

This is a **summary of the public comments** received to the **Draft Report of the external consultants on the organizational review of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) of ICANN.**

In preparing the summary of the comments received, any care has been used as to reflect as accurately and objectively as possible the opinions that have been expressed; however this summary does not substitute in any way the original contributions that were received, which are publicly available for full reference at

<http://forum.icann.org/lists/ssac-review-jas/>

The opinions below summarized are solely those of their authors, expressed during their participation to the public comment phase, and do not necessarily coincide with official positions of ICANN or with individual views of the author of the summary.

We would like to thank the participants to this public comment period for their precious contribution to this crucial phase of the Organizational Review process of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC).

Preamble

The public comment period ran from 20 March to 22 April 2009; two comments were received, respectively from Hiro Hotta (HH); and from Bill Graham, on behalf of the Internet Society (ISOC).

HH comments

- Appreciation of SSAC activities and outputs so far.
- Wish that the future framework of SSAC will remain well structured as to allow production of effective outputs through active participation of members; their good will must be respected.
- More diversification sought, particularly in terms of specialty areas.

ISOC comments

- (Disclosure: John Schnizlein, an ISOC staff member, is SSAC Member, where he acts on his individual capacity).
- Vital to recall that SSAC –as advisory Committee to the ICANN Board, not to ICANN management- is only responsible for issues falling within ICANN mandate.
- Useful to formalize in advance SSAC plans and intended activities (better communication with the Board).
- Need to formalize communication with the Board, as to enhance planning and understanding.
- No need for attributing Chairmanship and Liaison role to two separate individuals, while adoption of communication channels operating independently from individuals is key.
- Important to stress SSAC's advisory rather than operational role; as a consequence it should not be engaged in day-to-day activities, unless explicitly requested by the Board.
- SSAC members are experts, not representatives: as a consequence, voting, negotiating or trade horsing on issues does not have sense.
- Recommendation to consider for possible adoption the decision taking process adopted by the Internet Architecture Board Charter (RFC2850) –see *full text of comment for full quotation*-
- Strong support of recommendation on taking steps to avoid real or perceived conflicts of interest.
- Size of SSAC is not an important issue; it is fundamental instead to ensure appropriate coverage of all relevant knowledge and areas of expertise.

Brussels, 18 May 2009

Author of the summary:

Marco Lorenzoni

ICANN - Director, Organizational Review