RSSAC Caucus Annual Membership Survey

Open Date 7 September
Close Date 29 September

61% response rate
52 respondents of 85 surveys circulated
Have you participated in an RSSAC Caucus meeting?

- Yes: 83%
- Yes, via remote participation: 9%
- No: 8%
How frequently should RSSAC Caucus meetings take place?

- Much more frequently: 7
- More frequently: 8
- Current sequence: 33
- Less frequently: 1
- Never: 2
- Other: 1
- No response: 1
• Maybe some virtual meeting, preferably with some enticement (content for discussion or presentations), possibly at OARC?
• Unless there is compelling evidence of work-driven or goal seeking action demanding more frequent, I think it matches the reality of the pace of work Arguably, during KSK roll it had need of more frequency.
• Meeting quarterly seems reasonable.
• I think 2x per year is about right based on current levels of caucus activity.
• Note that not everybody is capable to be at every meeting, therefore should always be have remote access
• I'm still not convinced ICANN is the best venue, but I'm not opposed. I think teleconference calls would be helpful to keep momentum on work new, current and potential work items.
• But if we solve the remote participation issue, otherwise the current frequency could work.
• I am not advocating more or less frequently, but I am often conflicted because I am committed to other sessions at ICANN meetings, and do not regularly attend IETF meetings.
• Important to keep the fire burning. More calls makes us remember to invest time in the RSSAC Caucus.
• A monthly teleconference is very beneficial as it would help update caucus members on what's happening and resolve any outstanding issues.
Where should RSSAC Caucus meetings take place?

- Other: 5 votes
- Keep current venues: 8 votes
- RIR/NOG meetings only: 6 votes
- IETF meetings only: 5 votes
- ICANN meetings only: 40 votes
• Current **plus any suitable RIR/NOG**
• **Adding RIR/NOG** meetings into the mix wouldn't hurt
• Keep current, but we might add RIPE/NANOG to the list of alternating meetings
• **Mix of the ICANN, IETF, RIR and NOGs**
• Wherever caucus members want to meet
• I will say a **mix of ICANN, IETF and NOG** meeting (one of each with the NOG meeting rotating with Major regional NOG events). That will probably give a broader exposure to the Caucus and its work (of course only if that is part of its objective).
• RSACC meetings should stand on their own. The dependency as side meetings should not be a given. Only when enough members are available at these meetings it makes sense.
• I think that we could have **1 ICANN meeting, 1 IETF and 1 in another event** that we select depending on where the other ones are held and what facilities provides the possible event host.
• Should be a mix of both checked, but there is attendee overlap as well so perhaps that's too frequent on the one hand but on the other this greater flexibility for in-person meetings. That doesn't however help people who travel less than that.
Have you participated in an RSSAC Caucus work party?

% of respondents

- Yes: 38%
- No: 62%

[Diagram showing the distribution of responses]
How did you contribute to the RSSAC Caucus work party?

- **Wrote text**: 17
- **Reviewed text**: 27
- **Participated in discussions**: 26
- **Work party leader**: 5
- **Other**: 2

The chart shows the distribution of contributions among RSSAC Caucus work party members.
Please rate the difficulty of contributing to the RSSAC Caucus work party.

- Very easy: 37%
- Easy: 15%
- Neutral: 10%
- Complicated: 2%
- Very complicated: 15%
- No response: 36%
I’ve said before that a **primary editor should start a document**, even very rough. It starts the ball, easier to comment, add, etc. We did not have this and the overall work did not happen. A lead is always the right thing to have.

**Time (availability)** and time zones are problems.

It’s got a strong element of 'put up or shut up' driving it, and for complex questions, that’s a high barrier.

Finding the **time to review** the proposals is sometimes a problem.

Complicated to write text but also complicated to participate sometimes. I found hard to keep on dates and meetings. I am so used to meetings to pop up in my calendar that when that does not happen I lost control of participation. I would suggest using some **calendar tool** (Outlook, google calendar, Calendar, etc.) to send invitations to meetings and work parties sessions.

**Time zones** of various members sometimes makes it difficult to schedule a convenient time.

As long as I clearly understand the discussions and issues at hand, I have no problems contributing towards improving documents published by a work party.

The complication really lies more in **committing time** on my part more than anything else as well as scheduling conflicts. And some of us are on the wrong continent for sleep. :-(
Why have you not participated in an RSSAC Caucus work party?

- No time to contribute
- No interest in topic
- No technical experience/knowledge in topic
- Other
Comments (emphasis added)

- I'm still relatively new
- Sometimes I am unable to attend the face-to-face meetings.
- **Time constraint**
- **Lose track of work items status**
- Was on RSSAC, and then focus was elsewhere
- **I need to know the topic and how to contribute**
- Have not paid close enough attention to RSSAC
- ... one of my goal in the coming months. Trying to set time aside for this particular group. Also, still working out the right balance of contributions as ICANN staff.
- **Time has been a significant problem** for me over the past couple of years between my regular job and young children at home, but they're getting older and next year start kindergarten.
- I know it is difficult to keep work parties open, but **having a more open work process** (calls to non-work party members before draft completed) may assist in engaging folks.
- I'm very interested in the work and would still love to contribute somehow despite **time constraints**. Even if there is an opportunity to more actively engage in final review processes of drafts.
- While I haven't had time to actively participate in a work party yet, I do read the documents produced and give feedback when I can. I still hope to participate in an upcoming topic where I have experience.
• I think periodic **reminders of role and intention** might help. The caucus has pretty strong 'non-decisive' quality. I think we have to remember that: it doesn't tell people to do things, and it doesn't make decisions. It's part of a caucus and consensus process which informs other people, other groups.

• The RSSAC Caucus produces documents for the consideration of the RSSAC in the hope that the RSSAC finds some of the input useful. I have observed that **sometimes the scope of work that an RSSAC work party sets out to perform is somewhat nebulous**. That's not necessarily bad since coming up with a good problem definition can itself be a valuable exercise. However, I have also felt that **the current document publication process that moves ideas between the RSSAC caucus and the RSSAC is perhaps too elaborate and time consuming**. Starting with the original requirements and ending with a finished work party product requires some dedicated involvement of work party members and not all participants may be able to engage at all times. I'm wondering if there is a **more light-weight mechanism - perhaps some sort of internet-draft like process** that breaks the work party task into chunks and allows members to nibble away at little pieces so that ideas can flow quickly between the RSSAC and the caucus?
- I joined the caucus couple of months ago and at that time I expected to have a bootstrap document or something to get my feet wet with the procedures and commitments within the caucus but I couldn't find any. I think this will help new members a lot.

- I don't have any magic answers, but I continue to think that greater involvement is still stymied by a work process that isn't very transparent or encouraging of participation. Perhaps the Caucus works best with only a handful of dedicated participants, but if the goals is to get greater participation and engagement, I think there is still work to be done. Once online collaboration tools are sorted, that will be a good step. Other areas to reduce barriers to participation will be helpful.

- I think that we need to review membership every 2-3 years and let people go if they cannot participate in work parties or attend meetings (remotely or face-to-face). We also need to work the remote participation as any of us do this work on personal basis and support and time to travel sometimes is complicated.
Next Steps

Present survey feedback at IETF100
• Sunday, 12 November 2017
  15:30-17:00 SGT / 07:30-09:00 UTC
  Raffles City Convention Center, VIP A

RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee will
• Consider all comments and make recommendations to the RSSAC Caucus and RSSAC
• Follow-up with the 34 RSSAC Caucus members who did not participate in the annual membership survey or declined to return as members
• Begin process of updating Statements of Interest (if applicable)