

## RSSAC Review Work Party Feedback on the Assessment Report, Version 2

19 February 2018

### General Comments

Comment Number	Location in Document	Suggestion	Reasoning	Notes
1	Page 5; paragraph 1, sentence 1	Replace “not judgement” with “with judgement”	The document is judgemental in many areas	
2	Page 5	Adjust dates of review	Since the timeline is being adjusted, the dates in the current version of the document need adjusting	
3	Throughout	The examiners should explain the methodology used in citing quotes.		Many of the quotes seem inflammatory.
4	Page 33; first paragraph	Paragraph states incorrect facts. Rephrase.	RSSAC’s charter clearly defines who its stakeholders are.	The examiners are conflating issues of RSO vs RSSAC stakeholders. This is a consistent problem

				throughout the document.
5	Page 46; second to last paragraph			The RSSAC support staff will review the settings for <a href="mailto:ask-icann@icann.org">ask-icann@icann.org</a> . The RSSAC administrative team has previously received and responded to queries.
6	Throughout	Include more references, especially to RSSAC charter/documents.		The review should contain more references to the documentation and publications of RSSAC. The review should be focused less on perceptions (i.e., interviews) and more on documentation.

## Comments on Principal Findings

Principal Finding	Determination	Reasoning	Notes
1	In scope		
2	In scope		
3	Incorrect conclusion	Advice is always given as the collective RSSAC. Advice is achieved through consensus and by vote.	
4	In scope		
5	In scope	RSSAC operates according to its charter.	If the finding is attempting to say that the charter should be expanded, then say so as a recommendation.
6	Incorrect conclusion	RSSAC's charter clearly states that RSSAC is accountable and responsible to the ICANN Board and community. (Same problem as #5, RSSAC operates according to its charter.)	The examiners are conflating issues of RSO accountability with RSSAC accountability. There is no confusion with who RSSAC is responsible to. There are many opinions on who the RSOs are accountable to.

7	Needs references	Should be based more on work products and less on perception.	Are the examiners implying that the charters of RZERC and SSAC are also unclear?
---	------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Comments on Findings

Finding	Determination	Reasoning	Notes
1	In scope		
2	In scope		
3	In scope		
4	In scope		
5	Needs more references	Needs more references to where RSSAC has failed to reach consensus.	RSSAC releases advice after consensus is achieved. Much advice has been released. Is the implication that RSOs should not be diverse so that consensus can be achieved (even though RSSAC does achieve consensus)?
6	Incorrect conclusion	RSSAC releases advice only when consensus is achieved. When it does release advice it does so with one voice.	
7	Incorrect conclusion	RSSAC only releases advice after consensus is achieved.	In this finding the examiners cite the word “schizophrenia” out of context. The word was used in a recent RSSAC meeting to clarify that the ICANN Office of the CTO was directing questions meant for the RSOs to RSSAC. It appears that the examiners are making an attempt at being sensational in this finding.

8	Out of scope	This finding is about RSOs instead of RSSAC.	This is workshop content and future RSSAC advice. The examiner should not taint the work of RSSAC with its opinions.
9	In scope		
10	Incorrect	The function of the NTIA was present in the RSSAC via a liaison. Since the IANA stewardship transition, that function no longer exists. The reference to <i>governments</i> in this finding is incorrect. The reference should be to the NTIA function.	The examiners are indicating that <i>governments</i> had a perspective via the NTIA liaison. It was the oversight function, not <i>governments</i> .
11	Out of scope	The examiners' scope is to review the RSSAC. Not comment on the root server system and RSO skepticism.	There is a consistent theme in this review of the examiners being judgemental about the RSOs. They suffer from scope creep even after revising the document.
12	In scope	See item 5 below.	
13	In scope		
14	In scope	See item 4 below.	Some comments are framed negatively when such framing is not necessary. Regarding the second quote, ("The RSSAC is unimportant because...") it

			would be good to know why the examiners inserted this quote. Was that an isolated opinion or a majority opinion or are the examiners trying to be sensational and inflammatory?
15	In scope		
16	In scope		The RSSAC has not received feedback that its focus is misdirected thus far. If this is the case, its stakeholders (ICANN Board and community) need to say so.
17	In scope		
18	In scope		
19	Out of scope	See item 2 below.	The examiners should not be wading into RSSAC content and being judgemental about work that is under development.
20	Out of scope	See item 2 below.	Examiners are suffering from scope creep and being judgemental on content that is outside of their scope.
21	Out of scope	Have the examiners looked at the charters or is this based on opinions?	Were the examiners asked to compare roles and scopes of ACs?

22	In scope		
23	In scope		
24	Out of scope		The RSSAC is not an operational body. This finding is trending toward a recommendation.
25	Out of scope		This finding is trending toward a recommendation.
26	In scope		
27	Not a finding.	See item 3 below.	This finding is trending toward a recommendation.
28	Out of scope	See item 2 below.	
29	Out of scope	See item 1 below.	
30	Out of scope	See item 2 below.	
31	Out of scope	See item 2 below.	
32	In scope		
33	In scope		
34	In scope		
35	In scope		
36	Out of scope	See item 2 below.	RSSAC stakeholders are defined in its charter. The examiners are conflating RSO issues with RSSAC.
37	Out of scope	See item 2 below.	Again, RSSAC stakeholders are defined in its charter. The examiners are conflating RSO issues with RSSAC.



38	In scope		This finding is based on perception. The examiners should include references to documentation on RSSAC transparency.
39	In scope		
40	In scope		
41	In scope		
42	In scope		
43	In scope		
44	In scope		
45	In scope		
46	In scope		The RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee includes Caucus members.
47	In scope		This finding is based on perception. The examiners should include references to documentation on RSSAC transparency.
48	In scope		
49	In scope		
50	In scope	See item 4 below.	
51	In scope		

## RWP Reasonings

1. Sections of the report conflate the Root Server Operators (RSO) or Root Ops, with the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). The RSOs are not parts of ICANN and are therefore out of scope for the review.
2. The reviewer appears to take a snapshot of the RSSAC evolution discussion and make judgements. This is out of scope for the review for the following reasons:
  - a. In the opinion of the RSSAC Review Working Party (RWP), the independent examiner should ask whether the content of the RSSAC discusses is relevant. The independent examiner should not pass judgement on the merits of the working content.
  - b. The content itself is in development and continues to change significantly. Many of the points made by the independent examiner have already changed or are no longer relevant.
3. Some findings are trending towards and lend themselves towards very specific recommendations.
4. Some comments are framed negatively when such framing is not necessary.
5. Sections of the report portray RSSAC as a self-interested group with an interest in preserving its influence in light of future technical developments. However, the RSSAC has stated clearly in its report:

“On the topic of future evolution of the root server system, the RSSAC reached consensus on the following statements:

1. It is desirable to define the key technical elements of potential root operators that would be a critical part of a yet to be defined root server operator designation process.
2. The RSSAC recognizes that root server operators must stay ahead of capacity and performance demands.
3. The RSSAC should craft a strategy for better transparency.
4. Emerging technologies affecting the RSS should be embraced as long as the Internet globally unique public namespace (as expressed in IAB statement in RFC 2826) is preserved.”