Motivation Statement for ATRT2
Avri Doria
04 December 2012

I am sending this Statement to request consideration for membership in the ATRT2 that is currently being formed.

I have been involved with ICANN since I was first appointed to the GNSO by Nomcom in 2005. At that time, while I still skeptical about ICANN, coming off the WGIG review of organizations involved in Internet Governance, I thought it was the organization with the best chance for offer a global participatory democratic model for governance, what we called the multistakeholder model. WGIG had done a review of many Internet governance organization, include the ITU and ICANN and ICANN had by far, been the most representative of the multistakeholder ideal at that time. When offered an opportunity to be part of this organization I was intrigued and joined the experiment.

For seven years, I have worked and contributed as part of the ICANN volunteer community. I served 5 years in the GNSO council, and as its chair for 2.5 years. As chair I would regularly invest from 30-50 hours a week in council activities. I was chair of the NCSG Executive Committee while it was negotiating its charter with the Board Structural Improvements Committee. I have chaired several working groups, both in the GNSO and At-Large. I remain an active and committed member of the ICANN volunteer community. I believe I have a good understanding of the ICANN ecosystem, its architecture and its potential.

Over these years in ICANN, as well as during the rest of my career as a protocol architect and later as a Internet governance researcher I have had the opportunity to analyze both qualitative and quantitative data and have come to many conclusions based on data and analysis. I have at times been a vocal advocate for a position within groups and at other times, as chair or editor of a document, have been the neutral consensus builder within those efforts. Whether as an advocate or as someone in a neutral role, though, I believe that I have always let evidence guide the development of my viewpoint and my way forward.

Over the years I have been alternatively impressed and disappointed with ICANN progress in global participatory democratic governance process. I have, for example, been exceedingly impressed by the transparent manner way in which the GNSO works and have advocated for that standard of openness throughout the organization. On the other hand, sometimes the Senior Staff and of the Board appear to be by-passing the formal processes, something that concerns me. I have learned a lot during my years at ICANN, and continue to learn from the interactions of the various stakeholders. As the experiment continues, the forms of interaction evolve. I believe the AOC mandate reviews are critical in that process of evolution.

I followed ATRT1 and was impressed by the process it used, especially its transparency. At this point in time, my preliminary impression of the degree to which the recommendations in the report have been implemented is mixed. In some cases, such as Board transparency, including the release of a rationale for decisions, there appears

to have been improvement. In other activities, such as defining the distinction between issues that must be submitted to the policy policy[1] process and those that may be handled by administrative actions and implementation[2], the progress appears to fall short of the recommendations.

Recently detailed reports and analysis on the changes made based on the ATRT1 recommendations have been few and far between. I think one of the critical first tasks of ATRT2 will be to do a complete evaluation of progress since the first ATRT. Additionally I have some questions with regard to the manner in which the Board of Directors and ICANN senior management regard the work done by the IOC empowered review groups. This is an issue of accountability that needs review.

If selected, I will devote as much time as is needed to the ATRT. I will also do what I can, within the constraints established by the ATRT2, to include the community in that process. For many years my work load at ICANN resembled that of a second job. I view participation in Internet Governance activities to be on a par with participation in a volunteer fire department or other such volunteer public service. It deserves at least the same level of attention one pays to their regular job. As my children are now adults with lives of their own, I have the freedom to devote as much time and effort as needed to tasks involving Internet governance as a global public service. And to my mind, making sure that ICANN fulfills its commitments to transparency and accountability is as worthwhile as any task I am capable of participating in. Without genuine accountability to the global public good and the transparency to guarantee that accountability, ICANN will lose its legitimacy. I firmly believe that is something that must be avoided, ICANN's credibility is muct too important to sacrifice.

---

[1] Policy tentatively defined as those decisions that must be made by the community using the policy development process.
[2] Administrative actions and Implementation tentatively defined as those things the Board or staff may do without a prior or specific empowering policy development process.