

**Why do you believe that you are in a position to fairly assess ICANN's mechanisms for accountability, transparency and public input?**

I have been involved in ICANN for over six years and have been both critical and outspoken on all of these areas. I am sufficiently mature as to understand the difficulty of being perceived as accountable, transparent and always working in the "public interest" (A, T & PI), but at the same time understand that without doing well on all of these counts, ICANN's credibility and its very existence will be in question.

ICANN, its staff and its Board are of course charged with meeting all sorts of demands; some counter to the needs of A, T & PI, and some of which make need to be balanced with A, T & PI. Understanding how competing interests can be satisfied is always a challenge, but I believe that I have the necessary experience and skills to help move this in a positive direction.

Specifically regarding "public input", I sadly find that ICANN is currently not well served. Most forums for accepting input from the public focus on soliciting opinions from ICANN insiders. This is not particularly surprising given that the issues are complex, the time-frames for providing input are often relatively short, and it is exceedingly difficult to get meaningful and understandable questions widely disseminated. At-Large itself suffers from this problem. I do not pretend to have all of the answers to these troublesome problems, but understanding they exist and having a desire to see us do better I believe is a good start.

**Why do you believe that you are in a position to assess ICANN's focus on the global public interest?**

The "public interest" is of course an undefined term, and will likely remain so. So the first step is to try to understand what we are talking about. I believe that one of the keys to this problem is to identify and exclude things that benefit particular players in the ICANN ecosystem, but do not seem to have any bearing on the well-being of the general Internet user or indeed society as a whole. If they have little negative impact of the latter groups, then they are benign and can be tolerated or even encouraged. On the other hand, if they have a negative impact on users or society, there needs

to be compelling reasons for tolerating them. I do not believe that ICANN has handled this balancing act well in the past. Examples include contracted party contracts that overly favour the contractor over the public interest (using most any definition of public interest) and aspects of the new gTLD program. Understanding that this is a balancing act, and not having any allegiances to those who will profit from ICANN decisions both put me in a good position to help guide the organization.

**Why do you believe that you will be able to do the above from the perspective of the ALAC and the global ICANN At-Large Community?**

I have worked with and in ALAC for over six years. I have been entrusted by ALAC to represent it on the GNSO and at times in other venues. I have drafted numerous statements that have been put forward as positions of the ALAC, a number of which have been critical of ICANN in just these areas. So I don't believe there should be any doubt about my ability to represent ALAC and At-Large. To the extent allowed by privacy and confidentiality issues, I would plan on extensive consultation with ALAC and At-Large during the review process.