24 August 2020

Subject: SSAC2020-10: SSAC Review Detailed Implementation Report - Updated

To: Lars Hoffman, Director, ICANN MSSI Organizational Effectiveness
             Reviews

Dear Lars,

Below please find the updated SSAC Review Detailed Implementation Report for the second
organizational review of the SSAC. This version corrects an error in the introduction section by
removing Recommendations 24 and 25 from the list of completed recommendations in the first
dot point and clarifies those recommendations which had already been reported as complete in
the previous report on 19 December 2019. There are no other changes to the report.

Best Regards,

Rod Rasmussen
Chair, ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee

SSAC2 Review
Detailed Implementation Report

25 June 2020

Status of This Document

At ICANN67 in March 2020, the ICANN Board accepted the SSAC2
Review Detailed Implementation Plan published on 19 December 2019,
including the implementation approach contained within. The ICANN
Board directed the SSAC2 Review Implementation Work Party to
continue implementation and to provide updates to the Organizational
Effectiveness Committee of the ICANN Board (OEC) through written
implementation reports on progress every six months.

Accordingly, the following report by the SSAC Review Implementation
Work Group contains the necessary updates. It contains a
comprehensive list of all accepted recommendations, ten of which
were completed before the 19 December 2019 report (1, 2, 11, 12, 14,
15, 19, 20, 28, 30). Readers should direct their attention to the
following:

- Recommendations 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 16, 26, and 27 been completed
  by SSAC since the 19 December 2019 report. SSAC considers
  these items to be closed. Updates as of June 2020 are provided
  below.
- Recommendations 9, 10, 18, 24, 25, and 29 are in the
  implementation process. These are the only recommendations
  that remain to be completed. Below SSAC provides updates as of
  June 2020.

Other notes:

- The sections labelled "Detailed implementation costing": costs are noted
  in these sections only if yearly budget allocations are needed, or if a
  project is needed to execute.

- Most recommendations require the help of SSAC's ICANN support staff to
  execute, and SSAC assumes these costs will be provided as part of staff's
  standard duties, and that at least the current staffing levels will be
  maintained in the future. Where usual staff support is needed, the
  "Detailed implementation costing" sections are marked "n/a".

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,	According to FAAIP: n/a
ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	
Expected budget implications once implemented	According to FAAIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAAIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAAIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	According to FAAIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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	According to FAAIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (May 20): Complete – no implementation required
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 FAIIP (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?	According to FAAIP: SSAC Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	None
Expected budget implications once implemented	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Easy Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Low Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	According to FAIIP: Already done. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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>According to FAIIP:</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". <u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (June 2020):</u> Complete – no implementation required
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP)	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 FAIIP (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?	According to FAIIP: SSAC Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Expected budget implications once implemented	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Easy Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Improved Communications Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	According to FAIIP: Shortly thereafter Board decision Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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>According to FAIIP:</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.
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP)	Work to update the SSAC Operational Procedures per the above is currently underway; expected to be completed by end of February 2020. <u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (May 20):</u> Complete – Section 3.4 of SSAC Operational Procedures v8 issued on 12 February 2020 has been amended as above. No further implementation required.
Detailed implementation costing	n/a

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 FAIIP (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?	According to FAIIP: ICANN Board, ICANN Staff, SSAC Board Liaison Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: Will require assistance from ICANN staff Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	According to FAIIP: To be determined by ICANN Board and Staff. This will require some time from Board staff support. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Expected budget implications once implemented	According to FAIIP: To be determined by ICANN Board and Staff. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: TBD in discussion with ICANN Board and Staff Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Improved Governance Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	According to FAIIP: TBD in discussion with ICANN Board and Staff Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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	According to FAIIP: 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 (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP)	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 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. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (June 2020): Complete – Section 3.5 of SSAC Operational Procedures v8 issued on 12 February 2020 has been amended to read: "The SSAC Board Liaison should work with the ICANN Board and ICANN Staff to ensure that the Board Action Request Register (ARR) adequately captures the information required to understand the status of advice for the work product from when it is given through implementation." No further implementation required.
Detailed implementation costing	Staff time

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 FAIIP (if applicable)	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. 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. 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. Another goal is better communication about the implementation status of Board resolutions.
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	According to FAIIP: SSAC, ICANN Board, ICANN Board support staff Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Expected budget implications once implemented	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How would you rate the potential ease of implementation for this recommendation? Please consider the impact on needed resources,	According to FAIIP: High, easy Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:

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)	According to FAIIP: Improved effectiveness of SSAC and ICANN Board. Improved governance, transparency, and Improved communications. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	According to FAIIP: Shortly thereafter Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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	According to FAIIP: 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 performed by the ICANN Board Liaison and SSAC Admin Committee. 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.
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP)	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. Work to update Operational Procedures per the above is currently underway; this will provide for ongoing reviews. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (June 2020):

	Complete – Section 3.5 of SSAC Operational Procedures v8 issued on 12 February 2020 has been amended to read: "The SSAC Board Liaison, in conjunction with the SSAC Support Staff and SSAC Admin Committee, will actively review the implementation state of all advice to the ICANN Board, ensuring that all action items are listed in the ARR in accordance with the Board Resolution. For any aspects of action items that cannot be resolved by communication with the ICANN Organization, the SSAC Board Liaison will follow-up with the ICANN Board when advice has not yet been addressed or when progress is unclear." No further implementation required.
Detailed implementation costing	n/a

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 FAIIP (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?	According to FAIIP: SSAC Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	According to FAIIP: None (although takes up a lot of SSAC member/volunteer time.) Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Expected budget implications once implemented	According to FAIIP: None. Requires continued help of SSAC support staff. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Medium Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Community participation Medium Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How soon after the Board acceptance	According to FAIIP: Shortly thereafter

of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	<u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:</u>
What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months	done
High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board	<u>According to FAIIP:</u> SSAC Admin Committee to monitor and manage as part of ongoing operations. <u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (June 2020):</u> Complete – SSAC Admin Committee monitors all tasks with work deadlines and sets internal deadlines that enable external deadlines to be met. No further implementation required.
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP)	See High-level implementation steps above
Detailed implementation costing	n/a

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?	According to FAIIP: SSAC Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: SSAC annual workshop Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	According to FAIIP: Continuance of SSAC annual workshop Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Easy to implement Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Improved service to community Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	According to FAIIP: Already underway Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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	According to FAIIP: 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.
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP)	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. 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. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (June 2020): Complete – The first paragraph of Section 3.1 of SSAC Operational Procedures v8 issued on 12 February 2020 has been amended to read: "In 2019, the SSAC undertook a detailed environmental scan to identify SSR threats. The risk analysis flowing from the environmental scan will provide a prioritized list of topics for future SSAC work. In subsequent years, the SSAC will undertake at its annual Workshop a lightweight annual review of the environmental scan and risk analysis geared towards adjusting work priorities and identifying any new emerging SSR threats. A more substantial review will be undertaken triennially." No further implementation required.
Detailed implementation costing	n/a

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 FAIIP (if applicable)	n/a
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	According to FAIIP: SSAC Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Expected budget implications once implemented	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Medium Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Medium Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	According to FAIIP: 2020 membership review process Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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	According to FAIIP: 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.
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP)	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. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (June 2020): In progress – The following sentence was added to the first paragraph of Section 2.3 of SSAC Operational Procedures v8 issued on 12 February 2020: "The Membership Committee is guided in its selection of new members by the outcomes of the SSAC annual process to review SSR threats and update its planned future work, from which a determination of skills needs will be derived. The Committee will be further guided by consideration of desired diversity attributes as advised by the SSAC Administrative Committee after consultation with all SSAC members." After reviewing the text of Section 2.5 of the SSAC Operational Procedures, it was decided that no amendment to the procedures relating to Annual Member Review was required. The SSAC Skills Survey has undergone significant review and rewrite to simplify the format but also to better organize, clarify and update the skills list. It has also incorporated some questions to collect non-technical skills and demographic data to assess the SSAC's diversity in those aspects. All SSAC Members completed the new skills survey in February 2020 and this information has been collated and is being used by the Admin Committee to: - Develop, with the support of the ICANN Communications Team, outreach materials for recruitment of new members,

	- Develop, with the support of the ICANN Communications Team, appropriate messaging for inclusion on the SSAC public website, and - Identify skills in existing SSAC Members for proposed new Work Party topics.
Detailed implementation costing	n/a

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?	According to FAIIP: SSAC Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Expected budget implications once implemented	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Easy to implement Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Improved communications Easy Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	According to FAIIP: Already underway Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:

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>According to FAIIP:</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 FAIIP)	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. <u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (June 2020):</u> In progress – The SSAC Admin Committee is working with the ICANN Communications Team to develop appropriate messaging.
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 FAIIP (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?	According to FAIIP: SSAC Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	According to FAIIP: N/A Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Expected budget implications once implemented	According to FAIIP: See above. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Medium Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Efficient process. Easy Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	According to FAIIP: As needed Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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>According to FAIIP:</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 FAIIP)	Will be executed if and when needed. <u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (June 2020):</u> Complete – no implementation required
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 FAIIP (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?	According to FAIIP: SSAC and ICANN Staff Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	According to FAIIP: Research Fellow funding from ICANN Org. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Expected budget implications once implemented	According to FAIIP: Research Fellow funding from ICANN Org. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Hard Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Efficiency delivery, relieve some burden being imposed on SSAC volunteers Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	According to FAIIP: Immediately Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:

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	According to FAIIP: 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 FAIIP)	Per high-level implementation steps, SSAC has obtained Research Fellow assistance, and will maintain it; Research Fellows are currently engaged in SSAC work. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (June 2020): Complete – no further implementation required
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 FAIIP (if applicable)	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. 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. 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. 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.
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	According to FAIIP: SSAC, other bodies with ICANN Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Expected budget implications once implemented	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Medium Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How would you assess the potential	According to FAIIP:

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)	Improved community process Medium Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	According to FAIIP: Immediately Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP)	n/a as above Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (June 2020): Complete – no implementation required
Detailed implementation costing	Significant volunteer time cost. Requires continued SSAC travel support to ICANN meetings, 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 FAIIP (if applicable)	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. Some of those relevant efforts have placed significant burdens on SSAC and its members.
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Expected budget implications once implemented	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:

Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP)	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. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (June 2020): Complete – no implementation required
Detailed implementation costing	Significant volunteer time cost. Requires continued SSAC travel support to ICANN meetings, at least the current levels.

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 FAIIP (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?	According to FAIIP: SSAC Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	According to FAIIP: N/A Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Expected budget implications once implemented	According to FAIIP: N/A Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Medium Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Improved process Medium Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:

High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board	<u>According to FAIIP</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 FAIIP)	Update to Operational Procedures underway as per above. <u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (June 2020)</u>: Complete – The first sentence of Section 3.2.4 of SSAC Operational Procedures v8 issued on 12 February 2020 has been amended to read: "Once the SSAC has approved an initial draft work product, the next step is to identify affected parties in the ICANN community and, if the work party deems it necessary, to engage them in a preliminary review or notify them that the SSAC plans to publish a document on a given topic."
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 FAIIP (if applicable)	After consulting with the Admin Committee, plans are underway to incorporate this recommendation by adding the following to the SSAC website. • 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?	According to FAIIP: SSAC Admin Committee and support staff Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Expected budget implications once implemented	According to FAIIP: N/A Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Medium Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:

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)	According to FAIIP: More relevant and findable SSAC publications for Board and Community. Low/Easy Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	According to FAIIP: N/A Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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	According to FAIIP: SSAC Admin Committee to lead efforts to improve the content of the SSAC Web site.
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP)	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. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (June20): In progress – The SSAC Admin Committee worked with the ICANN Support Staff and Web Support Staff to develop appropriate wording for the public website. Updates to the current website have been developed and submitted but have not yet been posted by the Web Support Staff. We believe work on this effort has been delayed by other priorities of the Web Support Staff.
Detailed implementation costing	TBD. May require at least a revamp of the SSAC section of the ICANN web site. All other SOs and ACs (except RSSAC) have 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?	According to FAIIP: ICANN Board, SSAC Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: N/A Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	According to FAIIP: N/A Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Expected budget implications once implemented	According to FAIIP: N/A Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: N/A Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: No new implementation needed Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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?	According to FAIIP: N/A Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:

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	According to FAIIP: N/A
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP)	Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (June 2020): Complete – no implementation required
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 FAIIP (if applicable)	None
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	According to FAIIP: SSAC Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Expected budget implications once implemented	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Medium, requires work by Membership Committee Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Greater membership engagement High priority, for productivity Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	According to FAIIP: Immediately Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months	n/a

Long: ≤ 30 months	
High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board	<u>According to FAIIP:</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 FAIIP)	<u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (June 2020):</u> Complete – no specific implementation required
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 FAIIP (if applicable)	None
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	According to FAIIP: SSAC, at its Annual Workshop. SSAC Membership Committee in considering new member applications Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: 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. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Expected budget implications once implemented	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: High priority, for productivity Medium; requires work by all SSAC members Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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	According to FAIIP: Medium. Greater membership engagement, more efficient membership application process, SSAC non-technical expertise closely aligned to the work anticipated to be undertaken. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:

accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	According to FAIIP: Immediately Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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	According to FAIIP: 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.
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP)	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. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (June 2020): In progress – The following sentence has been added to the first paragraph of Section 2.3 of SSAC Operational Procedures v8 issued on 12 February 2020: "The Membership Committee is guided in its selection of new members by the outcomes of the SSAC annual process to review SSR threats and update its planned future work, from which a determination of skills needs will be derived. The Committee will be further guided by consideration of desired diversity attributes as advised by the SSAC Administrative Committee after consultation with all SSAC members." The SSAC Skills Survey has undergone significant review and rewrite to simplify the format but also to better organize, clarify and update the skills list. It has also incorporated some questions to collect non-technical skills and demographic data

	to assess the SSAC's diversity in those aspects. All SSAC Members completed the new skills survey in February 2020 and this information has been collated and is being used by the Admin Committee to: - Develop, with the support of the ICANN Communications Team, outreach materials for recruitment of new members, - Develop, with the support of the ICANN Communications Team, appropriate messaging for inclusion on the SSAC public website, and - Identify skills in existing SSAC Members for proposed new Work Party topics. Outreach efforts that were planned to commence at ICANN67 have been hindered by the lack of face-to-face opportunities due to the COVID-19 cancellations of ICANN meetings. Collaboration with the ICANN Communications Team to discuss alternative approaches if face-to-face meetings continue to be cancelled into 2021.
Detailed implementation costing	n/a

Recommendation 25	
Recommendation	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. 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.
RWP Comments in FAIIP (if applicable)	N/A
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	According to FAIIP: SSAC at its Annual Workshop SSAC Membership Committee in considering new member applications Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: 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. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Expected budget implications once implemented	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Difficulty to implement: High, for productivity Level of implementation effort: Medium; requires work by all SSAC members Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How would you assess the potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a	According to FAIIP: Medium. Greater membership engagement, more efficient membership application process, increased SSAC diversity

whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	contributing to higher quality of SSAC advice. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	According to FAIIP: Immediately Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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	According to FAIIP: 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 FAIIP)	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 limited to geography and gender. 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. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (June 2020): In progress – The following sentence has been added to the first paragraph of Section 2.3 of SSAC Operational Procedures v8 issued on 12 February 2020: "The Membership Committee is guided in its selection of new members by the outcomes of the SSAC annual

	process to review SSR threats and update its planned future work, from which a determination of skills needs will be derived. The Committee will be further guided by consideration of desired diversity attributes as advised by the SSAC Administrative Committee after consultation with all SSAC members." The SSAC Skills Survey has undergone significant review and rewrite to simplify the format but also to better organize, clarify and update the skills list. It has also incorporated some questions to collect non-technical skills and demographic data to assess the SSAC's diversity in those aspects. All SSAC Members completed the new skills survey in February 2020 and this information has been collated and is being used by the Admin Committee to: - Develop, with the support of the ICANN Communications Team, outreach materials for recruitment of new members, - Develop, with the support of the ICANN Communications Team, appropriate messaging for inclusion on the SSAC public website, and - Identify skills in existing SSAC Members for proposed new Work Party topics. Outreach efforts that were planned to commence at ICANN67 have been hindered by the lack of face-to-face opportunities. Collaboration with the ICANN Communications Team to discuss alternative approaches in the current situation continues.
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)	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. 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.
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	According to FAIIP: SSAC Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Expected budget implications once implemented	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Medium Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Improved management, accountability Low Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan	According to FAIIP: Immediately

can the implementation start?	Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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	According to FAIIP: Additional text will be drafted and proposed for the SSAC Operational Procedures during the next revision cycle.
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP)	SSAC Admin Committee to propose language for update to Operational Procedures by end of February 2020 Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (June 2020): Complete – The following new paragraph has been added to Section 2.8.3 of SSAC Operational Procedures v8 issued on 12 February 2020: "Prior to the appointment or reappointment of an SSAC outward liaison or other SSAC representative, the SSAC Administrative Committee should undertake an informal review of the benefits and outcomes of participation in each role and recommend to the SSAC whether that role should continue to be filled."
Detailed implementation costing	

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 FAIIP (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?	According to FAIIP: See #28 Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: See #28 Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Expected budget implications once implemented	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Medium Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Improved governance and accountability Low Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	According to FAIIP: Immediately Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months	Within three months

Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months	
High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board	<u>According to FAIIP:</u> See #28 for implementation
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP)	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." <u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (June 2020):</u> Complete – Section 2.8.1 of SSAC Operational Procedures v8 issued on 12 February 2020 has been amended to incorporate the above text.
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?	According to FAIIP: ICANN Board Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Expected budget implications once implemented	According to FAIIP: None Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: The amendment has been submitted for consideration in the next convenient round of Bylaws updates. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: Improved governance and accountability Low Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	According to FAIIP: Immediately

	<u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:</u>
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>According to FAIIP:</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. <u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:</u>
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP)	The required update to the ICANN Bylaws were made via Board Resolution 2019.05.03.13. <u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (June 2020):</u> Complete – no further implementation required
Detailed implementation costing	n/a

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 FAIIP (if applicable)	None
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	<u>According to FAIIP:</u> SSAC <u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan</u>:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	<u>According to FAIIP:</u> None <u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan</u>:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	<u>According to FAIIP:</u> None <u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan</u>:
Expected budget implications once implemented	<u>According to FAIIP:</u> None <u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan</u>:
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>According to FAIIP:</u> Medium <u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan</u>:
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>According to FAIIP:</u> Improved accountability and transparency Easy <u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan</u>:
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	<u>According to FAIIP:</u> Immediately <u>Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan</u>:
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	According to FAIIP: 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. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP)	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. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (June 2020): In progress – With only 2 exceptions, all SSAC Members reviewed and updated their bios and disclosure of interest statements at the beginning of 2020 and these statements were published as of 26 March 2020 on the SSAC website. Going forward, dates for individual bios and disclosure of interest statements will be reflected against the names of those individuals. Other aspects for managing conflicts of interest and issues of confidentiality and non-disclosure remain unchanged and are covered in the following sections of SSAC Operational Procedures v8 issued on 12 February 2020: Section 2.1.2 Withdrawals and Dissents Section 2.3 New Member Selection Section 2.5 Annual Review Process Section 2.6.1 Affirmation of Confidentiality and Non-disclosure Appendix B Appendix F
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 FAIIP (if applicable)	N/A
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	According to FAIIP: SSAC Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	According to FAIIP: The SSAC annual workshop, and travel support for 15 SSAC members to the thrice-yearly ICANN meetings, are essential to this goal. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Anticipated non-fiscal resources for the implementation (volunteers time, ICANN org, tools, etc.) (if applicable)	According to FAIIP: N/A Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Expected budget implications once implemented	According to FAIIP: The SSAC annual workshop, and travel support for 15 SSAC members to the thrice-yearly ICANN meetings, are essential to this goal. Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
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)	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
How soon after the Board acceptance of the detailed implementation plan can the implementation start?	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to	ongoing

completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months	
High-level implementation steps, proposed by the RWP and accepted by the Board	According to FAIIP: n/a Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan:
Proposed detailed implementation steps (should be based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP in the FAIIP)	Update as part of this Detailed Implementation Plan (June 2020): Complete – no implementation required
Detailed implementation costing	n/a