
MARRAKECH – From Newcomer to Review Enthusiast: Getting Started with Reviews

Monday, March 07, 2016 – 10:45 to 12:00 WET

ICANN55 | Marrakech, Morocco

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is the Palmeraie, From Newcomer to Review Enthusiast: Getting Started with Reviews, March 7th, 10:45 AM.

LARISA GURNICK: Good morning, everybody. We're going to get started in just a few minutes.

THERESA SWINEHART: Okay. Hi, everybody. Well, this is wonderful. Everybody has I seat, I hope we have some more seats back over there and over there. So before we kick this off, I just wanted to give a couple sort of introductory remarks and some context around this.

As we know, throughout ICANN as an organization, we have embedded in our bylaws and through the affirmation of commitments a range of reviews, and reviews are often seen as just sort of another project that's underway, but they're actually an indication of the progress report of how the organization is doing, how we can improve, whether it's the organizational reviews and those embedded in the bylaws on the different structures within the ICANN model, or those reflected in the

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

affirmation of commitments that go to some of the different substantive areas, and they touch on important points for the evolution of ICANN as an organization.

We've also seen recently with the IANA stewardship transitions some very important work around ICANN accountability and how additional accountability mechanisms in light of the changing relationship can be put into place. And part of that has now been the incorporation of the recommendation to incorporate the affirmation of commitment reviews, including those around accountability and transparency, into our bylaws themselves. So they're not a separate standing document but they're incorporated into the bylaws.

These reviews are important, and we need to have people participating in the reviews because this is how we determine whether the checks and balances of the organization are evolving in the right way and to hear the voices of the community as part of that context. So this presentation here and this dialogue here is going to be very important for the continued work around improving the community participation in these reviews, including the availability of the information and how things are being conducted. Again, it's the progress report and the tools by which we can continue to evolve the institution itself, and you can be part of that process. So with

that I look forward to the presentation and thank you everybody for being here.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you, Theresa. My name is Larisa Gurnick, and I am with the Multistakeholder Strategy and Strategic Initiatives Team. Our team gets to do the reviews. It's our responsibility to do the reviews and as Theresa suggested, reviews are ICANN's progress report to the world. It's our opportunity to demonstrate how we at ICANN deliver on our commitments. We will walk you through how reviews are conducted, how you might be able to get involved in the process, and hopefully you too will get excited about the review mechanisms and will want to join and participate in the process. We're also excited to have several review veterans with us today and you will get to meet them later in the presentations. They will share their experiences so that you can have a better understanding of what it might be like to participate in the review process.

To get started, I'd like to introduce to you Sherwood Moore, my colleague. He is Manager of Review Communications and Engagement, and he is a newcomer himself. He'll share some comments with you.

SHERWOOD MOORE: Thanks, Larisa. Yeah. I spend some time thinking about – I wanted to speak a little bit about motivation, and it fit really well with Fadi’s speech today because he’s all about our purpose. In thinking about why I’m here, I started thinking last night about what would happen to me if the Internet didn’t exist. I come from a technology background. I’m an entrepreneur, so if the Internet didn’t exist the past ten years of my work experience, my professional life wouldn’t exist.

I also live on the other coast, the West Coast. My family lives on the East Coast, so if the Internet didn’t exist, I wouldn’t be able to communicate with my family. I wouldn’t be able to have a Skype video chat with my 98-year-old grandfather on his birthday and also keep up with the perfect lives of all my friends on Facebook. I wouldn’t be able to have a window into the world, a very human view, which helps me understand the context of all the challenges that are going on in the world and not just reading print but really seeing the impact on people’s lives.

So it’s really important to me and I think it’s really important to us as a society as a whole because we’re all witnessing how it’s changing our society and our cultures. It’s changing not only the way that we’re sharing information, but it’s changing fundamentally the way that we share motivation, and ideas, and resources, and action. We’re seeing that play out in everything

from how we're electing our leaders to how we're taking on some pretty significant issues from everything from the environment to inequality. It's changing how we're sharing our resources. Things like crowdsourcing allow us to fund different things that are important to us.

And so I think I could say without being dramatic in any way that the Internet is one of the most fundamentally ground shifting tools that the human race has ever had experienced or access to, right? So for me, personally, it's very important to protect it for me and protect it for all of you and protect it for future generations. And for that to really work, it's got to stay free and open, right?

Next slide. I think just as important as why we do this work is how we do this work. The only really the way to make the Internet be able to adapt in such a dynamic and complex world is through the bottoms-up multi-stakeholder model. We have to have all those voices at the table.

What's so interesting to me about ICANN and the work that we're doing and the work that you are all getting involved with is it this is the largest multi-stakeholder model in the history of humankind. It's a huge vast experiment that were all involved with and we're all watching it unfold. So I want to thank you all

for being here because of all the people on the planet, you guys are the guys here right now. I think that's amazing.

But I also want to add this: the power that we have and the voice that we have right now is not something that is guaranteed and it's not something that we should take for granted. There are organizations out there that would love to run the Internet and not run it with a multi-stakeholder model and kind of have a lot more power and take that voice away. So it's important for us because the whole world is watching us and they're watching you. I mean, we're facilitating. You guys are doing the real work and we're watching to see how well we can pull this off. It's very important that we do a good job.

With that said – and that's kind of the framework that motivates me – I want to talk about just a brief introduction to reviews which subjectively I think are one of the most interesting things that ICANN does because reviews are where the policy meets the real world. So what we essentially do is we look at the actual impact versus the intended impact, and then we try to figure out recommendations to make that model work better. And so you can think of it as a health check for the policies that ICANN puts out. You can think of it as kind of a real time learning center where we are helping ICANN and the policies adapt to an ever-changing environment. But however you look at it, it's a really crucial role that is on the frontlines of ICANN policy.

So we're excited to have you here. We are very interested in growing the community. We need more voices. We need more dynamic views. I can't really delve into some of the specifics of the review stuff because I'm a new comer as well and I'm still learning, so I'm going to turn it back over to Larisa to take it away.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you, Sherwood. Next slide, please.

You've heard a little bit of reviews, that they're an important accountability mechanism. Reviews help us look forward, but first we have to look back. Part of the review process, in order to come up with that progress report, that report card that we share with the world, we look at processes, we look at actions, and we look at outcomes, and that helps us make improvements in the future. Next, please, and next slide.

For those of you that may have heard Fadi's words earlier this morning, he talked about an interesting combination of process as a guarantor of our collective values. So his words were that process is essential to ensure that we have legitimacy. But in addition to process, he talked about spirit, that spirit was really important and it's the combination of process and spirit.

You'll hear a lot about the process in this presentation. Reviews have a great deal to do with process. So the slides will show you the process and all of you in here are the spirit because reviews don't happen by themselves, and ICANN staff cannot make the reviews happen on our own. It requires and demands a whole lot of attention and energy and participation from all of you.

As we look at our own lives, professional lives, personal lives, I think you'll all agree that we try to do better. We strive to improve every day. Whatever we do, we try to do it better. It's the same for ICANN. This process is all about what can we do to improve the way things work at ICANN. The way we do that through the review process is by looking at other organizations best practices, ways that things can be improved, and developments in the industry that we need to keep up with because you will probably agree that we operate in a very complex and often challenging environment, and in order to make sure that ICANN not only has legitimacy, but also viability and success in the future, these are all very, very important stuffs for us to go through. Next slide.

Reviews are fundamental on accountability and transparency mechanism. You've been hearing a great deal about those words, accountability and transparency, particularly now in connection with the transition of the IANA stewardship function. But those words are not new to the ICANN conversation. Those

words and the actions and the symbols behind accountability and transparency has been with ICANN since the beginning. So these are not new notions, but they're certainly even more critical today than they ever have been.

The component of accountability that's really essential is that it holds ICANN accountable to the stakeholders and ensures that we fulfill our commitments. That's the basic principle of accountability, and it's an opportunity for our community, which is also ever-changing to be the voice and to provide input into this process, and that's what makes the accountability and transparency work: those two components. Next slide, please.

So you might be wondering: what kinds of things do reviews cover? What's included in the reviews? We have topics of interest for everybody, I would say. First we have Security, Stability and Resiliency. This is looking at the reliability and security of the Domain Name System. Then we have a review of the WHOIS, a policy, and that has to do with ensuring that there is public access to accurate and complete domain registrant information, a very important process within the ICANN community.

Accountability and transparency reviews look at the way ICANN is governed and how the decision making process takes place and holds ICANN accountable in its decision making process to the stakeholders and the community and the public interest.

The latest re-addition to the review catalogue is the review of the impact that the introduction of the new Top-Level Domains has on competition, consumer choice, and consumer trust, and that review is currently underway.

And then we have the organizational reviews. These are reviews of the various ICANN structures. You'll learn more about which structures are subject to these reviews. But in that grouping of reviews, we look at how well each of the ICANN structures fulfills its mission and its commitments. Next slide, please.

For anybody that gets involved in the reviews, one of the first questions is: so what? What happens? What's the impact of the reviews? Why would I want to spend my time contributing energy and effort to this process? Does change really happen as a result of this? Well, we talked about the fact that we are pretty complicated. We deal with some pretty complicated subject matter and we were really challenged trying to provide several examples that were simple enough to put on a slide without making you all squint, but we did it. And I just have to underscore that we have at this point hundreds of recommendations that have come out of the review process. What you see here is a high level summary of just three examples. So this is by no means the full set of improvements that have come out of the review process. This is just to give you

a flavor of the kinds of things that have been accomplished through the review process.

For example, we identified a need to improve the public comment process. Public comment is the way that everybody provides input into the policy development process and the decision making process. So it's a very significant process for ICANN. It wasn't working as well as we want it to, and as a result of the review teams – the Accountability and Transparency Review Teams – some improvements were made in the public comment process.

Some of these improvements include a more streamlined approach. It's easier to understand. People can have a better idea of what the timeline looks like. If you're interested in the following a particular comment, you can now do that.

Probably most importantly, if you submit a comment and then the next step for that comment is that it'd be summarized and used as part of the analysis that will ultimately lead to a decision – if you noticed that the intent of your comment as it was submitted is not accurate, then you have an opportunity to correct that before the decision making process begins. So it's another very much an accountability example. Next slide please.

We have, as Theresa introduced in her comments, two types of reviews, affirmation of commitment reviews and here comes the

alphabet soup and I'll try to use the full names to not confuse anybody. The Accountability and Transparency Review, the Competition/Consumer Choice and Trust Review, Stability, Security and Resiliency, and WHOIS.

That grouping of reviews is currently mandated by the Affirmation of Commitments, which is one of ICANN's governing documents. What's unique about this group of reviews is that they're conducted by the community, people like yourselves, and this is why it's so important. The reason these reviews are conducted by community and volunteers and not professionals is because we want the review process to be representative of the broad and diverse stakeholder group. So participation in this process is really critical.

Organizational reviews, on the other hand, are conducted by independent examiners that are hired by ICANN to perform the reviews. These are reviews of the various structures at ICANN. You're, for sure, familiar with most of these: the GNSO, the ccNSO and various others. These reviews are mandated by the ICANN bylaws. It's really important to underscore that the review process is given to us, it's driven to all of us, by our governing documents, and it's an essential component of holding ICANN accountable. Next slide, please.

Some data for you to consider. This is where we are in the review process. We've conducted at least one or two cycle of most of these reviews. In some cases, we're moving closer to the third cycle of reviews. So we have some experience behind us in having conducted these reviews. Particularly for AoC Reviews, it's very important that we have diversity and broad participation. As you can see from the geographic distribution, we're not quite where we would want to be, so I'm very happy to see all of you because I'm hoping that with your help and your involvement and you taking this message to your communities, we can get more geographic diversity and more diversity in general in the review process.

Of course, on the gender graphic, we're looking for balance. We want 50-50 because that is what the world is made up of. So we want more balance, and again, there are two. Your presence here is really important. Next slide, please.

If you think this is a very busy slide, you are right. This is a busy slide. We have a crazy schedule and many people say, why? Why do we have to do it this way? Remember, these reviews are mandated, and ICANN staff does not get to decide when the reviews take place. That information comes from the bylaws and the AoC. Those documents specify how frequently the reviews should take place, and they also specify when these reviews should take place.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So that we can do the job that we are empowered to do on your behalf better. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Cheryl and Jonathan. It looks like our presentation is back on track, so why don't we jump back in and just give you a few more pieces of information? Next slide, please.

The review process end to end could take as long as three years and one might wonder, why does it take so long? So I wanted to break it down for you into components. Generally, the review process starts with the assembly of the review team and that process takes us several months. If we have – and we want to have – lots and lots of volunteers and applicants to choose from, it might take even a bit longer to give everybody a chance to apply. But that's an essential part of the process. For all of you that might be interested in taking part in the AoC Review process, it all starts with an application.

From there, once the review team is appointed, the review team does some planning to plan out its work, and then it could take upwards of 12 months to actually do the work. The subject matter, in some cases, is technical. There is a lot of ground to cover, and the work itself requires analysis, collection of data,

research, in many cases, and a lot of consultation with the community and the input from the community, and that takes time. There's public comment processes that are there part of the way.

Once the review concludes, it usually concludes with the final report and a set of recommendations, and then we move into the next phase, which is Board consideration. With AoC Reviews, the Board has up to six months to make a decision on the recommendations and start actions of making improvements. Then we move into the implementation phase of the process. Next slide, please.

Organizational reviews work essentially the same way with some minor differences. Instead of volunteers being assembled, it's the process of going through an open request for proposal and procurement process to look for a skilled and qualified independent examiner to conduct the review. But in these reviews, also, there is an underpinning of community involvement. Whatever organization is being reviewed has a voice in the process, and that voice comes through the Review Working Party, which is what we call it, a working party to differentiate it from the working groups that have a different connotation and meaning in the ICANN policy development process. So the working party is a group of volunteers that

participates in the process. Then the process is essentially the same. Next slide, please.

At the end of all this hard work on the part of the review team, recommendations happen. In most cases, recommendations happen after at least two or three cycles of public comments are provided. The recommendations and the final report then go to the Board of Directors for their consideration.

They essentially have three options for what to do with these recommendations. They can accept the recommendation as is. They can accept the recommendation with the modification, or they might choose to not accept the recommendation, in which case, they're required to provide a reasonable justification for their decision.

Very frequently, recommendations that come out of these processes have long term strategic impact and implications, and recommendations end up being inputs and processes that really form our strategic direction.

What can a review team do to make sure that their recommendations are accepted? Well, that's the really extensive work that the review team conducts in making sure that the voices of the community are heard, that everybody's inputs are considered, and that the recommendations themselves have

certain qualities that make them implementable. You'll see on the bottom of the screen what some of those qualities are.

A recommendation needs to be specific and clear. A recommendation should be prioritized because, as you remember from the busy slide of work, there's a lot of work to be done. And that's just review work. That doesn't begin to even put into the context all the other work at ICANN. So we want to prioritize recommendations that can really drive impact and improvements in the future.

It helps to have a recommendation be framed in such a way that, down the line, we can measure if it's been successful or not. Otherwise, it's very difficult to have a shared conclusion as to whether a recommendation brought the desired change.

And of course, recommendations have to consider the resources that are available, both human resources, volunteer staff, as well as dollars. So those are generally attributes of a good recommendation. Next slide, please.

The roles and responsibilities are really shared between these three groups: community, the Board and staff. While each group has its unique focus, the community is conducting the review in most cases or providing inputs to the people that are conducting the review. Community, all of you, have a hand in how the

implementation work will take place and ultimately in how the results will be measured.

The Board is responsible for overseeing the process. That's their role here. The staff is the support system because we participate in all these reviews. We develop knowledge and expertise and historical experience from having done these reviews. So we provide the foundation, the support, the project management, and the guidance from lessons learned from prior reviews.

But you'll notice that one responsibility is shared across all groups, and that's measuring results. Because if we're not making impact with the recommendations, we're really not using all the resources in the most optimal way. So measuring results really falls on all the groups to participate in. Next slide, please.

So here you are. You've heard the pitch. You've heard from two of our review enthusiasts and you might be wondering, "Why would I want to participate?" I think Cheryl has already opened up the dialogue much better than any slide could, but people participate because they learn something, because they're passionate about a particular cause, because they want to meet other interesting people, it's a professional development opportunity. But in order for all of these to happen, it's

important to show up and to learn. We hope that you will all take that opportunity. Next slide, please.

This is really important. I don't know if you can tell, but the slide is divided into kind of two halves. The half that's above is direct participation, by serving on the review team, by working through the plans, by doing the research, and by presenting the recommendations. That's active participation for those that end up being on the team.

But that's just half the story, and that's really important for a group, such as most of you, that might be figuring out where is the best way for you to spend your time, to make your impact. There's many other ways for you to learn the process by being in the supporting part of the slide, which is being interested; showing up and learning about the reviews, participating in the programs.

When there's opportunities to provide input, the reviews are based on community input. When there is public comments, when there's consultations, when there are surveys, when the review teams go out to the communities asking for feedback, asking for ideas of what's working and what's not working, it's really essential for people to provide their views and their feedback. The more views and feedbacks that are shared with the review teams, the easier their job in making sure that they

represent all the voices. So there is a very important role for participation in doing all those things – public comments, consultations, meetings, and asking questions.

It is an intimidating process. We've tried our best to simplify it so that it could be a little more open and inviting, but it is a complex process. For those of us that have been working in it for a while, we tend to get very, very complicated. It's thanks to the newcomers on our team and all of you that it snaps us to reality and we realize that our language and our slides and our documents can be incomprehensible and we're going to do our best to simplify and make it easier for people to digest. But it is complex subject matter. It's really important. Next slide, please.

So here we are. We hope that you will all become review enthusiasts. This is more than the term. We try to find the word that would be the essence of what it is that we're trying to build here, but our responsibility is to make sure that we have what it takes to conduct these reviews and that these reviews work the way they're intended to work. The schedule is a busy one. There's a lot of work to be done, and the work is essential to the legitimacy of ICANN. I hope that all this information is kind of falling into place and the different puzzle pieces are connecting. In order for this to work, we really need people to be coming into the Review Enthusiast Program on a continuous basis so that there's more people to participate.

This is just the first step. The program is something that we intend to carry out for a long time to come. There will be sessions, and Sherwood will talk about some more details. There will be opportunities to learn more about the specific reviews that are coming up.

For example, the next review that will be happening, the next AoC Review, is the review of the Security, Stability and Resiliency of the Domain Name System. That's going to be starting up pretty soon. You'll be hearing information. We intend to have webinars and other opportunities for people to learn more about how this works and how they might be able to contribute.

So we ask you that you tell us if you're interested, and if you are, you'll become part of the group, part of the team. We'll continue to share information with and really hear from you to find out what it is that we need to do better to enable you and to empower you to participate in the process.

Sherwood?

SHERWOOD MOORE:

Yeah. Larise, you really just covered it all. The only thing that I would add is the way to do it is, on the back of this button, there's a URL that has a sign-up. That'll get you plugged in and

we'll get started. So just make sure that you sign up and share your information with us. All right. Thanks.

And I think, with that, we will go and open up a Q & A session with some of our seasoned community members.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Seasoned and enthusiastic.

SHERWOOD MOORE: Seasoned and enthusiastic. And so they have a couple of questions that –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm so sorry. Fiona just walked in.

SHERWOOD MOORE: Oh, Fiona, hey. We'd love to hear a quick introduction from you as well, and then after that we'll jump into an open Q & A with questions from the audience.

FIONA ASONGA: Good morning, everyone. My names are Fiona Asonga. I have been involved in ICANN since 2008, and I'm very passionate about the transparency and accountability mechanisms. That is the area that I harass the ICANN Board, staff, and everyone else

on. It's what I'm passionate about. I'm involved in the ASO. That is very much one of the many groups – I'm sure you've already got enough brief on the different groups within ICANN. So I'm an ASO representative. Thank you.

SHERWOOD MOORE:

Great. Thank you. And I think, with that, we'll open up the Q & A to the audience. Are there any questions that you guys have for us or for the Board?

Any questions? Don't be shy. There is one over here. Do we have a ...

Let's see if we can get a mic.

CHENAI CHAIR:

Hi, my name is Chenai Chair and I am Nextgen with Research ICT Africa from South Africa and Zimbabwe. My question is, as a review team, has there been any review to look at why women are so lowly represented, at only 19%? I'm glad to see that there's actually a panel full of women. It's inspiring.

And then the second question: also, why are there not many African organizations or African individuals participating in the review? Is it a matter of capacity, or is it a matter of they're unaware, or they're just not interested in ICANN? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Do you want me to take that?

LARISA GURNICK: Sure, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The institutionally internal reviews that were up on one of the slides have run for a few years now, but even that is relatively new in terms of ICANN. It came in sort of two-thirds of ICANN's life. So a lot more balance, for example, of what may be created out of those aspects of the internal reviews – the external reviews, the very important ATRTs – and I'm talking of at Security and Stability, the ones looking at WHOIS, and of course now the CCT, the Consumer Choice Trust one that Jonathan is involved in – these are relatively new, and they've been running at extraordinarily busy times in our organization. So I think some of it is consequential of how much human bandwidth people have. B

ut that said, as we all know in the ICT sector, we are underrepresented as a gender. All right? But that simply means we need to work harder with outreach, and engagement. The staff who assist with this are being proactive. They were out there at Our Women in DNS breakfast this morning. They were

pitching it effectively and will continue to do so. So it's something that I don't think is deliberate in terms of gender.

In terms of the regional diversity, I do think capacity is a very big part of it. I also think that, when many of these are only the first time ones being run, they're not designed specifically to be equitable in their make-up, in the nomenclature of how being – they're designed to have the advisory committees and support organizations and subject matter experts putting in a balanced way. But to some extent, it's who steps up from within those sub-components that counts. Is there a reason why, for example, the number of people from the African continent are underrepresented?

In some cases, that will reflect the diversity of the support organization and the advisory committee that they come from. So in the At-large Advisory Committee's capacity, it will be equitable. If they have five seats, one of them will be from our colleagues out of African country. So, yeah, it sort of depends on what part of ICANN we're looking at, and that all means we just get to work on that and make that better in the near future.

But there is a barrier to entry for emerging and developing economies, whether they come out of Asia Pacific, Latin America, or the Caribbean or, of course, the Continent of Africa, and that is, a lot of these teleconferences and webinars happen

at particularly unfriendly times in your day. Quite frequently that affects the capacity to have effective bandwidth technically. It may be, for example, that you can only get access during your working hours. Of course, and it's reliant on your working environment to allow you to spend three hours a week, for what seems like the term of your natural life, engaged in these teleconferences. So sometimes it's that that's made the difference.

Can we find clever ways of working that out? I'm confident we can.

LARISA GURNICK:

Just to add to what Cheryl was saying, the look or the inspection, if you will, the consideration of diversity and balance, gender balance and diversity as a whole, is a topic of each of the organizational reviews that we undertake. Those are the reviews of each structure, so that looks at the more fundamental participation at the structural level.

Just to give you an idea of one of the reviews that is wrapping up right now is the review of the GNSO organization. There were several recommendations that were offered by the independent examiner suggesting ways that diversity and participation be improved. So while that doesn't specifically relate to participation and reviews, these are building blocks. The more

people participate in the various structures the more people participate in ICANN, the more diversity and balance there is, the bigger the pool for the review teams to choose from so that there is a balance on the review teams, the AoC Review teams. It's always the balance of skill, experience, and diversity.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Hi. Briefly, I'll just add to that that we just recently went through a 15-month process to come up with an accountability framework for ICANN, and this very issue of diversity was hotly discussed as part of that process. In fact, Sébastien Bachollet was a staunch proponent of trying to find ways to enhance diversity.

And so part of the question becomes, do you do that through imposing quotas on the teams that are created, or is it better to address the things that Cheryl outlined, some of the sources of the problems, and let the teams come together more organically? That I think is one of the harder problems to solve, but rest assured that it's something that is up front and center of the debate within the organization.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

So I'm [Asad Hajibi]. I study here in Morocco in Rabat. I study IT and data analysis. I want to answer the question being asked

there. There is a simpler answer to this. How can someone write about something he doesn't know? With a low amount of Internet access in this continent, the participation of Africans can only be lower. We live in an era where computers cost a few dimes. I'm talking here about raspberry pie. And with Google's initiative for free Internet access, I think there is a lot to be done in this matter. We can build a mega project for Africans and the countries that don't have access to the Internet.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Come on down. Come on down.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What do you mean by this?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We want you to do it. Careful. You're about to get the job if you're not careful. Please go ahead.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Hello. Thank you very much. I happen to be a [buff ninja] but I'm Daniel and I happen to be the AFRALO coach here on Outreach and Engagement.

Yesterday in our working group meeting, we posted this same question: why is it that there is many more involvement? And

issues like the language barrier came up, just to mention. But she highlighted a very interesting point and that is the gender distribution. Currently, like in the strategies that was drafted for FY15-16, we're getting more involvement to get different organizations to get engaged in different processes and their respective working groups.

The challenge is probably that the different ALSs could be ignorant of what is transpiring in their respective working groups. And so the challenge to engage their respective members into this is it becomes total jeopardy. So, practically, I think the Capacity Building Working Group should come up with more materials and probably put a set of action points or carry out a respective survey on what is really missing. I'll be very happy, in case they work together with the Outreach and Engagement, to come up with appropriate strategies on how we can best collaborate to reach out to more in this space.

In case anyone has ideas, please feel free to join Outreach and Engagement Working Group and to see how we can be able to move this agenda forward. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I ask you to stand up, Daniel, so everyone knows who to go and find out in the corridor how they can assist? There's local activities going on, there's local initiatives being developed.

Become part of it, become part of the solution. This is a man who you can approach and make the next step happen.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Did I have someone up there before Sébastien? Yes, please. Veni and then Sébastien.

VENI MARKOVSKI: I think, having participated in the ATRT2 review process and been involved in the IANA transition, the Cross-Community Working Group and Accountability, part of the issue that affects the participation of Africans within some of these processes is our priorities.

I think we – and we need to be honest to ourselves – prioritize other issues above getting involved in all these spaces. As a result, we acknowledge it is important, but we would rather someone else sort of like did it for us. That puts us in a position where, when you go through each of the constituencies within ICANN, you will find that there are very few of us actively involved. We go in, we understand what needs to be done, but we don't want to take a bite of the pie, so to say. We sort of

expect someone else to bite it for us and do the chewing and we'd only swallow, which can't work.

I've been involved with the ISP and Business Constituency as well. When I go in there, they're absent. Yet there are ISPs on this continent. The ALAC works well and the ASO works well because they have structures that facilitate engagement at the regional level and those insist on that balance, the regional balance.

But for the others, like the ISP constituency, which doesn't have those structures – or of the ccNSO – well-ingrained in the way they engage, we seem to just be happy taking a laid back position, which means we need to change.

I'd like to challenge everyone from the African region who is here during this meeting to please see where you can plug into and follow the discussion. First of all, you need to follow up on the discussions to understand what the issues are and how do they impact us as a region and participate from the periphery. Eventually, you're able to become part of the consistency.

We'd like to come in and then we disappear, and so what happens is that we can actually make a list of attendance, an attendance list of which ICANNers from the African region you are going to find [inaudible] meeting.

The rest keep coming. We see so many new faces and then they never come back. We need to see you coming back for more and more ICANN meeting and participating in more discussions. Thanks.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Merci. Thank you. I'm going to speak French. When we speak about diversity, language diversity is also a key element, a very important element, a key element. So I'd like to explain to you: why do I speak in French? Well, I'm here with 20 students, you have heard one of those students. He came from the National Institute of Posts Telecommunications from Rabat, Morocco. It's a program that Aziz Hilali and Tijani Ben Jemaa implemented. They have organized a group of 60 students. They are here for two days, not for the whole ICANN meeting. They were some budget problems and they are with us for two days but that's good. I think that we have to take care about the – because if we want these participation, we need to be not so demanding. We can't tell everybody you have to spend half of your life, half of the time, half of your nights for some people working with ICANN and doing things for ICANN. We need to be able to ask people to do things with little time. We have just one hour per week. Use that hour per week, because if we ask them to spend so many time, as many of us here in this room, they can't do that. They have their studies, they work, they have families, and they have

to keep all that. If they have some time to give to ICANN, they can do it.

So it's not just on the "Please participate. Please engage yourself." No. Just tell us what you can offer to us. When I say "to us," I'm speaking about staff and community. We need to see how we can use your time in a very efficient way for everybody.

The diversity issue is very important. Jonathan spoke about that. I'm not going to speak of again about that, but I think that the work which has been done in the working group on the ICANN accountability has been very important work. It has been a review on the global functioning of our organization with evolution proposals. There won't be another one of this kind for a long time. It's a pity. Those reviews could have some review of the whole system, not part of the system.

Since 2002, we are working silo by silo in these reviews. We never had the global review. I think it's a lack in our system. We should do it. I've said that for many years. I'm still saying that. The Board doesn't want that to get in place, but the work we have did in the working group on accountability has allowed us to have this global vision.

Now, for the students, to be able to speak, to ask questions now or later, please look at the people around that table. You can meet them in the corridor. Ask them questions. Don't be afraid.

We are telling you that you need a lot of time, but with a little time, it's okay. You will be welcome among us. And thank you very much to be with us today.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Now Beran, and then I'll come to you, okay? And then you. Okay.

BERAN GILLAN: Thank you, Cheryl. This Beran Gillan the record. I'm also a co-partner of Sébastien with the 20 students that we have from Rabat.

I just wanted to sort of buttress on what Fiona was saying with regards to finding your way, finding what you're passionate about within ICANN, and sort of latching onto that, so to speak.

I will give myself as a typical example. I've been in ICANN for about four years. You see me roam in the halls with my baby on a push chair. But, basically, let's not try to find excuses not to engage, and let's try to do what we can to engage. Let's latch on. We all have areas where we're passionate about, each and every one of us. ICANN is making it so easy for us to engage. They call us on our mobiles. We don't have to worry about calling and racking up phone bills. We don't have access to Internet, that's not a problem. They'll call you on your phone. All you need is

battery life. Charge and you're able to basically attend a conference, a teleconference.

So really, for me, we shouldn't use anything as an excuse. We should try to find our way, latch on, and basically engage. If I can do it, we can all do it with a baby in tow, and mother, of course.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hopefully, we don't all have to do it with the babies in tow. It could be difficult to have one for each of us. Over to you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hi, everyone. My name is [inaudible] and I am from the National Institute of Posts and Telecommunication. Well, my question is that we have heard a lot about accountability and transparency, which I don't know if this organization has a unique model. You vote in public and everyone sees what others just say, and if you refute something, you have to say why. But don't you think being born in the U.S.A. and still being in touch with that government causes a problem for your accountability and transparency? Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's a good question. Thank you for the question. I think that the relationship to the United States has been complex, and the

United States has played a very important role in nurturing the evolution of ICANN. I think that people's concerns about the role of the U.S. government in ICANN policy development is probably in most cases one of image than reality. In other words, the opportunities for them to exercise power over ICANN have mostly not been taken by the U.S. government. So they've mostly let the process go as it will.

That said, I think that we find ourselves at a very important time where the organization is meant to be truly independent. I think that that's can be an incredible and historic event.

Part of the reason that we've spent the last 15 months talking about accountability is that freeing yourself from accountability to the United States is not the same thing as achieving accountability to yourself or to your community.

So that process was necessary because we've seen what happens when organizations become unaccountable and independent; organizations like FIFA, that had broke their ties to government and then became corrupt among themselves. So this exercise we've gone through for the last 15 months is so critical to making this transition away from the U.S. government to accountability to the community as a whole a smooth and realistic one. So I think we're at a historic time, but it's important to do it right.

LARISA GURNICK: I'm sorry to say that this will have to be the last question because we're nearly out of time. Please, go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm just curious. I'd like to know, because normally having the opportunity to be [accountable] for the revision of everything, for the review of everything, for having – what do you do apart from ICANN? What's your profession?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You can take that up online, but each one of us – Sébastien and Fiona and myself, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and Jonathan Zuck – all has something called a statement of interest on the ICANN website. I think we probably can quickly link that from today's session notes, and you can find out far more about us than you would ever want to know. Time is against us, and if you want to walk and talk, we can tell you about it now. But we are open books.

LARISA GURNICK: I wanted to say thank you to everybody for coming and participating and being flexible with our slight technology challenges. Please don't let this be the end of your questions

and answers. We're all more than happy to engage in the conversation. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And here's my Twitter handle if anybody want to reach out with additional questions later on.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]