



**RSSAC Review  
Status Report 12 April 2018  
Draft Recommendations**

Prepared by Interisle Consulting Group for the  
RSSAC Review Working Party (RWP)

## Schedule

- ◆ Draft Assessment Report (findings) delivered on 9 February 2018 for discussion with RWP on 15 February 2018
- ◆ Draft Assessment Report (findings) published on 27 February 2018 for public consultation
- ◆ Presentation at ICANN61 on 14 March 2018
- ◆ Draft Recommendations delivered on 2 April 2018 for **discussion with RWP on 12 April 2018**
- ◆ Draft Final Report published for public comment (40 days) on 27 April 2018
- ◆ Final Report submitted for publication 2 July 2018

# Recommendation 1

Modify the RSSAC membership criteria to allow the RSSAC to recruit a variety of skills, perspectives, and interests that include but are not limited to those available from the root server operator organizations.

(a) Extend RSSAC membership by invitation to any qualified person.

This is the SSAC model—recruit the expertise you need, with confirmation/ratification by the Board. The RSOs might retain their prerogative to appoint representatives to the RSSAC, but the RSSAC could recruit members from other sources as well.

(b) Let individual RSOs decide whether or not to participate.

Some RSOs are interested in the RSSAC, some are not; some RSOs have the resources to commit to RSSAC activities, others do not. Admit any RSO that wishes to participate, but do not require every RSO to do so.

## Recommendation 2

Resolve the apparent mismatch between the charter and operational procedures of the RSSAC and the requirements and expectations of the ICANN Board and Community for interaction with the root server system.

The apparent mismatch between what ICANN needs from an interface to the root server system and what the RSSAC is currently chartered to provide suggests that either the RSSAC scope should be expanded or the attention and expectations of the Board and Community should be explicitly redirected away from the RSSAC to some other group.

(a) Document the rationale for the architecture of the root server system.

The RSSAC could improve the quality of discussions about the ICANN/RSS relationship by clearly documenting the rationale for the current RSS architecture, particularly with respect to RSO diversity and independence.

## Recommendation 3

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.

Constructing and periodically revisiting a formal work plan would align the understanding and expectations of both the Board and the RSSAC, and enable the Board to hold the RSSAC accountable for specific deliverables rather than general undefined advice.

It would also help to dispel the erroneous impression that the RSSAC is an “association” of the RSOs, in which the distinction between RSSAC accountability and RSO accountability is too often lost.

## Recommendation 3abc

(a) 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.

This is a direct quotation from the RSSAC charter.

(b) Coordinate the gathering and publishing of meaningful data about the root server system.

Pursue and extend the RSSAC's previous recommendation in RSSAC002 that individual RSOs collect and publish data in a standard format for a standard set of metrics.

(c) Assess and report on the status of compliance with the recommendations of RSSAC001.

## Recommendation 4

Develop and implement a leadership training and succession plan.

The membership criteria for the RSSAC do not actively select for leadership skills, but as the evolution of the RSSAC since its reformation in 2014 demonstrates, leadership matters.

## Recommendation 5

Engage more actively with the rest of ICANN and its Community.

More visible engagement with other ICANN Advisory Committees, Supporting Organizations, review teams, and task forces would contribute to fulfillment of the RSSAC mandate to “[c]ommunicate on matters relating to the operation of the Root Servers and their multiple instances with the Internet technical community and the ICANN community.”

It would also help to dispel the community perception that the RSSAC is a closed and secretive group.



## Recommendation 6

Clarify the role and responsibility of the RSSAC with respect to other groups with adjacent or overlapping remits, including the SSAC, the RZERC, and the RSSAC Caucus.

Only the RSSAC and RSSAC Caucus charters and operating procedures are within the scope of the RSSAC, but clarity in these documents with respect to roles and responsibilities would be easier to achieve in collaboration with the SSAC and the RZERC.

## Recommendation 6abc

(a) 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.

(b) In cooperation with the SSAC, develop and publish a statement that clearly distinguishes the roles and responsibilities of the RSSAC and the SSAC, describes how they are complementary with respect to their shared interests in security and stability, and establishes a framework for collaboration on issues of mutual concern.

(c) In cooperation with the RZERC and the SSAC, develop and publish a statement that clearly distinguishes the roles and responsibilities of the RSSAC, the RZERC, and the SSAC with respect to the evolution of the DNS root system (within the scope of ICANN's mission).

## Next Steps

- ◆ Revision of Findings and Recommendations based on results of RWP and public consultations
- ◆ Draft Final Report published for public comment on 27 April 2018
- ◆ Revision of Draft Final Report based on results of public comment
- ◆ Final Report published on 2 July 2018