and RSSAC Caucus (or their successor structures) would take place in 2022.</p>
<p>High-level implementation steps</p>	<p><u>According to FAIP:</u> Implementing a future membership model is linked to the ICANN Board response to RSSAC037 and RSSAC038.</p>
<p>Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP)</p>	<p>Root Server System Governance Working Group develops final governance model, which includes new membership model for the RSSAC and RSSAC Caucus.</p> <p>Root Server System stakeholders approve final governance model.</p> <p>New membership model takes effect.</p>
<p>Detailed implementation costing (if applicable)</p>	<p>Costs for supporting a new membership model for the RSSAC and RSSAC Caucus are already assumed in standard community support from the ICANN org Policy Development Support function. ICANN org has committed to support the work of the Root Server System Governance Working Group.</p>

Recommendation 3

<p>Recommendation</p>	<p>Formalize the responsibilities of the RSSAC to the ICANN Board and Community in a work plan that is periodically reviewed and published; and hold the RSSAC accountable for work plan deliverables.</p>
<p>RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)</p>	<p>The RSSAC welcomes this recommendation and looks forward to discussing next steps. The RSSAC reiterates, though, that from its perspective, there is no misalignment between the understanding and expectations of the ICANN Board and RSSAC in regard to its advice and work. As with any other group within ICANN, the RSSAC adjusts its work to reflect the availability of its members and allocation of supporting resources from the ICANN organization, so it is not clear what “hold the RSSAC accountable” means in this context. The RSSAC takes several steps, on a regular basis, to share its work with the community and solicit input on where it might need to engage: The RSSAC regularly meets with the ICANN Board at every ICANN public meeting to discuss its work and items of mutual interest; provides updates on its work at ICANN public meetings; and works closely with the RSSAC liaison to the ICANN Board to make sure the ICANN Board knows when RSSAC input is relevant to its work. Since ICANN62, RSSAC work sessions have been open to observation by default.</p>
<p>Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?</p>	<p><u>According to FAIP:</u> RSSAC</p> <p><u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:</u> In March 2019, the RSSAC adopted a work plan, which is published on rssac.icann.org. RSSAC reviews this work plan annually to ensure it is current and reflective of RSSAC projects and priorities.</p>
<p>Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation</p>	<p><u>According to FAIP:</u> It would be particularly helpful to have an example of another ICANN community group that uses such a work plan.</p> <p><u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:</u></p>

	The RSSAC reviewed the work plans of the SSAC and various other community groups including policy development process working groups for models of what to adopt.
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.)	<p><u>According to FAIP:</u> Web and publication support.</p> <p><u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:</u> RSSAC support staff publishes the RSSAC work plan on rssac.icann.org after RSSAC approval.</p>
How soon after the Board accepted the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	RSSAC first published its annual work plan in March 2019 and reviewed it in December 2019.
<p>What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?</p> <p>Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months</p>	<p><u>According to FAIP:</u> Short: 3 months</p> <p><u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:</u> The implementation effort was roughly three months (January-March 2019).</p>
High-level implementation steps	<p><u>According to FAIP:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The RSSAC would develop a work plan template and share with ICANN Board/community for feedback. 2. The RSSAC would publish its work plan and regularly update it.
Proposed detailed implementation steps (based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP)	This recommendation has been implemented.
Detailed implementation costs (if applicable)	n/a

Recommendation 3a

<p>Recommendation</p>	<p>Engage in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the Root Server System and recommend any necessary audit activity to assess the current status of root servers and the root zone.</p>
<p>RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)</p>	<p>This recommendation asks the RSSAC to execute the mission in its charter. As such, the RSSAC welcomes this recommendation and looks forward to discussing next steps. The RSSAC continues to be engaged in threat assessment and risk analysis and looks forward to receiving detailed items where the ICANN community believes increased focus is needed.</p>
<p>Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?</p>	<p><u>According to FAIP:</u> RSSAC</p> <p><u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:</u></p> <p>Per the FAIP, this recommendation asks the RSSAC to execute its mission. As such, the RSSAC welcomes this recommendation. The RSSAC continues to engage in threat assessment and risk analysis and looks forward to receiving potential work items where the ICANN Board and community believe increased focus is needed. For example, in December 2019, the RSSAC published “RSSAC045: RSSAC Statement on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System”, endorsing the work of the Root Server Operators which outlines security risks for the Root Server System and general methods for mitigation. This was a request from the ICANN Board in March 2018.</p>
<p>Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation</p>	<p>Implementation of this recommendation is ongoing.</p>
<p>Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.)</p>	<p><u>According to FAIP:</u> Research support.</p> <p><u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:</u> n/a</p>

<p>How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?</p>	<p>Implementation of this recommendation is ongoing.</p>
<p>What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months</p>	<p><u>According to FAIP</u>: Medium: 1 year</p> <p><u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan</u>: Implementation of this recommendation is ongoing.</p>
<p>High-level implementation steps</p>	<p><u>According to FAIP</u>: Upon realizing the need for focused efforts on specific issues: 1. The RSSAC would develop a statement of work and launch a work party. 2. The RSSAC would review the outcomes of the threat assessment and develop a document. 3. The RSSAC would publish the document.</p>
<p>Proposed detailed implementation steps (based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP)</p>	<p>The detailed implementation steps are the same as the high-level implementation steps in the FAIP.</p>
<p>Detailed implementation costs (if applicable)</p>	<p>Costs for supporting ongoing RSSAC threat assessment and risk analysis are already assumed in standard community support from the ICANN org Policy Development Support function.</p>

Recommendation 4

Recommendation	Develop and implement a leadership training and succession plan.
RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)	The RSSAC welcomes this recommendation and looks forward to discussing next steps. As agreed upon with the ICANN Board, the establishment of the current leadership structure in 2014 was a direct result of the first organizational review of the RSSAC. The RSSAC recognizes the importance of evolving its leadership structure. Discussions about the RSSAC leadership structure are already underway. The topics of succession and training can be addressed in this context.
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<p><u>According to FAIP:</u> RSSAC, ICANN Board</p> <p><u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:</u> After robust discussions, the RSSAC updated its operational procedures in March 2019, modifying its leadership structure from model of two co-chairs to a chair and vice chair. Due to the required amendments to the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Board considered and approved this in May 2019. A Public Comment proceeding in June/July 2019 found no objections from the community. The ICANN Board approved the amendments to the ICANN Bylaws in September 2019, and the Empowered Community subsequently did not reject the action. The new provisions in the ICANN Bylaws went into effect in October 2019, and the RSSAC elected its first chair/vice chair team in December 2019.</p>
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	Amending ICANN Bylaws
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.)	<p><u>According to FAIP:</u> Drafting support</p> <p><u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:</u> ICANN Legal reviewed the proposed amendments to the ICANN Bylaws.</p>

<p>How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?</p>	<p>After the ICANN Board and Empowered Community processes concluded, implementation took less than two months.</p>
<p>What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months</p>	<p><u>According to FAIP:</u> Short-Medium: 6 months-1 year <u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:</u> The implementation effort was roughly nine months (March-December 2019).</p>
<p>High-level implementation steps</p>	<p><u>According to FAIP:</u> 1. The RSSAC would discuss its leadership structure and agree on revisions to current model or on a new model. 2. If the RSSAC revises current model, the RSSAC would implement it. 3. If the RSSAC approves a new model, the ICANN Board would adopt Bylaw changes, then the RSSAC would implement the new model.</p>
<p>Proposed detailed implementation steps (based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP)</p>	<p>This recommendation has been implemented.</p>
<p>Detailed implementation costs (if applicable)</p>	<p>n/a</p>

Recommendation 5

Recommendation	Engage more actively with the rest of ICANN and its Community.
RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)	<p>The RSSAC believes its engagement is generally appropriate given its charter and role as an advisory committee. The RSSAC welcomes this recommendation and looks forward to discussing next steps. The RSSAC recognizes the importance of improving its engagement with the ICANN community while remaining focused on its core mission and welcomes input on how to best balance between these priorities. As a path toward increased engagement, since ICANN62 the RSSAC has made its work sessions open to observation by default and regular update and information sessions will continue to be arranged. However, the RSSAC respectfully suggests that “engagement” is not an end in itself and should serve a purpose.</p> <p>The RSSAC notes that it currently maintains liaison relationships with the ICANN Board, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC), the Internet Architecture Board, the IANA Functions Operator, the Root Zone Maintainer (RZM), the Customer Standing Committee (CSC), and the Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC). The RSSAC would be willing to consider establishing additional mutually beneficial liaison relationships, too. Furthermore, the RSSAC invites the ICANN community to attend its sessions at ICANN public meetings and observe its various joint meetings (e.g., ICANN Board, OCTO, Nominating Committee, etc.).</p>
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<p><u>According to FAIP:</u> RSSAC</p> <p><u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:</u> n/a</p>
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on	n/a

implementation of this recommendation	
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.)	n/a
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	<u>According to FAIP</u> : Next ICANN public meeting <u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan</u> : Implementation of this recommendation is ongoing.
What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months	Implementation of this recommendation is ongoing.
High-level implementation steps	<u>According to FAIP</u> : The RSSAC will proactively engage with ICANN community groups about its publications. The RSSAC will continue to seek input on other possible steps toward greater engagement.
Proposed detailed implementation steps (based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP)	The RSSAC will continue to engage with the ICANN community via its established liaison relationships, open work sessions and meetings, publications, and tutorials about the Root Server System. The RSSAC leadership will also continue to work with ICANN community leaders as necessary.
Detailed implementation costs (if applicable)	Costs for supporting ongoing RSSAC engagement with the ICANN community are already assumed in standard community support from the ICANN org Policy Development Support function.

Recommendation 6a

<p>Recommendation</p>	<p>Develop a more effective and transparent process for defining RSSAC Caucus projects, engaging its members and managing its membership, managing its work, and promoting its output.</p>
<p>RWP Comments in FAIP (if applicable)</p>	<p>The RSSAC recognizes the importance of developing the projects, engagement, management, and output of the RSSAC Caucus and regularly seeks input from it about potential work items. This guides the decision-making and prioritization of the RSSAC. Currently, the RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee is evaluating the engagement and contributions of each RSSAC Caucus member. The RSSAC also reviews its operational procedures on annual basis, making adjustments as necessary to improve its function as an advisory committee and its relationship with the RSSAC Caucus.</p>
<p>Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?</p>	<p><u>According to FAIP:</u> RSSAC</p> <p><u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:</u> n/a</p>
<p>Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation</p>	<p>Rather than modifying the membership model and work processes of the RSSAC Caucus now, the RSSAC will closely follow the work and output of the Root Server System Governance Work Group. Any changes to the RSSAC and RSSAC Caucus as a result of this work will be reviewed by the RSSAC and RSSAC Caucus.</p>
<p>Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.)</p>	<p><u>According to FAIP:</u> Drafting support</p> <p><u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:</u> n/a</p>
<p>How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?</p>	<p><u>According to FAIP:</u> High priority, moderate implementation effort</p> <p><u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:</u> It will likely take roughly one year after the stakeholders of the Root Server System, including the ICANN Board,</p>

	adopt a new governance model for the Root Server System to implement changes to the RSSAC Caucus.
<p>What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion?</p> <p>Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months</p>	<p><u>According to FAIP:</u> Short – Medium: 6 months-1 year</p> <p><u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:</u> Per the work plan of the Root Server System Governance Working Group, it will take roughly a year (2020) to develop the final governance model for the Root Server System and then another year of review and approval (2021). Therefore, implementation of changes to the RSSAC and RSSAC Caucus (or their successor structures) would take place in 2022.</p>
High-level implementation steps	<p><u>According to FAIP:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The RSSAC, RSSAC Caucus, and RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee discuss how to better define, initiate, track, complete, and track work items and how to better recruit, onboard, engage, and offboard its members. 2. RSSAC operational procedures are modified/updated accordingly.
Proposed detailed implementation steps (based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP)	<p>In early 2019, the RSSAC modified how RSSAC Caucus work is conducted. All substantive work party discussions, including draft and final report reviews, occur on the RSSAC Caucus mailing list rather than on individual work party mailing lists. This promotes broader participation. The RSSAC continues to involve the RSSAC Caucus in determining its work projects and priorities.</p> <p>The RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee is assessing the individual engagement of RSSAC Caucus members. The output of this effort will provide the RSSAC with a better understanding of the levels of participation and contributions in the RSSAC Caucus.</p> <p>These two developments are incremental steps to improve RSSAC Caucus operations as the RSSAC marks five years since the establishment of the RSSAC Caucus.</p> <p>Any changes to the membership model of the RSSAC and RSSAC Caucus and the structural relationship between them as a result of Root Server System</p>

	governance evolution will be reviewed and carefully considered before modifications to charters and operational procedures.
Detailed implementation costs (if applicable)	Costs for supporting the RSSAC and RSSAC Caucus are already assumed in standard community support from the ICANN org Policy Development Support function. ICANN org has committed to support the work of the Root Server System Governance Working Group.