

Subject: [Ext] RSS GWG board report

Date: Thursday, August 5, 2021 at 6:29:14 PM Eastern Daylight Time

From: Ted Hardie

To: maem@nic.ad.jp, Carlos Reyes

Dear Akinori,

As

you likely have heard from Tripti Sinha and Lito Ibarra, the RSS GWG held a joint meeting in late June with the RSOs to discuss some structural concerns they had with our draft proposal. The approved minutes of that meeting are here:

<https://community.icann.org/display/soacabout/Teleconferences+and+Work+Sessions?preview=/120820205/167544141/RSS%20GWG%20Teleconference%20%2332%20Minutes.pdf>.

While

we expected revisions based on their input, that conversation included a fundamental concern about how and whether representatives from the root server community can act on behalf of other root server community members. That discussion derived from interventions on the use of the representative model in the GWG, but the question is much larger, as it reads on what forms of governance would be acceptable to the RSOs.

As

a result, the RSS GWG asked the RSO community what representative models, if any, are acceptable to the RSOs. The answer we received was:

There is at present no consensus among the RSOs concerning what, if any, representative models might be acceptable in a future RSS Governance Structure. While the RSOs will give special attention to this question in their ongoing discussion of the RSS Governance Structure Success Criteria document, we anticipate that a more complete answer will emerge only later in that process as we have the opportunity to identify and discuss issues arising.

This is new and untested territory for the RSOs, who have never been represented in a governance structure by anyone other than ourselves and who wish to take extraordinary care to support the health of the Internet by limiting the risk of institutional "capture" presented by any such structure. (These principles are further expressed in RSSAC042 and RSSAC037.)

With no current consensus among the RSOs on a representative model, it remains important that all of the RSOs are engaged individually with the GWG process.

They

have also separately indicated that the "RSS Governance Structure Success Criteria document" is under active development and that they anticipate providing it as an input to the RSS GWG at some

point during September. We have tentatively scheduled a joint meeting for September 23rd.

The

RSS GWG discussed what edits or changes could be made to the current proposal in advance of receiving this document, and it has concluded that it is best to suspend the work of the group for a few weeks until the document has been received. Once we have received it, we will begin an assessment of what models are available that will accomplish the goals set out for the RSS GWG.

As

I noted above, the original interventions on this topic focused on the use of the representative model for the RSS GWG, which has three participating members from the RSO community. If it remains the case that the RSOs believe that all RSOs must be "engaged individually with the RSS GWG process", it may be useful to consider a restructuring of the RSS GWG group and process. While the RSS GWG can seek input very broadly, its membership is not currently designed to include each RSO individually.

best
regards,

Ted
Hardie