
HYDERABAD – Review Enthusiast Public Session
Saturday, November 05, 2016 – 13:45 to 15:00 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. We're just going to give it a couple more minutes, then we're going to hop into it. Okay. Well, thank you so much for joining us. This is actually going to be great because this will be a very intimate setting where we can take questions and have a discussion.

So, essentially, what the session agenda for today is going to be is I'm going to walk through a quick introduction to reviews. And then we're going to break into a panel discussion. We have Chuck Gomes who is here right now. Holly Raiche should be joining. Then Drew Bagley is going to be joining us as well. And Cheryl just got here, fantastic.

When I talk about reviews, I like to talk first about the mission of the stakeholder model and ICANN's work with the global community. So, obviously, our mission is to maintain a free, stable, resilient, open Internet for ourselves and for future generations. And that actually is a pretty big job, ICANN working with the community to achieve this.

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.

Because the Internet itself is not just a single network. It's multiple networks, many networks, spread across the globe. With billions of different devices connected to it, speaking in different languages all at the same time, having emerging innovation, changes in technology, changes in infrastructure, and potential threats of security issues. That's the environment that they work in to keep this entire Internet infrastructure stable.

I think in many ways how we're doing our job is just as important as what we're doing. Because ICANN facilitates one of the largest multi-stakeholder engagement models in the history of humankind. That's because the Internet doesn't belong to a single person. The decisions about how it's run aren't made by a single entity; it's something that belongs to the world. So, in order to make decisions about its future and how to run it, we really have to have the multi-stakeholder model where we bring together for-profits and non-profits and city government and local citizens to make these decisions. So we can have all those perspectives and have the appropriate diversity to make informed decisions.

One point that I really try to make is that this multi-stakeholder model shouldn't be taken for granted. It's this vast experiment that we're all participating in. But in order for us to be able to continue to be able to keep this model going, we really have to

make sure that we're reaching our commitments because the world is watching.

There are many organizations that I'm sure would love to take over the roles of the global stakeholder community and the facilitation that ICANN does and move away from a bottom-up form of decision making potentially to a top-down. So the work that you, the community, does is really important. And it's a tremendous responsibility. So it's great to have you here.

Now, the reason I bring all this up is because reviews play a crucial role in this process. Essentially, the way they work is they look at the past performance of processes and actions and outcomes and they make recommendations to improve future performance of the ICANN organization and the stakeholder process.

In this way you can think of ICANN reviews as the learning center for ICANN. What they do is they look at industry best practices. They're looking at emerging business trends. They're looking at changes in innovation and changes in the landscape. They're making decisions on how we're ensuring that we're maintaining our strategic path.

Another key component that reviews are really important for is improving transparency and accountability. The way they do it is simple. Reviews ask really hard questions about really important

core concepts that make ICANN function well. So they ask really important questions and they develop answers, data-driven answers, and then they share that with the global community.

What that does is a couple different things. One, it makes ICANN and the stakeholder model much more efficient. It also builds the trust that's necessary for all these different stakeholders to work together. And the transparency that creates also creates this ability to have an accountability which is crucial to make sure that everybody is meeting the commitments that they've set forth.

There are two different types of reviews. There's specific reviews and there are organizational reviews. Specific reviews are run by the community and organizational reviews are run by independent examiners. Or you can think of them as independent auditors. But both of these are mandated by ICANN Bylaws.

Before we go to the next slide, I want to point out with organizational reviews, those are really focusing on ICANN structures. The supporting organizations and the advisory committees, you've probably heard a lot about them or are very familiar with them, ASO, GNSO, ccNSO. And I'll talk a little bit about them, but I wanted to make sure that we pointed out that that was a real focus for the organizational reviews.

I want to jump into the specific review topics just to give you an idea of what these reviews look at. The security, stability, and resiliency review really looks at just that, the security, stability, and resiliency of the domain name system or the unique identifiers that make the Internet work. The next one, RDS or WHOIS, really focuses on public access to accurate and complete domain registrant information.

Has anybody here ever created their own website before? Okay. You know when you do that you have to put in your information. And if you're like me, you put in your information, your real e-mail address and real phone number. Then all of a sudden you're getting tons of spam and people are calling you and they've gotten your information. This review is really looking at that problem.

They're looking at the balance and the need for data security and data privacy of the people who are registering the websites and the legitimate needs of law enforcement. The accountability and transparency review is looking at the robust mechanisms that have been put in place for public input. The decision making is reflective of the public interests and ICANN is being held accountable to all stakeholders.

The last one is competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice. That's looking at the New gTLD Program. Making sure

that the new gTLDs that are being entered into the marketplace are being able to maintain efficient competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice.

Organizational reviews are essentially looking at the SOs and ACs that I mentioned. They're making sure that they're fulfilling what their role is supposed to be, that they're working in an efficient manner, and that they're accountable to the stakeholders that they represent and that they're functioning the way that they should be.

But, throughout these reviews the community plays a vital role, especially, with the specific reviews. Say you apply for a Call for Volunteers and you submit your application. Your application will actually be reviewed and the decision on whether to accept your application will be done by the community. It will be done by different SOs and ACs. If you're chosen to join a review, you are responsible for establishing the plan. You and your team are responsible for conducting the review as well as presenting recommendations.

One thing that'd be really the highlight is that these recommendations need to be specific, measurable, actionable, relevant, and time-based. It's really important because these recommendation, the processes they go to the Board. The Board decides to accept them, reject them or accept them with

changes. The recommendations that are accepted then go on to implementation.

So you can imagine, the ICANN organization implements these recommendations with the help of some review team members that come over to help us understand the intent of the recommendation when we're implementing them. And specific reviews or SMART reviews are much more easy to implement. It makes the entire system work better because everybody wants to see the fruit of their labor. They want to see reviews that have been able to be executed. That's really the reason that we highlight that for the review process.

The main point here is that it's long and there are a lot of resources that go into it. It's a lot of work. The staff spends about six months with planning, logistics, and assembling the review team. The review itself, planning the review takes about three months. The review team takes about 12 months minimum to conduct the review.

Then, once they've submitted the recommendations, the Board will take about six months to make a decision on whether to accept, reject, or accept with changes before it goes into the implementation process. Once it goes into the implementation process, you're looking at another three to six months to plan the implementation. Implementing can take 6 to 18 months,

depending on the complexity of the recommendation, before it becomes standard operating procedure.

This slide is really busy. These are the reviews that we have coming up. And the reason it's busy is because we're really busy. The good news is there's a lot of opportunity for the community to get involved. So if you're interested in reviews we have a lot of opportunities for you to get involved with.

We don't have the time to go through all the stuff we have coming down the pipeline, but the ones I wanted highlight: CCT has gone through the research. They're about to make their recommendation. So there's going to be a public comment period. So if that's an area of interest for you, I'm going to share how you can become aware of how to engage that. But that's coming down the pipeline.

Security, Stability, and Resiliency of the Domain Name System (SSR-2). They're in the process of choosing their review team. That review is just about to start. And there again, I'll share some different ways that community input and community participation is still going to play a vital role for people who aren't review team members. There's still a lot of work and community participation that needs to happen as well.

RDS, formerly known as WHOIS. That's a really interesting one because that Call for Volunteers is open right now. You can go to

ICANN.org and you can go to, I believe, it's the media button. But you can pull up announcements and you can see the Call for Volunteer announcement. And I highly recommend that because you can get a good understanding of what the process looks like to apply, the specific skillsets that this review requires, as well as some different information about what is the typical time commitment for participating in a review. It gets a little more granular than this presentation. But you can get a good feel for the type of work that you would expect to be doing and what the review process looks like. So, I think it's a really good opportunity to do that.

The last one that I wanted to mention, ATRT Accountability and Transparency is coming up and should be announced this year, the Call for Volunteers.

So becoming active in ICANN reviews. Our goal in having you here today and sharing about reviews is to really get you to be active review team community members. In order to really start that process, the very first step is just to make sure you've joined your community. Especially, if you're applying to join a review team because that selection process is going through the community. Obviously, communities are more likely to bring somebody onboard that they know, that they've worked with. That's important to start finding your place within that community.

How to actively participate? Well, we've already spoken about joining a review team. You can also observe review team meetings, and there are mechanisms through which you can share input with the review teams that are doing the work. It's a great way to just learn about the process, learn about the specific issues, start building relationships with community members, and start making an impact. There are public comments spread throughout a review, and there are surveys that come out as well.

Those are all great ways to start getting involved. Review activities themselves. If you want to find out about what's coming down the pipeline, there's a review list and I'll pass around a sign-up for that, which will provide you with all the different activities that are coming up so that you can have them all in one spot may make it easy for you.

If you follow ICANN social channels, we always post engagement opportunities there as well. Then review wiki pages are a great resource. If you go to ICANN.org, you go to specific reviews or organizational reviews, well actually, specific reviews for sure. They have wiki pages that have a ton of information and they have a calendar where you can see all the upcoming Plenary Team Meetings and Subgroup Team Meetings. So that's a great way to get plugged in. And they're really interesting to listen to.

We wanted to also bring up this slide just in case you are focused or you're interested in applying for a review team. This is the actual process right now. We issue a Call for Volunteers like we've just done for RDS/WHOIS. Interested candidates will apply. We then forward those applications to the relevant supporting organization or advisory committee that you've affiliated with through your application process. Then the SOs and ACs, they'll use their own process, aided by a scorecard and relevant selection criteria.

SATIA: Hello. I am [Satia]. It is written there, “Leadership will select representatives for review team according to expertise and diversity.”

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So what type of expertise do you require?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's a really good point. Every review is different. With RDS and WHOIS, that is a review that they're looking for very specific skillsets of people having a deep understanding, high level of

subject matter expertise with WHOIS and the previous review and the recommendations that were made, people who have been tracking and following that. Accountability and Transparency is a bit broader.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: What I mean is do they require a technical background for that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: They will require a range of different backgrounds. Oftentimes, they will require a technical background. But you don't have to have that technical background; somebody on your team has to have it. The idea is to have a team made up with people with a variety of different skillsets and perspectives so that together you can bring together that expertise because there's never going to be one person who has all the knowledge to do a good job.

CHUCK GOMES: Just to add to what you're saying, if you look at those up there, the SSAC is going to require a fairly high technical level of expertise, especially from a security point of view. Whereas, you look at some of the others, they may not and they may actually want a mix of technical and non-technical and so forth.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I just have a comment. It's a personal one. I am a nutritionist, educationalist, and environmentalist. I'm just wondering where I can fit into ICANN. I taught for many years in the schools, so I can just go to schools and start informing about ICANN and the school children what it does and all as a subject. Is it possible?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible]. So you said your background was education and...?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Nutrition and public health and environmentalist. I feel I'm miles away from the subject.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The first time when I went to Helsinki, it was all a confused state for me. I couldn't follow anything that was going on. But I enjoyed talking to people and trying to get some information about ICANN. But this time, I got a clearer picture because I did all the online things, online courses which ICANN has provided on the Internet, and I am a user of Internet.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may. I'm hearing two things. I'm hearing a woman with passion to be involved and a desire to contribute and that's something that, of course, our communities across all of ICANN would value deeply. But I'm also hearing the need to find exactly the right space where you feel best equipped to contribute.

What you've got in front of you there does give you some of the slices of the component parts of ICANN, so find some people – and many of us can step up and help you navigate some of that – to help you work out where in these slices your best fit is. There is, for example, parts of the GNSO which are quite likely to be a natural fit for you, as there is within the At-Large Community. There's parts of that that would be a natural fit. That's a journey that you need to take.

In terms of the review process though, in terms of the importance of having diversity in these review teams, it's always worthwhile having a look at where, what you were saying, being an Internet end-user and an environmentalist and an educationalist, may come in. In other words, are any of these particular reviews focused on the effectiveness of this entity for representing something that includes Internet end-users? And if that's the case, then I would suggest that there is a good fit. But

it is horses for courses and as Chuck said, for example, with SSAC it could be very, very specific.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think that was a great answer. Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you. And At-Large Community, I think I feel I can fit into that, At-Large. Because I am an end-user and a freelancer, I use a lot of Internet. But in my own personal capacity, how can I contribute to ICANN because I have lot of time on my hands and I use Internet a lot? I see my school children are using lot of Internet from the age of maybe six or seven, they are initiated into Internet by parents itself in India.

CHUCK GOMES: This session is about reviews. Keep in mind there are tons of other opportunities besides reviews where you may fit in, and that may become clearer as we get through this session today. So don't assume that review teams are the only place. I think you already know that. They're not the only place that you can get involved.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

So just to wrap up the selection of the review team process, the SOs and ACs basically have their own process and they can provide a list of no more than seven candidates to the SO and AC chairs. And those chairs will then select up to 21 candidates maximum to participate in the review and publish the list.

So speaking to diversity these statistics here are essentially all of the diversity statistics for all the reviews that we've done. We need to do better. Our goal is to have diversity that is reflective of the global community. So that's both geographic location and in gender. Just having those perspectives is a great value that you can bring to a review team. Our goal is to continue to increase diversity to be reflective of the global community.

The last thing, I always like to highlight why community members participate in reviews, and part of it is this higher purpose of building and protecting the future of the Internet for ourselves and for future generations. I think that's something that motivates a lot of community members and a lot of ICANN organization members and Board members. But there's also the ability to develop valuable new skills, experience, and expertise just by getting involved in reviews and in ICANN, in general.

ICANN is also a tight-knit community. It's a great opportunity to build strong relationships with a global network of professionals across the globe and also to contribute your unique skillsets to

this idea, this multi-stakeholder model, and provide your perspective and provide your skillsets. And, lastly, to ensure that the specific interests of your community or your region and your industry are represented.

Before we hop into the Q&A, really what we're here to do is trying to get people to sign up and be active. We're really looking to develop a very strong active community. We have some sign-up sheets that I'll share around. The sign-up sheets will basically provide you with a stream of updated information about ways to get involved.

We also encourage you to visit [ICANN.org/resources/reviews](https://icann.org/resources/reviews). We have a lot of good information there that can help you get started and help give you a good foundation for what reviews are in general and dive more deeply into the specific reviews that we have. And, yeah, just become an active review enthusiast. It's just a matter of getting started and taking action, taking that first step.

With that, I want to thank and introduce – we have several seasoned, experienced community members here, and I just wanted to give a quick introduction. That is the smallest text I've ever seen, so I'm going to read off the screen here.

Drew Bagley, who is Senior Privacy Counsel for Crowd Strike and Director of Operations for the Secure Domain Foundation. Drew

brings about two years of active experience with ICANN. And he's a sub-team co-chair and independent expert for the ICANN Competition, Consumer Choice, and Consumer Trust Review Team, the CCT Review Team, which I spoke about, which is in the process of forming their recommendations. Drew, thank you for coming.

We also have Chuck Gomes. Chuck is the Vice President of Policy at Verisign. He has 18 years of experience working with ICANN. He's had several roles: Chair of the RDS PDP Working Group as well as the Co-Chair of the Policy and Implementation Working Group for the GNSO Counsel Chair. A ton of experience there and very happy to have you here as well, Chuck.

I have a couple questions to start off with, and then we were going to open the floor to any additional questions that you have. But the first question that I wanted to ask was specifically for ICANN Reviews, why do you feel in your experience that ICANN Reviews are important? We've spoken to it a bit, but I want to get your input.

DREW BAGLEY:

Thanks for having me. For me, when I first saw the posting for the ICANN Review and decided to apply for it, what I found was most important was what you said about that higher purpose. Really, I looked at it as an opportunity to make an impact.

I have an extensive research background and wanted to apply that to doing something that I thought was overall really important for the Internet. So I see these review teams as such a key component in the community's ability to audit itself, especially, post-transition.

So, for me, I thought doing something that was data-driven and being part of that was really, really important because in the community there are many different voices here obviously. And for many people it's people advocating certain policy positions that represent their employer or whatnot. And I saw the review team as something that could be much more objective than that in the Internet community space and yet have such an important influence on policy, so that's why I decided to join.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Fantastic. Chuck, do you have any thoughts on that particular question?

CHUCK GOMES: First of all, I'm an avid supporter of the bottom-up multi-stakeholder model and it's relatively new in the world. There's lots of room for improvement. So the review process provides an opportunity to find what's working, what's not and then to work together to come up with improvements.

Now, by the way, I would add another type of review to your list. It's at a lower level than the ones you're showing, but that's policy review. I'm in the GNSO, but I suspect the ccNSO does it, too. The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy, that happened to be one that was broken into many parts and went over many years. But it was the review of a policy that was developed and implemented in the early '90s and just finished up its work. Although there's one new issue that surfaced recently in implementation, and good improvements have been made to that because of that review process. And most of the things you had on your slide apply to those as well.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Chuck, thank you for that. I'm going to come back to you with this next question. What has been the most rewarding part of your experience working on a review team?

CHUCK GOMES: Well, the real rewarding part is when you see the recommended improvements implemented. I was a part of the previous GNSO Review that resulted in a structural change of the GNSO Counsel and so forth. And over the last few years we've been able to see how that worked. And I think from a policy perspective it has worked very well. There are some other issues that probably

need to be addressed, but seeing it implemented and seeing the process work is very rewarding.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Drew, what are your thoughts on that? What has been the most rewarding part of your experience working on the CCT Review Team?

DREW BAGLEY: I'm still in the middle of it, so I can't be as optimistic yet as Chuck. That sounds very rewarding what I'll, hopefully, one day be able to say, looking back retrospectively. So right now I'm in the part where it's still just a lot of hard work.

But thus far even I have to say, we're not at the recommendation stage, but we're getting very close to that. Thus far, looking back, even not yet knowing what we're going to recommend it has been so rewarding to actually get ahold of and create data that did not previously exist.

I think that that's one of the most important things. And looking forward, I think six months down the road if we make recommendations that many people agree with or disagree with, no matter what, we'll have a data trail behind us. And that alone is going to be helpful for the community to actually create their own recommendations in so many different parts.

So the review I'm on touches many different things because we are looking at the new gTLDs and we have such a broad mandate. I think that's what's so rewarding is knowing that we're creating data sets that are going to inform policy for years to come.

Specifically with that, for me personally, the main personal victory thus far is actually getting to really design a DNS Abuse Study. So we will finally have that for the first time in the community's history a comprehensive DNS Abuse Study that I'm sure will be criticized like everything I'm sure we'll do. But the fact that we'll have something that is quantitative to go off of as we're having all of these important DNS abuse discussions for years to come I think is really important.

I think the fact that our review team, we see that the work doesn't end with us. Because some of the data from our review team is going to be not only informing future CCT Review Teams, but even the SSR Review Team that'll be starting up. I think that's been really rewarding to finally, this far into it, see where we fit in the puzzle and everything. And one day I hope to say it was so rewarding to see recommendations implemented.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

That's great, Drew. Thank you for that. Chuck, you're going to have to go way back for this one. Because I've been spending a

lot of time talking about ways that people can get involved in reviews, but I actually haven't done it. So my next question is for somebody who's been through that process and you've seen other people come onboard, what types of recommendations would you give to somebody who's new to the process, who's trying to figure out how to find their place? What advice would you give to them?

CHUCK GOMES:

Sure. My first advice— and I'm going to qualify it in a minute— would be to get involved in certain parts of the community. Starting out doing a review before actively being involved is going to be much more challenging. Now, there may be some value to that— here's my qualification. Sometimes it's helpful to have new blood that doesn't have experience. But if that's all you have on a review team, it's going to be really hard.

So, for example, if you are interested in a GNSO Review, hopefully, you have some GNSO experience. And there are tons of opportunities to get that experience. If you're going to be involved in the ALAC Review, having a firsthand knowledge of how the ALAC operates and maybe even having identified some of the issues that the ALAC has – they don't have any issues, do they?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. Well, yes, we do.

CHUCK GOMES: It is very helpful. I happen to be very active in the GNSO, so that's a place where I can contribute more readily. Again, that doesn't eliminate newcomers in reviews, but if you're really interested in getting involved in reviews, get involved in the things that they're reviewing. And that will really make it easier to be a positive contributor.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Chuck. Drew what are your thoughts?

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, I think having the institutional and historical context in how ICANN functions is really, really important for any review no matter what you're doing. But, speaking as a person who was a relative newcomer myself, what's been great for me is that I can lean on other members of the review team for those areas of expertise. And then I'm able to contribute my own area of expertise that focuses mostly on cyber security.

I think part of this goes to the design of a review team. I think an ideal review team operates with not only diversity in backgrounds but diversity in experience, and in ICANN specific

experience. You absolutely want people there who have been trailblazers in ICANN and have that historical knowledge. And then you definitely want that complicated by people who are less jaded, I would say, too. I, hopefully, as of now still fall into the latter category.

But something I think is really important to understand with review teams is the time commitment. I don't think that is accurately expressed on the bulletins for the review teams. I think it's an idealistic to say it will only take four hours a week or I forget what's on there. But I know for me it takes much more. And so, it's a very, very big time commitment and I think you need to accept that going into it.

And then the other advice I would give looking back, if I could do it all over again, is knowing from the get-go, really understanding how ICANN staff can support you and the role they can play as you're figuring out what you're going to do in the beginning, figuring out the scope of your mandate, identifying your data sources and whatnot. Because ICANN staff is extremely helpful. There's so much talent on ICANN staff. They're expert researchers. And I think that's something that on a review team once they start properly utilizing ICANN staff, then they really function much better.

I know for us and I think for other review teams there's often a slow start because people are clearly identifying what is an ICANN staff role versus what's something that a review team might need to look for another outside data source for. And so I think that's really important. I also think identifying all the data needs as soon as possible and in as specific of a way as possible is very important. Because oftentimes for review teams some of the data that's necessary to even form a recommendation might take months to gather in and of itself. So to operate on a pretty tight timeline, you really need to identify that in the beginning.

CHUCK GOMES:

I'm going to follow-up a little bit on that. First of all, you're absolutely right that review teams need certain types of expertise. So there are lots of opportunities even if you haven't had some of the specific experience that I talked about where having somebody with research expertise, for example, is very valuable. Or training, teaching, education expertise is very useful. And, in fact, in the GNSO, and [Larisa] knows this very well, the recommendations for GNSO improvements, several of them involve training.

So another area besides just being on a review team that still relates to reviews is implementation teams to implement the recommendations and they need different types of expertise.

For example, there are quite a few training recommendations in the GNSO improvement recommendations that have been approved by the Board. And so having some people with that kind of expertise is very useful.

DREW BAGLEY:

I was just going to jump in again. Yeah, absolutely, so I note Chuck was following up on me, now I'm going to follow-up on Chuck following up on me, so we're going to get several layers down.

But, yeah, the diversity of the subject matter expertise is so important to where even there's a lot of value in subject matter expertise that comes outside of the Internet, specifically outside of the domain name system world, but even the broader Internet or technology world because there are oftentimes issues that come up that if you have an analytical framework that's analogous it can be very helpful.

So, for example, on my team we have some economist on there. That's a universal skillset that is not specific to certain types of markets. And that skillset, on our team we wouldn't be able to do our jobs if we didn't have economists. And it didn't matter one way or another before the review team started what their knowledge was of the specific domain name industry for us. They did have some knowledge, but from what I've seen is even

if they had had no knowledge, we still would have been much better off having them just because of the skillset that they brought because a market is still a market and you still need to define things.

Similarly, people with a policy background, I think, are often very helpful even if it's been developing completely unrelated policies because they still understand the gap that will exist between a policy and the implementation of that policy. If the policy is not crafted in a specific enough way, if there aren't benchmarks and mandates, if there aren't further review mechanisms for that policy and whatnot.

So I think even looking ahead for when we're finally getting to the recommendation standpoint I think, on my team, that diversity of skillsets is really going to come into play in many ways that are probably not that closely related to the ICANN world.

That's why, I think, one of the most important things to have is a willingness to contribute and to really put forth the time. An absolutely mission-driven purpose to see your role in doing something to improve the domain name system. And an ability to learn and to be honest about what you don't know about the DNS and learn from those who know much more than you. And I think that as a whole means that you can have review teams

where you have many newcomers on them and still be very successful.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Drew. Well, I was going to open the panel up. I guess I will open the panel up. But also, I wanted to take a moment to introduce Holly Raiche. She is our other experienced community member who's agreed to join us today. So thank you very much.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm sorry for being late.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Not at all.

HOLLY RAICHE: I needed to get coffee.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Got to have a coffee. Well, I understand that. I've got a Red Bull in my briefcase right here just waiting. She is adjunct lecturer in law at the University of New South Wales. She is very experienced with eight years active experience here at ICANN. She has had a variety of roles, including the ALAC Leadership Team, Chair of APRALO.

HOLLY RAICHE: APRALO.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. I'm still learning some things as well. And the APRALO Rep on the ALAC. Her focus is on the RAA Amendments and WHOIS. Which is the review that you've got a Call for Volunteers out right now. That's fantastic. I've got some questions. I want to make sure that we have enough time to open this up for you if you have any questions.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'll be really quick.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, absolutely.

HOLLY RAICHE: You ask four questions, I'll give you two minutes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Why do you feel that ICANN Reviews are important?

HOLLY RAICHE: I think they're particularly important now because post-October 1, it's really this community that has to make a go of it. And we have to actually look at the way we're operating, not only the individual organizational reviews, but the larger reviews how we work together because we're either going to make it fail or succeed.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's a good answer.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The second question is, what has been the most rewarding part of your experience?

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, this is the beginning of my review and so far no one has killed me. And I think this is very important. The most rewarding thing is actually standing back and having a think about what it is that ALAC and that At-Large Community do role they play. I have a long road ahead of me, Larisa is sitting there smiling going, "Boy, has she got a long road ahead of her." It is going to be an interesting road and it's going to be a rewarding road. I

suppose the best part is that I've got some terrific people to deal with.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Fantastic. And the last question that I have for this audience here, what advice would you give a community member who's interested in getting involved in reviews or really ICANN as a whole? Think about when you first started [inaudible].

HOLLY RAICHE: Cheryl threw me in at the deep end with no instructions at all. So I learned the hard way which is probably a way to learn that we really learn. But don't do it that way if you don't have to. I think some of the Fellowship, NextGen are probably much better ways to introduce what it is that ICANN does, what it is that the various SOs and ACs do. So don't do it the way I did.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So don't do it the way she did. Great. I'm going to go ahead and open up the floor to you the audience to see if you have any questions for these experienced community members. Any questions at all.

[ROBERT]: Hi, I'm [Robert] an independent [inaudible]. First of all, thank you for opening the [RDS] applications for everyone. My question is, I have a lot of domains and websites and I just have one primary email attached to it for [inaudible] and I get a lot of spam. Not for renewing my domain name and for all official communications the registrar should send an e-mail. But, obviously, my information is public so any e-mail or anybody sends a spam e-mail that, "Please renew your domain. Please this and that." So what can I do for those spam e-mails coming from, not from registrars, for my domain names. Any e-mails because [what happens is my] e-mail information is public, so everybody has that information and I don't know from where the spam is coming?

CHUCK GOMES: This is probably a little off topic for this session here, but one real straightforward thing to do is delete them. You know that one, right? We all do that. Depending on the situation, obviously, you can install spam filters and I find those very helpful. You can use a privacy proxy service for registering your domain name. There are a variety of things there. But again, this is probably getting a little off topic for this particular area.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Please feel free to come up and join the table if you have any questions. Yeah, please?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm not sure if this is off topic or not. My name is [inaudible], so a newbie here. So for the Internet right now we see [is as Facebook]. And we have recently in India the Internet.com where free Internet was given by Facebook, but they had their own policies in place. I'm not sure ICANN was there at that time, but there was a lot of big community campaign and they stopped that. Facebook had that Internet.org the free Internet for in the mobile phones.

TIM: ICANN's been around for nearly 20 years and we really try and focus our mission on names and numbers and public, technical identifiers what we're calling them now. So that sort of higher level issues is more appropriately dealt with in other fora. But some of these reviews that we're talking about we do talk about some of these higher level issues, but many of us are trying to keep ICANN focused on its core mission of names, numbers, and other identifiers.

CHUCK GOMES: A lot of people don't understand, especially, if they're new to ICANN. But ICANN really doesn't have any authority over content on the Internet. Now, certainly there are things indirectly that come about based on policies that are implemented and so forth. But as a general rule, if it's a content issue, as Tim said, there are other fora to deal with that. It might be law enforcement. It might be something else. But that's certainly not part of ICANN's mission.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I just jump in there more to come back to Robert's first question. If you have a look at the program you'll see that after the coffee break there's in Hall 3 an update on the WHOIS Initiatives and you may find some of the conversation there assists you in some of what you're interested in as well.

CHUCK GOMES: Another thing, too, the WHOIS Review Team that was mentioned, one of the things that it will kind of touch on the concern with spam and so forth. Not that they have any authority there with regard to spam, but because WHOIS is a source of information that is used, that kind of concern will come up at least indirectly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Cheryl's had far more experience with reviews than I have. She's lived through one. And I'm going to ask Larisa as well. Ask you about your experience with reviews, about the importance of this particular review, and this one is very different to the one that you ran. And for those who don't know it she was actually responsible for the first review of what was then At-Large, but a much smaller At-Large.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. We'll talk later on the last comment. However, before I go down a rabbit hole, the first At-Large Advisory Committee Review was conducted as one of the first of the two organizational reviews that were done. The way reviews are conducted now is vastly different, well, I would like to suggest a highly improved model on how they were done then. They were still equally important. In fact, to some extent the review team was created out of Board resolutions, for example, and the chair, that person was appointed by the Board.

So it has always been taken very seriously. The importance of them is not the question. But the nature of what happened out of the recommendations and how those things were implemented were very, very different in those early rounds compared to what we're experiencing now in our second round. So I am a fan of reviews. I believe they are a huge foundation

piece to our accountability, both internally and externally. But I also think that it's important to realize not all reviews are the same.

And in the case of At-Large Advisory Committee Review that was done last time round, our subsequent review is actually focusing on another layer of our community. So we're now looking at At-Large. So not the 15-person committee that is the At-Large Advisory Committee, but the larger construct which is made up in a number of ways that I won't bore you with. But it's a little bit like looking at the GNSO Counsel or the ccNSO Counsel, the first time round and then the ccNSO or the GNSO the second time round. So those variations are important as well. You build on the learnings. But, I mean, my experiences are analogous to everything else you've heard. They're hard work. You've got to prepare. And if done well, they're enormously important.

HOLLY RAICHE:

And I'm going to ask Larisa, I mean, sitting where you sit which is a very different place to where the rest of us sit, you actually have some expectations with reviews which I'd love to hear.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you. I am part of the ICANN team that supports the community work on reviews. I see us as being the guardians of

the process. If we do our job well, we provide the right forum so that the right people can come together and we can support their efforts so that recommendations are smart, S-M-A-R-T, as you saw on the slide. So that the Board can make a quick decision so that the community and the Board and the entire ICANN organization can actually implement change. Because I think for all of you that are sitting here, and as you heard Drew talk about the huge amount of time that people in the community volunteers are investing in this process, we are the guardians to make sure that it all works because if you all waste your time, we should go home.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Are there other questions? Were you going to say something, Drew?

DREW BAGLEY: I was just going to say that – and Theresa's in the room – I don't know what we would do without our ICANN Staff to keep us, and Theresa knows for sure. But we love our ICANN Staff. We would not be able to do the review team without them.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you for that. Thank you.

CHUCK GOMES: And it's important for you to realize whatever you're thinking about getting involved in, you wouldn't be able to do it with the excellent staff support that happens. They make it possible for us as volunteers who have a full-time other life to contribute in a — I can't say not busy, it still takes a lot time like Drew said. It's true. But without the staff support, it would probably be impossible. So everybody, whether it's a policy development working team, whether it's a review team, whatever it is, ICANN has developed to a point where they have great support for all of us and they make it feasible to do it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And that's on the record now. Thank you so much for that. And Larisa had a point to make.

LARISA GURNICK: Well, actually, I noticed that Fiona walked in and I was just noticing that we do have another experienced review team member with us. So I was wondering if you would care to share any of your observations with the group of people here that might be thinking about whether they want to invest their energy into reviews at some point.

FIONA ASONGA:

Hello, everyone. Thanks for the opportunity. I was actually coming in for the next session, but— yes. I think involvement in the review process takes a lot of time and you have to be involved and you need to be ready to put in quite a bit of time reading the documents.

One thing I learned when I got into ATRT 2 is that ICANN has a lot of documentation. So if you ask for documents, staff do not shy away from giving you the pages and pages and pages of documents that you need to go through. You, therefore, need to be able to have very good reading skills to be able to take note of what is important, what you're looking for so that you can ask the relevant questions to staff for additional information. Otherwise, without time for that, it's very difficult for you to then contribute appropriately to our review process or review discussion. And that goes for any of the reviews. It's just a general comment. It takes a lot of time.

You need to be ready to do that, and sometimes it will interfere with your holidays. But, yeah, [inaudible]. I was just talking to someone outside and asking, "So when does ICANN office close this December?" Because sometimes the office doesn't close because we are having conference calls on the 27th, the 28th – crazy dates when guys feel they should be away on holiday or something. But in a review team, you need to finish a document. ATRT had a deadline of 31st of December, and so we worked with

the staff. We worked through the entire Christmas break to make sure that we made the deadline. So you need to be ready to do things like that. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just one additional question. What type of advice would you give to somebody who's new to the process about actually getting involved. You know people talk about how it's hard to find their place. It's difficult to find ways to actually start. What kind of advice would you give there?

FIONA ASONGA: Somebody who's very new to ICANN, if say this is your first ICANN meeting you've come for and you want to get involved, you first need to know which group you need to plug into. For those who have been here, we are able to [inaudible] supporting organizations that they are. For someone who's new and they come in, they get lost sometimes within the GNSO because of the many subgroups in that.

So it's important that you first know which group you want to be affiliated to because participation is normally sponsored by the supporting organizations. So you'll be nominated from the group you're involved in, though there's normally two slots, I think, for free random participants who are not affiliated to any

of the groups. But it helps when you've been involved in one of the groups and, therefore, you have some level of understanding of what the institution is all about. Then you're able to participate appropriately. So start out getting into a group. If you work for an ISP, it will be [ISP]. If you work for a registrar, it will be the registrar group. If you are from a registry, it will be the registry group. If you working say for an exchange point, you'd be interested in the [inaudible] the numbers group.

So there are different groups that you can be involved in. If you are a lawyer it depends on which aspects of law you are interested in. If it's intellectual property, in trademarks, is it just business. There so many groups you can get involved in, Civil Society, there are many groups you can get involved in. If you are not sure where to be, then you need to go to At-Large because At-Large welcomes everybody.

And then from here, get involved. Let the group members know you because they will be involved in deciding whether or not you are the person that that group wants to send to the review team. So you need to get involved at that level first, then grow as you move along. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Fiona. Yes, please?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you. I'm [inaudible]. I'm from China. Actually, I know the ALAC from the inSIG, the India School of Internet Governance. There are some leaders from [there. I see] they participate and give some introduction. So I'm very interested in this organization. And right now, my personal interest in [WHOIS]. I actually also sent an e-mail to ALAC trying to apply to be an individual member, but it seems right now in APRALO they do not accept individual member yet.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let me assure that it is in our rules, in our guidelines, and we do, in fact, have individual members. So I would encourage you to have a chat to Holly. There is no impediment for you to be an individual member of APRALO, and I know you would be welcomed.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: That's Asia Pacific Regional At-Large Organization. We all talk in acronyms and need to talk in English or whatever. So by all means, do apply to Asia Pacific Regional At-Large Organization.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Holly, thanks for the note on the use of acronyms. But, of course, when she used them herself, I'm assuming she understands what they mean.

I want to make a point though and that is that the fact that our Regional At-Large Organizations do accept individual members is an implemented outcome from recommendations in our first review. So it's a very nice point that you've made. We obviously need to do better at communicating it. But the reason that that could happen is because of recommendations made in the first organizational review. And so every RALO should have rules that allow that to happen. That sort of just ties it up, but that's part of the growth and improvement that reviews can bring to the components parts of the organization.

CHUCK GOMES: Within the GNSO, you don't have to be part of any organization. Now, by the way, let me stop and say, I fully agree with the recommendation to find out where you fit and get involved with that organization. But in GNSO Policy Development, you don't have to be from a particular organization. Anyone, regardless of where they are in ICANN, is welcome to participate in a policy development effort. And you don't even have to be part of the

GNSO. We even let Cheryl participate. Once a month, we have one for you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, I think we're just about out of time. I wanted to thank you Fiona and thank you Cheryl and Drew and Holly and Chuck for all your fantastic input. It really helps, I think, to hear from community members who have the experience and have the knowledge. And to be quite honest, I learn quite a bit from these as well. So I really appreciate your participation and impromptu participation and thank you so much.

THERESA SWINEHART: First, thank you for participating here and also thank you for the kind words on the support from the organization to the community. I think the reverse is also, thank you very much for the community's time and commitment to these reviews. They are, as you know, an important part of the accountability mechanisms of the organization. They are the tools for the evolution of the organization to reflect the community and the input there. And as we go into this post-transition phase will be a very, very important and continue to be an important tool towards this. So I think a big thanks to the community for all of its time and commitment to this as well.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]