



18 October 2019

Subject: SSAC2019-08: SSAC Response to ATRT3 Group Survey

To: Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Patrick Kane, ATRT3 Review Co-Chairs

Dear Cheryl and Patrick,

Please find below the SSAC Response to the Group Survey for the third Accountability and Transparency Review (ATRT3).

The response was approved by the SSAC on 18 October 2019. The SSAC would like to thank ICANN's Multistakeholder Strategy and Strategic Initiatives (MSSI) team for managing the review process, and the ATRT3 Team for their hard work.

Rod Rasmussen  
Chair, ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee

**Note: SSAC answers are recorded in bold and highlighted yellow. Italicized questions only appear in the survey based on a response to a previous question.**

### Accountability and Transparency Review (ATRT3) Survey: GROUPS

1. Which SO, AC, GNSO constituent body, or RALO (Structure) is responding?

- SO/AC: ASO
- SO/AC: At-Large
- SO/AC: ccNSO
- SO/AC: GAC
- SO/AC: GNSO
- SO/AC: NomCom
- SO/AC: RSSAC
- **SO/AC: SSAC**
- GNSO constituent body: Commercial Stakeholder Group
- GNSO constituent body: Commercial Business Users
- GNSO constituent body: Intellectual Property
- GNSO constituent body: Internet Service Providers
- GNSO constituent body: Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group
- GNSO constituent body: Non-Commercial Users
- GNSO constituent body: Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns
- GNSO constituent body: Registrars Stakeholder Group
- GNSO constituent body: Registries Stakeholder Group
- RALOS: AFRALO
- RALOS: APRALO
- RALOS: EURALO
- RALOS: LACRALO
- RALOS: NARALO

**Please note that all questions in this survey only cover the period from October 2016 (IANA Stewardship Transition) to August 2019.**

### BOARD-RELATED QUESTIONS

2. Please indicate your Structure's satisfaction with the Board's performance overall:

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- **No opinion**
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

*Please answer if you selected 'very dissatisfied' or 'somewhat dissatisfied' to question 2. If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements?*

3. How does your Structure feel regarding the Board's interaction with your SO/AC?

- Very satisfied
- **Satisfied**
- No opinion
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Please answer if you selected 'very dissatisfied' or 'somewhat dissatisfied' to question 3. If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements?

4. Does your Structure consider the diversity amongst Board members satisfactory?

- **Yes**
- No

Please answer if you selected 'no' to question 4. Which areas of diversity do you feel need improvement? (select all diversity factors you think apply):

- Geographical/regional representation
- Language
- Gender
- Age
- Physical disability
- Diverse skills
- Stakeholder group or constituency

Please explain:

Please answer if you selected 'no' to question 4. Do you have any suggestions for improvements?

5. How satisfied is your Structure with the Nominating Committee's selection of Directors for the ICANN Board:

- Very satisfied
- **Satisfied**
- No opinion
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Please answer if you selected 'very dissatisfied' or 'somewhat dissatisfied' to question 5. If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements?

6. Please indicate your Structure's satisfaction with the accountability of the Board under the new accountability mechanisms such as the Empowered Community:

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- **No opinion**
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Please answer if you selected 'very dissatisfied' or 'somewhat dissatisfied' to question 6. If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements?

7. Rate the mechanisms ensuring the Board's transparency:

- Very effective
- **Effective**
- No opinion
- Somewhat ineffective
- Ineffective

Please answer if you selected 'ineffective' or 'somewhat ineffective' to question 7. If ineffective or somewhat ineffective, do you have any suggestions for improvements?

8. How would your Structure rate the importance of the Board implementing the Transparency Recommendations from the CCWG-Accountability WS2?

- Very important
- **Somewhat important**
- No opinion
- Somewhat not important
- Not important

9. Is your Structure satisfied with the Board's decision-taking process?

- **Yes**
- No

Please answer if you selected 'no' to question 9. Do you have any suggestions for improvements?

10. Is your Structure aware of the training program for the Board members?

- Yes
- **No**

**Note: The SSAC is aware of the training program's existence but is not aware of what it entails.**

11. How satisfied is your Structure with the financial information that is provided to the public by ICANN?

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- No opinion
- **Somewhat dissatisfied**
- Very dissatisfied

Please answer if you selected "very dissatisfied" or "somewhat dissatisfied" to question 11. If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements?

**As an SO/AC the SSAC does not have a clear picture of our impact on the budget or how to steward our portion of the budget towards ICANN's greater goals. That information is purposefully kept away from the SO/ACs. In addition, SO/ACs cannot cross compare their budgets to other SO/ACs.**

12. How would your Structure rate the usability of the financial information?

- Very useful
- Somewhat useful
- No opinion
- **Somewhat not useful**
- Not useful

#### GAC-RELATED QUESTIONS

13. Should GAC accountability be improved?

- Yes
- No

**No response from the SSAC.**

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 13. What would you suggest?

14. Should GAC transparency be improved?

- Yes
- **No**

*Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 14. What would you suggest?*

15. How satisfied is your Structure with the interactions the GAC has with the Board?

- **Very satisfied**
- Satisfied
- No opinion
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

*Please answer if you selected 'very dissatisfied' or 'somewhat dissatisfied' to question 15. If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements?*

16. How satisfied is your Structure with the interactions the GAC has with the SO/ACs?

- Very satisfied
- **Satisfied**
- No opinion
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

*Please answer if you selected 'very dissatisfied' or 'somewhat dissatisfied' to question 16. If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements?*

## TRANSPARENCY

17. Has your Structure ever filed a Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP) request with ICANN?

- Yes
- **No**

*Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 17. What information was your Structure seeking?*

*Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 17. Did your Structure receive the information it requested in full?*

- Yes
- No

*Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 17. Did the material that your Structure received answer its question?*

- Yes
- No

*Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 17. Please feel free to add any other thoughts you have about the Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP) process.*

18. Do you believe the information ICANN makes available on the icann.org website should be better organized to facilitate searching for specific topics?

- **Yes**
- No

19. Do you believe the information ICANN makes available on the community wiki website should be better organized to facilitate searching on the wiki?

- Yes
- No

20. Is your Structure aware of ICANN's open data mechanisms, including the Information Transparency Initiative (ITI) or the Open Data Initiative (ODI), or of ICANN's transparency policies more generally?

- Yes
- No

### SO/ACs

21. Are ICANN's mechanisms sufficient to generate policies which are acceptable to the global Internet community?

- Yes
- No

*Please answer if you selected 'no' to question 21. Where do you think these shortcomings lie, and how could they be improved?*

**The SSAC observes the following shortcomings: vested interests, lack of compromise, representation issues, volunteer burnout, unbalanced expertise**

22. What procedures do you have in place within your Structure for electing NomCom representatives?

**Per SSAC Operational Procedures Version 7.0 (<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/operational-procedures-30nov18-en.pdf>), "The SSAC may choose to elect an outward liaison to other ICANN Advisory Committees and Supporting Organizations, at the discretion of a majority of SSAC members and with the agreement of the receiving Advisory Committee or Supporting Organization."**

23. Do you feel that the NomCom, as currently constituted, is a sufficient mechanism for fostering nominations that have adequate stakeholder and community buy in?

- Yes
- No

*Please answer if you selected 'no' to question 23. Where do you think these shortcomings lie, and how could they be improved?*

**It is an inefficient process, the Board may be better served by using an external recruitment agency to propose candidates subject to community approval. For further comments, please see SSAC2018-03: SSAC Comments on the Independent Review of the ICANN Nominating Committee Assessment Report (<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac2018-03-14feb18-en.pdf>).**

24. Does your Structure have formalized or instituted term limits for membership?

- Yes
- No
- Does not apply

25. Does your Structure have formalized or instituted term limits for leadership?

- Yes
- No

26. What is your Structure's feedback regarding its selection of Board members or non-voting Liaisons to the Board?

**No feedback - the SSAC is satisfied with the current process.**

27. Does your Structure have a transparency policy?

- Yes
- No

*Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 27. Please describe or provide a link to any formalized transparency processes/protocols/policy that your Structure uses.*

**Please see SSAC operational Procedures V7.0 (<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/operational-procedures-30nov18-en.pdf>), Section 4: SSAC Work Plan and Activity Reporting.**

*Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 27. When was the last time it was revised?*

**The Operational Procedures were last updated on 30 November 2018.**

28. Does your Structure have a conflict of interest policy?

- Yes
- No

**SSAC does not have a conflict of interest policy, we have a disclosure of interest policy, please see SSAC operational Procedures V7.0 (<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/operational-procedures-30nov18-en.pdf>), Section 2.3: New Member Selection and Appendix B: SSAC Member Disclosure of Interests.**

*Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 28. Please describe or provide a link to any formalized conflicts of interest processes/protocols/policy that your Structure uses.*

*Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 28. Does this include an evaluation component?*

- Yes
- No

*Please answer if you selected 'yes' to the question above. Please provide details:*

*Please answer if you selected 'no' to question 28. Has your structure ever experienced or perceived challenges related to conflicts of interest?*

- Yes
- No

## PUBLIC COMMENTS

29. Please rate how effective the current system of Public Comments is for gathering community input.

- Very effective
- Effective
- No opinion
- Somewhat ineffective
- Ineffective

30. Does your Structure believe the concept of Public Comment, as currently implemented, should be re-examined?

- Yes
- No

31. Has your Structure responded to a Public Comment in the last year?

- Yes

- No

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 31. How many responses has your Structure submitted to Public Comments in the last year?

- 1
- 2
- 5 or more
- 10 or more

4:

1. SAC106: SSAC Comments on Evolving the Governance of the Root Server System
2. SAC104: SSAC Comment on Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process
3. SAC103: SSAC Response to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group Initial Report
4. SAC102: SSAC Comment on the Updated Plan for Continuing the Root KSK Rollover

Please answer if you responded 'no' to question 31. What prevented your Structure from responding?

- Did not have the time to produce a detailed response
- Subject was too complex
- Consultation document was too long
- Language issues
- Time to respond was too short
- Other:

32. Would your Structure respond more often to Public Comments if the consultation included short and precise questions regarding the subject matter in a Survey Monkey or similar format?

- Strongly agree
- **Agree**
- No opinion
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

**The SSAC would like to note if this was done effectively and was not the only way to respond to public comment it would be helpful.**

33. Does your Structure agree that responses made to Public Comments by individuals and external organizations/groups be considered equally?

- **Strongly agree**
- Agree
- No opinion
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

34. Does your Structure agree that the responses made to Public Comments by SO/ACs have more weight than other comments?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- **No opinion**
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

35. Does your Structure agree that the responses made to Public Comments by the Board have more weight than other comments?

- Strongly agree



- Agree
- No opinion
- **Disagree**
- Strongly disagree

36. How useful are staff reports on Public Comments?

- **Very useful**
- Useful
- No opinion
- Not very useful
- Not useful at all

37. Does your Structure agree that staff reports on Public Comments clearly indicate if suggestions made by the commenters were accepted and how they were included?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- **No opinion**
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

38. Does your Structure agree that staff reports on Public Comments clearly indicate if suggestions made by the commenters were rejected and the reason they were rejected?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- **No opinion**
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

#### SUPPORT FOR ICANN DECISIONS

39. Does your Structure believe the Internet community generally supports the decisions made by the Board?

- Yes
- **No**

40. Does your Structure generally support the decisions made by the Board?

- Yes, strongly support
- **Yes, support**
- No opinion
- No, do not support
- No, strongly do not support

**The SSAC would like to note there are a few exceptions to this response.**

#### POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (PDPs)

41. What role should SO or ACs play in fostering buy-in from their community to ICANN's policy-making?

**SOs and ACs should either provide input during the policy development process or provide comment on specific policy proposals.**

42. How could your structure improve this?

**No suggestions.**

## SPECIFIC AND ORGANIZATIONAL REVIEW

43. How would your Structure rate the effectiveness of the specific reviews (ATRT, SSR, RDS) as they are currently structured in the ICANN Bylaws?

- Very effective
- Effective
- No opinion
- Somewhat ineffective
- **Ineffective**

**The SSAC would like to note that the current structure of specific reviews is overly burdensome and time-consuming on volunteers and does not deliver the desired outcomes. Please see SSAC2018-18 and SSAC2018-19 for SSAC's comments on Short- and Long-Term Options to Adjust the Timeline for Specific Reviews (<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac2018-18-24jul18-en.pdf>) (<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac2018-19-24jul18-en.pdf>).**

44. Should specific reviews (ATRT, CCT, RDS, SSR) be reconsidered or amended?

- **Yes**
- No

45. How would your Structure rate the effectiveness of organizational reviews (those reviewing SO/ACs as they are currently structured in the ICANN Bylaws)?

- Very effective
- **Effective**
- No opinion
- Somewhat ineffective
- Ineffective

46. Should organizational reviews be reconsidered or amended?

- **Yes**
- No

*Please answer if you responded "yes" to question 46. Should organizational reviews continue to be undertaken by external consultants?*

- **Yes** (add comments re: quality of reviewers, care selecting reviewers, have reviewed SO/AC work with ICANN org/Board to align on content/scope of review (terms of reference))
- No

**The SSAC would like to note that while it believes that external consultants should continue conducting organizational reviews, the quality of the reviews is highly dependent on the quality of reviewers and the care in selecting external reviewers. The SSAC suggests that all SO/ACs work closely with ICANN org and the Board to align on the scope and content of review prior to hiring external consultants in order to ensure high quality reviews.**

## ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATORS

47. Has your Structure looked at the ICANN Accountability Indicators which can be found at <https://www.icann.org/accountability-indicators>?

- Yes
- **No**

*Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 47. How would your Structure rate their usefulness overall?*

- Very useful

- Useful
- No opinion
- Not very useful
- Not useful at all

Please answer if you responded 'yes' to question 47. How would your Structure rate these for effectiveness in measuring the accountability of ICANN?

- Very effective
- Effective
- No opinion
- Somewhat ineffective
- Ineffective

### PRIORITIZATION AND RATIONALIZATION OF ACTIVITIES

48. Should the ATRT3 make recommendations about prioritization and rationalization of ICANN activities?

- **Yes**
- No

**The SSAC would like to clarify that the ATRT3 should make basic, high-level recommendations. The SSAC believes the Board is responsible for synthesizing all of the recommendations and making prioritization recommendations to the community for community input before proceeding with instructing the org to implement recommendations.**

Please answer if you selected 'no' to question 48. Whose responsibility does your Structure think it should be?

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 48. Should such recommendations include a process to retire recommendations as it becomes apparent that the community will never get to them or they have been overtaken by other events?

- **Yes**
- No

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 48. Should such recommendations aim to provide a general approach for prioritizing and rationalizing work for ICANN?

- **Yes**
- No

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 48. Should the mechanism for making recommendations on prioritization and rationalization only apply to PDPs, reviews and their recommendations, or include other operational aspects in ICANN? (*skip*)

- PDPs and Reviews
- Include other operational aspects

Please answer if you selected 'include other operational aspects' to "Should the mechanism for making recommendations on prioritization and rationalization only apply to PDPs, reviews and their recommendations, or include other operational aspects in ICANN?" What does your Structure think these other operational aspects should include?

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 48. Should the community or representative(s) of the community be involved as a decisional participant in any mechanism which makes recommendations for prioritizing and rationalizing work for ICANN?

- **Yes**
- No

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 48. Do you think the Empowered Community would be a good mechanism for making recommendations on prioritizing and rationalizing if its role was amended to allow this?

Yes

**No**

Please answer if you selected 'no' to the question above. Is there an existing structure which could fill this role?

**The Empowered Community only includes part of the community, the ability to provide feedback on prioritization and rationalization of activities should be offered to the entire ICANN community (specifically including the SSAC and RSSAC). For instance, an improved public comment process could be a useful mechanism for inclusive consultation to solicit a broader opinion base.**

**The SSAC is concerned there is a gap in the community's general ability to prioritize Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR) related recommendations because the entire community is not aligned on common goals. The SSAC would like to note it sees indications the Board is recently prioritizing SSR issues.**

**END OF SURVEY**