

Alan Greenberg - Candidate Statement Of Interest

SECTION A. Identification and Contact Information

Poll Heading: 1a. e-mail address

alan.greenberg[at]mcgill.ca

Poll Heading: 2a. Alternative e-mail address

greenberg.alan[at]gmail.com

Poll Heading: 3a. Contact telephone number(s) (Must include your country and area code)

Poll Heading: 3b. Contact telephone number(s) (Must include your country and area code)

Poll Heading: 3c. Any other numbers/methods you wish to list

Poll Heading: 4a. Country/countries of citizenship

Canada

Poll Heading: 4b. Country/countries of residence

Canada

SECTION B. Professional and Educational Background

Poll Heading: 1. Provide details of your current job, role, title, employer and affiliations

I am a (part time) self-employed consultant working with national and international donor agencies related to the use of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) in support of developing countries. Assignments have included (both paid and pro-bono):

- an evaluation of current ICT development progress for the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD).
- an overall review of the support of ICT by Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) with recommendations on whether Sweden should continue such support, and if so, how.
- a review of Sida ICT support in Tanzania.
- a draft position paper on ICT support for the Government of Germany.
- co-authored an Information Technology Security Handbook, published by the World Bank in 2003.
- post-project evaluations of projects in various countries.
- a study investigating how technology can be used effectively to address poverty issues, and what must be done to ensure such successful use (presented at WSIS-2 in Tunis – the report can be found at <http://www.eldis.org/fulltext/sidaictpoverty.pdf>).

All of my efforts in these projects have focused on what developing countries must do to be able to effectively deploy and support Information and Communications Technologies – a pre-cursor and co-requirement for the effective and widespread use of the Internet.

Poll Heading: 2. Describe your educational and professional history. Provide all information that you believe may be relevant to being an effective member of the ICANN Board

Education:

B.Sc. (Major Physics), McGill University (1967)

M.Sc. (Computer Science), McGill University (1973)

I spent much of my professional career at McGill University in Montreal, Quebec, Canada holding a variety of technical and managerial positions. For the period from 1987 to 1999, I held the position of Director of Computing and Telecommunications. In that role, I was responsible for the institution's communications and computing infrastructure, technology policy advice and formulation, personal computer sales and support, and a profitable commercial software subsidiary. My responsibilities included a staff of over 100 full-time people and budgets totaling about \$18m. Universities are challenging places to work, where technical and managerial skills must be melded with the ability to work collegially and yet still make crucial decisions in a timely manner.

During 1980-81 I was on leave from McGill holding the position of Visiting Scientist at IBM's Watson Research laboratory.

Since taking early retirement from McGill, I have been working as an independent consultant focusing on the use of information and communications technologies (ICT) in developing countries.

I have included additional information with regard to Board experience and volunteer experience in following sections.

Poll Heading: 3. Describe any current and past volunteer community positions, roles and accomplishments. We are particularly interested in similar Board directorship and committee experience

Much of my past volunteer experience has been Internet-related, and will be described more fully in Section C.2.

My volunteer activities date back to the early 1970s when I started working with an IBM mainframe user group (SHARE), an activity that continued in various forms for over 20 years. I was an elected member of their Board of Directors from 1983-87.

I have been a member of the Board (or similar) of organizations responsible for research and education networking in Canada and Quebec starting in the mid-1980s as well as a not-for-profit foundation responsible for funding innovative Internet projects.

From 1995 to 2001 I worked with and later managed the Internet Society's Developing Country

Network Training Workshops. These workshops were instrumental in facilitating the Internet connection of nearly all developing countries. (See C.2 for additional details.)

I was an elected member of the Internet Society Board of Trustees for 2001-2004 (elected by individual ISOC members).

I was vice-president and a board member of a for-profit subsidiary of my university, responsible for developing and marketing software.

I am vice-president, webmaster and database manager and a member of the executive committee of a local genealogy society.

Within ICANN, I am a member of the ALAC and the ALAC's Liaison to the GNSO and have been extremely active in both roles over the last 3+ years. I have represented the ALAC and At-Large on a number of key GNSO working groups, and I am currently chairing the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery. Further details will be provided in section C.1 and C.2.

I have effectively worked on and chaired committees of varying sizes and compositions for several decades.

Poll Heading: 4. List any relevant personal or professional web pages
Empty submission

SECTION C. Internet Involvement and Interest in ICANN

Poll Heading: 1. Describe how you meet the criteria for the At-Large selected ICANN Board Director position

Bylaw-mandated Criteria

[C.1-Bylaw-1] Accomplished persons of integrity, objectivity, and intelligence, with reputations for sound judgment and open minds, and a demonstrated capacity for thoughtful group decision-making;

I will let my references speak to my integrity, objectivity and intelligence.

I have a proven success record for innovative planning and successfully implementing those plans. Collegial decision-making is a mandatory pre-requisite for longevity in a large research university and under my direction, McGill went from its pre-network days to an Internet leader. In my current role as consultant to donors and developing countries, my recommendations have little value if I cannot successfully get buy-in from the parties involved. I was an active member of the working group that developed the current GNSO organizational structure (starting with some VERY diverse positions), and I was a member of the STI group that developed the consensus positions on the new gTLD intellectual property issues. Several members of that group credit me with helping to bridge the initially large gap between the Non-Commercial Users and At-Large, and the Business and IP Constituencies.

[C.1- Bylaw-2] Persons with an understanding of ICANN's mission and the potential impact of ICANN decisions on the global Internet community, and committed to the success of ICANN;

Although I only became active in ICANN in 2006, I have been very involved in inter-networking activities for over 2½ decades and I have a deep understanding of ICANN's background and activities. "Internet Governance" discussions are always of interest, and I participated in both WSIS-1 and WSIS-2. Since 2006, I have been a member of both ALAC and the GNSO. In the GNSO, I was active in the new gTLD discussions and I initiated the ALAC request for an Issues Report on Domain Tasting and followed it through in the GNSO, resulting in the PDP which eliminated Domain Tasting. I am currently playing a similar role trying to protect registrant rights in the Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery PDP. All of these endeavours illustrate my clear understanding of the potential impact on the global Internet community of the decisions that ICANN takes (or doesn't take).

My commitment to ICANN and its success can be measured by my taking on both the ALAC leadership and GNSO Liaison roles over the past two years, both of which have required very significant time commitments.

During the last few months, I have been averaging about 7-8 teleconferences per week plus uncounted hours of e-mail, report writing, etc.

[C.1- Bylaw-3] Persons who will produce the broadest cultural and geographic diversity on the Board consistent with meeting the other criteria set forth in this Section;

Although I come from and live in North America, activities over the last 15 years have involved working in and with a number of developed and developing countries around the world (Germany, Japan, Malaysia, Mozambique, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Tanzania, Uganda) and working with people from a far larger list of countries. As noted in my answer to question C.2, the training workshops that I managed involved people from over 140 countries, and I am still in contact with many of them. I believe this has given me the knowledge and sensitivity to look at things from a wider perspective than a typical North American.

Having spent much of my career working in a bilingual setting, I am very aware of both the benefits and the difficulties in supporting a multilingual environment.

[C.1- Bylaw-4] Persons who, in the aggregate, have personal familiarity with the operation of gTLD registries and registrars; with ccTLD registries; with IP address registries; with Internet technical standards and protocols; with policy-development procedures, legal traditions, and the public interest; and with the broad range of business, individual, academic, and non-commercial users of the Internet;

I am not an Internet technical guru, but I have a long and deep understanding of detailed technical issues, the infrastructure that supports them and the policy issues that governs it all. My involvement with regional and national networks included activities in all of the mentioned areas and my experiences with the Internet Society (ISOC) developing country training

workshops and the ISOC Board has reinforced this, as have my more recent ICANN activities. As ALAC Liaison to the GNSO, I fully understand the ICANN policy development process and I am currently one of the small group of people who are developing the follow-on procedures to the current PDP. Although the PDP is far more formal, it is not that far removed from the policy development process in a collegial university such as McGill; policies are formally adopted by the University Senate, and for policies to be approved, they must have been developed with the involvement of all constituencies.

Although not a lawyer, while at McGill University I wrote and/or negotiated numerous contracts. In most Boards or similar groups, I tend to be regarded as “the Bylaw expert” speaking well of my ability to both read and write with precision.

My experiences at McGill included interactions with and support of all mentioned categories on Internet users.

Similarly, my consulting activities in developing countries have covered all of these domains.

[C.1- Bylaw-5] Persons who are willing to serve as volunteers, without compensation other than the reimbursement of certain expenses;

I have worked as a volunteer for the good of various technical and social communities for over thirty years. The efforts that I have made on behalf of At-Large as a member of the ALAC over the last 3+ years continue to demonstrate this.

[C.1- Bylaw-6] Persons who are able to work and communicate in written and spoken English. English is my native language.

I have participated in or presided over meetings throughout my career and have taught university-level courses for most of that period. Much of my career for the last 25 years has involved writing reports and documents, and I am told that I do it well. I believe that my recent efforts on behalf of the ALAC and At-Large demonstrate this as well. Following are pointers to a few documents that I authored recently. All were endorsed by the ALAC.

=> Comment on a proposed VeriSign registry service. The request was later withdrawn - <http://forum.icann.org/lists/registryservice/msg00034.html>

=> ALAC comment on the Interim report of the Vertical Integration PDP WG - https://st.icann.org/working-groups/index.cgi?alac_vertical_integration_comments

=> Proposal for revised Community Travel Support Guidelines - <http://atlarge-lists.icann.org/pipermail/alac/2010/001331.html>
Nominating Committee Criteria

[C.1-NomCom] The NomCom adds (in summary) two additional criteria: a commitment to ICANN’s mission; and an understanding of the importance of good governance practices and an ability to contribute to the Board in this regard.

My references have seen the various aspects of my commitment to ICANN, and I will let them speak on my behalf in that respect. With respect to the proper governance of ICANN, the Board is in an interesting and difficult position. It is not supposed to be involved in operational issues, but at the same time, it needs to ensure that the organization is indeed going in the right direction. Due to the complex nature of many of the issues that the Board must address, it relies heavily on ICANN staff. In the view of some people (and I am among them) this has led to staff having too strong a position in a supposed bottom-up stakeholder-based organization. Although I believe the current Board is doing far better, this is an issue that still needs significant attention.

And of course, the Board must not only act in a wise and sound manner, but must be perceived as doing so by the community – a most daunting task.

At-Large Criteria

At-Large has included several additional criteria which will be considered by the evaluation committee and ultimately by the voters.

[C.1- At-Large-1] An understanding of the structural, communications and decision-making processes of ICANN At-Large

Having been on the ALAC for nearly four years as it transitioned from the Interim ALAC to its current organization, having been active in the NARALO, and having filled the role of Rapporteur and Vice-Chair, I can say with confidence that I meet this criterion.

[C.1- At-Large-2] An understanding of the potential impact of ICANN decisions on the global Internet-using community and the Internet end-user community in particular.

I do not believe that anyone can know the full impact of some of the decisions that ICANN is making. There is a truism that goes “We tend to overestimate the effect of a technology in the short run and underestimate the effect in the long run.” (usually attributed to Roy Amara, but science-fiction writer and futurist Arthur C. Clarke has said that he came up with it first). This is definitely true about some of the decisions that ICANN is making and will make. What is certain is that there WILL be significant impact on the Internet user (at all levels) and it is crucial that we try to think of it from that point of view when decisions are being made.

[C.1- At-Large-3] A track record of working to build consensus with a diverse set of interests working together on complex policy issues.

As mentioned elsewhere in this Sol, survival in a policy-making role in a large research university makes this attribute mandatory. Within ICANN, we have seen several times in the very recent past where the differences between the various players are vast (the new gTLD issues of intellectual property protection, registry/registrar vertical integration and morality and public order). In the first case, we managed to find common ground, and I believe that I was a key part of finding that consensus. In the latter two cases, we may not be able to come to closure, but even then, a key step is to clearly identify the core issues to be addressed, and understand why

the various participants take the positions that they do. With that understanding, it may be possible to find some level of consensus, or at least semi-comfort among the largest number of participants.

[C.1- At-Large-4] Independence from the ICANN stakeholders whose financial situation is significantly impacted by ICANN decisions.

I am not employed or in any way connected with the various industries that surround the Internet, and would receive no personal financial benefit from any decisions that will reasonably come to the ICANN Board.

[C.1-Overall]

I have a proven record of working effectively on not-for-profit boards. I understand the issues of fiduciary responsibility and independence. I am not afraid to take positions that may differ from the “accepted views” when I feel that important issues are at stake. ICANN is in a transition mode and it is critical that the Board take a real leadership role while at the same time being sensitive to the needs and of its various stakeholders.

I am a “quick-study” and I have no worries about being able to quickly get up-to-speed on any issue that the Board may need to tackle. I am a strong believer that a Board should address policy issues and not operational ones, while at the same time, I am sensitive to the many comments that past Boards have been more influenced by ICANN staff rather than by the constituent ICANN stakeholders (including At-Large).

Poll Heading: 2. Describe current and past involvement in, contributions to, and leadership roles in activities and organizations involved in the development and operation of the Internet, its naming and addressing infrastructure and/or its security and stability

I was part of the group that started NetNorth, the first Canadian national research and education network in the early 1980s. My department at McGill ran the Quebec hub of the network, and I have the distinction of being NetNorth’s Executive Secretary overseeing its demise when the first Canadian national IP network (CA*net) replaced it. I was a charter member of the CA*net Board (and was also the designer of CA*net’s cost-effective but redundant dual-ring topology). I was a charter member of CANARIE, the organization that (among other things) functionally replaced CA*net a few years later. Following the replacement of CA*net, I sat on the board of the not-for-profit Foundation chartered with awarding the remaining CA*net funds (plus matching funds raised commercially) to innovative network-related development projects. In Quebec, I was one of the prime instigators and the founding Chair of the Quebec regional network RISQ (currently Réseau d’informations scientifiques du Québec, although like many long-lived acronyms, its meaning has varied over the years). For the first years, at my initiative, McGill physically ran RISQ. I remained active in RISQ management until my retirement from McGill. I was just recently given an award for my pioneering service 20 years ago.

In 1995 I started working with the Internet Society’s (ISOC) Developing Country Network Training Workshops. Over their nine year lifetime (1993-2001) these network training

workshops taught over 1,000 students from 140 developing countries how to build, support, manage and use the first networking and Internet facilities in their countries. In 1996 I was responsible for the local arrangements of workshop held in Montreal in conjunction with the ISOC's INET meeting and a concurrent IETF meeting. I co-managed the 1997 workshop in Malaysia, and managed the next workshops from 1998 to 2001 in Switzerland, USA, Japan and Sweden.

Unlike some volunteer activities, managing the workshops required a massive time commitment. It gives me deep satisfaction to know that nearly every country that connected to the Internet after 1993 did so with the help of people trained at these or spin-off workshops (Eastern Europe, Francophone, Latin-American and later African).

From 2001 to 2004, I was an elected member of the Internet Society Board of Trustees. In 2006, the ICANN NomCom appointed me to the then Interim ALAC (now the ALAC). At my first meeting, I was elected to be the ALAC Liaison to the GNSO. Since that time, I have served in both roles. My first ALAC year was a tumultuous one, with all five Regional At Large Organizations (RALOs) being formed and selecting ALAC members to replace those on the Interim ALAC. Much of the ALAC's efforts in 2007/8 focused on process, adjusting to its new membership and constituents. I played an active role in this process. Moreover, partially in an attempt to help the ALAC shed its sometime image of a less-than-productive organization and focus more on policy issues, I took responsibility for the domain tasting issue (where millions of domains per month were being "sampled" by domainers at no cost). As a result of the Issues Report requested by the ALAC, a GNSO PDP was started which led to the Consensus Policy that eliminated domain tasting. I have played an active role on the GNSO throughout my tenure there.

In 2008/9 I took on a new role as a member of the ALAC Executive Committee where I took responsibility for ALAC administrative policies (a thankless task). For 2009/10 I am one of two ALAC Vice-Chairs. Throughout this time, I have continued to serve and be active as the ALAC Liaison to the GNSO. I have represented the ALAC and At-large in a number of important initiatives (including the GNSO STI and Vertical Integration working groups) and I have largely authored several crucial ALAC documents. I am currently Chair (and lead At-Large participant) of the GNSO PDP Working Group on Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery. I played an active role throughout the recent ALAC review, I was the only individual to comment exhaustively of the various interim reports, and I believe that I was instrumental in convincing the review team of several important points.

Poll Heading: 3. Provide a statement about what you would contribute in the At-Large selected ICANN Board Director position to ICANN and its mission

I believe that I have the interest, perspective, ability and maturity to be an ICANN Director. By the end of this year, I will have served for four years on both the ALAC and the GNSO. I believe that this unique recent history and perspective could be beneficial to the Board.

As will be noted by my ICANN volunteer record in recent years, I am not afraid of hard work. I have no illusions of this being an elite position, but rather one where some hard decisions are going to need to be made over the coming years. They will need to be made with careful analysis and with an awareness of the implications on all of the stakeholders, both those that

come to ICANN meetings and those who do not even know (or care) what the initials I.C.A.N.N. stand for. I come into this as someone with no financial connection to any of the many businesses involved in the Internet, and this independence, I believe, is a key to my ability to work purely on behalf of ICANN and the public interest.

These general comments notwithstanding, I have a number of specific goals as a Board member:

1. The recent Board resolution to have a working group look at ways to help foster new gTLDs in developing countries was very welcome, as was the inclusion of a “low bandwidth” chat capability for Nairobi remote participation. But these were and are unusual moves for ICANN. And although these moves send a good signal, they are at best nice gestures. I would work to ensure that ICANN not be as focused on developed countries only. Doing this will take more than just words - it will require that all levels of ICANN, from the Board on, be conscious of the issue and take positive steps to become a more global organization and a more globally sensitive organization.

2. We talk a lot about transparency in ICANN. Those in positions of authority often tell us how transparent ICANN is. Those working at lower levels often feel that it is not quite the case. I believe that as a Director with recent operational experience in ICANN, I will be in a strong position to recognize and address issues of transparency.

3. The first review in the Affirmation of Commitments is “Ensure that decisions made related to the global technical coordination of the DNS are made in the public interest and are accountable and transparent.” The first review process is entitled “Ensuring accountability, transparency and the interests of global Internet users”. The review is routinely being referred to as the “Accountability and Transparency Review”. Although seemingly just a shorthand version of the name, I believe that it is indicative of a routine tendency within ICANN to focus on the stakeholders present at ICANN meetings, and in particular those with “money in the game” and not to focus on the greater Public Interest. As a Director, I would consider a key responsibility to be to regularly and continually address issues from a public interest point of view. Ultimately, I believe that structural change may be required to effect this transformation.

Poll Heading: 4. Provide a statement about what you would contribute in the At-Large selected ICANN Board Director position to the At-Large Community

I think that the best contribution that I (or any other At-Large Director) could make is to keep At-Large and perhaps more importantly, the Internet users that At-Large represents, in the forefront of all Board discussions and decisions.

I strongly believe that the items I highlighted in the previous question are of specific importance to At-Large, and it is through change such as this that At-Large will benefit.

I think that the other major contribution is to work to ensure that there is a continued dialogue between At-Large and the Board, ICANN staff, and other parts of the ICANN organization. It is only through such dialogue that the rest of ICANN will realize the worth of At-Large, and At-Large will understand how it needs to work to ensure that the needs of the Internet user are addressed by ICANN. At the Board level, it is clear that the Director selected by At-Large must be a key participant in that dialogue, but it cannot be restricted to just that Director.

The current “misunderstanding” between At-Large and the Board/staff regarding funding of RALO general assemblies in the FY11 budget could have easily been avoided with earlier dialogue leading to true understanding.

And of course, it should go without saying that part of this continued dialogue must include the Board responding to formal ALAC Advice, and I would take it as a personal responsibility to help ensure that this happens.

Poll Heading: 5. Please describe specifically how and why you will be able to advance, at the ICANN Board, the interests of the At-Large Community and the broader global community of Internet end-users

I have addressed this already in previous answers and will not repeat myself here. I have the ability to identify the core issues and to fight for what I believe is needed to give ICANN a vibrant and useful At-Large Community. This position may not be popular with some Board members, but I have a track record of not letting that get in the way of trying to effect change. At the same time, I understand that there are many competing needs within ICANN, and one must make compelling arguments to win over others. At-Large will not likely be the prime motivators in most Board policy – governments and the multi-billion dollar industry will always have a strong voice. I believe the key is to ensure that we also have a strong voice and that there is continued dialogue with At-Large. The Public Interest, which ICANN is now explicitly bound to respect and enhance, demands this.

Poll Heading: 6. Is there any additional information you would like to submit that would be helpful to the BCEC in making its decision? If so, please summarize it here

Perhaps the only thing to be added is that both ICANN and At-Large will have a difficult transition over the next few years. ICANN must convince the global community that it is a good steward of Internet Names and Numbers. At-Large must convince the rest of ICANN that it well represents the needs of Internet users around the world – a VERY diverse group. And At-Large, with the support of all parts of ICANN, must develop the tools to do this properly and to get more users involved in the processes which WILL ultimately impact them.