

---

HYDERABAD – At-Large Public Interest Working Group  
Tuesday, November 08, 2016 – 17:00 to 18:00 IST  
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Check, check.

At-Large public interest working group, 17:00 to 18:00, Hall one,  
ICANN 57, Hyderabad.

WOLF LUDWIG: I would like to suggest that we start with the meeting now immediately, in one minute. And not to wait much longer, because I was told that the RALO chairs have a very special audience with the ICANN CEO at 5:30, so they will run away. And the meeting will be even smaller than we are now, but it's a bit surprising.

So I, therefore now, would like to officially start the meeting.  
Okay?

Thanks to those who have come here in the late afternoon, after difficult and tight meeting week. And I guess most of you are quite tired already. So, let me suggest the following show and unofficial agenda for this wrap-up meeting.

---

**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.**

---

In my opinion, we had a very good, successful session on Sunday. And at this point I would like to thank [inaudible] for having invested quite some time, and [inaudible] to prepare this excellent session. It was a good program, with good participants, with good panelists. We had a good room, and I was surprised about a lot of attendance at this time.

So, there is a sort of proof of an interest, or a certain interest in the community. Therefore, I would like to suggest that we make a short feedback round here to start with, because most of you, I have seen in this session, and I would like to have short and consist statements, what was your impression. Olivier and I, we had an active role on the panel, and then you sometimes have different impression or observation than from those who have been in the audience.

And therefore I would especially like from, as you to know, what is your idea? And after this feedback round, I would like to shortly discuss what should or could be our next steps for the working group. If you all agree, then let me suggest we start after me.

I said already, I was extremely impressed by this meeting. It was well prepared, organized. There were substantial inputs, a good spontaneous feedback. One was not noted. It was because of shortage, the lack of time.

---

Stephanie had to walk around. I informally consulted with her. And she may have some very good ideas, so I invited her to show up here this afternoon, or to express it on the mailing list. So as you know, my feedback now, and so I am handing it over to [inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you Wolf. This is [inaudible] for the record. I don't know if it would be useful for me to just quickly go over key takeaways from the meeting, for everyone who may not have necessarily been there, and are members.

So we started with Olivier, who sort of setup the scene and highlighted the importance of the public interest, and outlined the process in ICANN community to date. Olivier also noted the, how the concept of the public interest is mentioned about 10 times, the new bylaws and the importance that they have, and the importance in getting to a shared understanding across the community, and how these could be applied.

Then Wolf took on the stage, and discussed the public interest from a European perspective. He did note that it is very difficult to define it at the global level, because there are various regional angles, historical issues, and linguistic issues. However, the public interest, Wolf said, is constitutional for any good governance system or model.

---

And then we moved on to get the Indian perspective, which was related much more to how internet service providers fit into the overall picture, and the main idea that I got out of that was that the ISPs are actually creating interest in the public by bringing them forward, so they can take an active part in the decision making and in the policy making.

Then we had Jonathan Robinson and Becky Burr who made their comments from the GNSO perspective, but also from the community At-Large. And there were a couple of areas that I think were important from Jonathan's perspective, and he noted how supporting the security, stability, and resiliency of the DNS is, in fact, in the global public interest.

And this is one specific way in which how ICANN supports the public interest. He also mentioned how cooperation and competition to help promote greater diversity and understanding, is another way in which we further the global public interest. Becky, I think, if you were to look at the feedback from those who took onto the mic later on, made a very important point, and the way she articulated this was that, essentially when the bottom up policy development process is carried out successfully, and within mission and scope, that in of itself, is the articulation of the public interest in ICANN's context.

---

And I think that resonated with quite a few people in the audience. We then moved on to Thomas Schneider who spoke, or gave a very complex example of the public interest. And he added layers, and layers, and layers of complexity, just to showcase how complex this actually can get for governments in particular, but I think the main takeaway from his intervention was that, you need to look at the aggregate of all of the special interests to understand the public interest.

Not at just one element of it. And since it's an abstract concept, and it's, to have an adaptable process and not a very fixed definition. Then we had the open mic session. And a lot of people really echoed Thomas's and a few other panelists, intervention on the fact that we cannot have a fixed definition.

The issue of governments acting in national interests rather than the global public interest was raised as well, and the response there was that, in the case of the GAC, in particular, if we look at it as one unit, it's supposed to mitigate the special interests into something, again, like an aggregated balance and global public interest.

So, the notion of diversity came up again. And it was noted that with an open and inclusive and diverse participation in the policy development process, are key elements to meeting the public interest in ICANN's case. So, next steps.

---

Olivier opened it up to the floor, and recommended that we move forward by maintaining a loose form of getting together and furthering this discussion. One of the ideas that came out afterwards was to create a committee or a working party of sorts, but one key thing that we're currently missing, is actually to have a leader or multiple leaders, from the community to take this conversation forward.

We had one individual who had said that they're willing and able to do it. We're going to see how that's going to play out in the next few days, but I've already personally reached out to them and asked about their time commitments and what this might entail.

So that's, in a nutshell, a brief overview of some of the key takeaways from that session.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: My name is [inaudible]. I've been a long time participant of At-Large, and I'm from ISOC India [inaudible] At-Large structure. I have a keen interest in taking part in global public interest, and I want to participate as well, member, and contribute significantly to the discussion. Thank you.

---

JIMMY SCHULTZ:

Jimmy Schultz, outgoing ALAC member. I attended the session, and what I saw is exactly what you've been seeing, is that due to cultural and political, different understandings of what public interest might be or is, not everyone accepted the examples, for example, of Thomas Schneider, because they are complex. The issue is complex, and the outcome for me is that we might take care more about those, well, different understandings of what it might be, and maybe try to get more easier, more understandable examples to show what we think public interests can be.

And we have to take in mind that we have to get to some procedures, how to find out what our public interest within the community is. There must be a procedure to get to the public interest, define it.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

I am [inaudible], I am an AOS representative, and I do agree what previous speaker said. Public interest is, indeed, understood in various ways, in different ways. I would just participated in the meeting in the next room about global stakeholder engagement.

And so I would like to contribute to the work of this group as an ALS representative, if I can.

---

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: My name is [inaudible], I'm with ALAC, and I'm from the place where the public interest equals the state interest. To be honest with you. However, as life goes on, I mean, things changing, sometimes it's a public interest, sometimes it's a government interest, then it's sometimes back again.

So, it's kind of complicated environment. And for me, as ALAC, it is important to gain the whole spectrum of the interest of the whole stakeholders in ICANN, so at least to learn how to navigate through this vectors of different interest. It's kind of straightforward, was straightforward when I was, more or less straightforward when I was in GNSO, because there were stakeholders with their interest was just, you know, which was just kind of understandable, but with public interest in the generic term.

It's not an easy issue for me, at least. So, I hope I will find out more.

WOLF LUDWIG: Before we hand over to Olivier, there is a question or comment in the AC.



---

**YEŞİM NAZLAR:** Yeşim Nazlar, ICANN staff. There is a comment on the AC from [inaudible], saying, “Sorry, but we had gone around the block on this issue for years, without a core definition of public interest. The issue becomes a moving target, and defies resolution. This situation serves the purpose of those who claim to be interested in the subject, but in fact, are happy with this status. Thank you.”

**WOLF LUDWIG:** Interesting observation. I would like to keep this for the next step discussions. And I would like to continue. Thanks Evan for this contribution, and please stay and we just continue with Olivier, and Satish, etc. and then we can come back to the next steps.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you Wolf. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And it was status quo, not just status, status quo. Anyway, thank you. First, I wanted to absolutely congratulate [inaudible] on having prepared this session. I got into this rather late, and by then, he had already prepared a total suggested workflow, which made the session very productive indeed, because every speaker already knew what they were going to speak about, generally, in general terms, and therefore we could go from one person to another, and it was quite easy to moderate as a result.

---

When it came down to the suggestions that were made, it appears that there are pretty much two camps. There is the camp on the one side that says, well, we need to define the public interest. We need a definition. We need something that will, a little bit like whatever they're saying here, as long as we don't define it, then we're dealing with moving goal posts.

And since we're dealing with moving goal posts, we'll never be happy with what we have, and therefore, we can discuss this ad infimum. I quite liked what Becky Burr has said, which was, if you act in a certain way, if you have checks and balances... I think that was also the words that she used, checks and balances, bottom up, multistakeholder, and I think we should even add equal multistakeholder.

So, some way where all of the points of you really are taken, then you have a process, a solution, which by its very nature, is in the public interest. Now, that of course remains to be seen because it's very difficult to balance things so that there really are totally balanced. And perhaps one of the avenues we might wish to explore is, how do you balance all of those, these stakeholder inputs?

Because if that's indeed the case, then we don't need a definition of the public interest itself. There is one thing that I'm always concerned about with regards to definitions, and that's

---

when you define something, you effectively freeze it in time. You have something that becomes static, and we are in a very dynamic environment.

Things change all of the time. ICANN, a year ago, is not the ICANN that we have today. And it might well be that ICANN changes again. I'll remind you that the At-Large is going through, at the moment, a review cycle. The generic name supporting organization has gone through a review cycle.

There is so many different things that move around, so I would caution about the public, having an exact definition of this, which some parts of the community might not agree with. I see that we've looked for this for so long now, it has been quite a while that we've searched for a definition, that you know, are we ever to get consensus on this? Is one of the questions I ask myself.

So, that was one process which I thought was maybe a way forward. And then just on the few last words that I said during the session, [inaudible] Dickinson, who is a well-known blogger, and follows a lot of the things that go on at ICANN, was under the impression that I had asked for a cross community working group to be created, and I had said exactly the opposite.

Not a cross community working group. So I did respond to her, but we do have a mailing list, at the moment. We've got, of

---

course, the ALAC working group. There is also an overall mailing list with, I'm not quite sure what the stakeholder representation is on there, perhaps [inaudible] might know, by having seen the list, on whether we've got people from other supporting organizations, advisory committees, etc. on there.

But that mailing list is not really doing much. It's sitting there. There isn't very much traffic. And so, if we were to be able to find someone that could animate this mailing list, that would probably, that might be a first step to explore. It's always, you know, mailing lists are great, but somebody needs to, I wouldn't call it steer the discussion, but stimulate the discussion.

And you know, put things in there that will get people to react and start interacting together. So, I know that I mentioned, you know, maybe we should have a working group, a working party, or something. I don't think the name of it really matters. We've already got the tool that is there to allow for interaction.

We do not need to have chartering... If we're not going to define a term that then needs to be ratified by the different parts of ICANN in a formal way, I'm not sure if we actually do need to have a formal vehicle as such. The mailing list is already very official, it's an ICANN mailing list at the end of the day.

All we need really is to have people that are willing to discuss the matter, to move things forward, so that we don't end up with

---

just having one discussion every three or four months at an ICANN meeting, but we've got intersessional work as well. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks Olivier. You are included already the next part of the discussion. Okay, I know you have to leave after that, etc. There is one more remote statement.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Yeşim Nazlar, ICANN staff. A comment from Evan Leibovitch, saying, "Olivier, is the public of the public interest really different now than it was a decade ago? I challenge the assertion that the public interest in ICANN is really that dynamic. Thank you."

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Good point again. I would like to continue now with Satish because he has to leave as well...

SATISH BABU: Thank you Wolf. Satish Babu for the record. I'm from APRALO. I would like to, first of all, congratulate Wolf for setting up this initiative. I'm not very, well, I'm not an expert on the matter of public interest, but I think it's extremely important. It is something that's easily understood, but very difficult to define.

---

And if the definition perhaps is not as important as the scope that we would like to cover is. I also think that while this has been discussed for [a] long [time], after the transition, we have a very special role in defining this because of the fact that the governments do not dictate anything anymore, and it's up to the community to define what is public interest from a very broad perspective, not going into the original specifics that have been discussed earlier.

And for At-Large, when we represent end users, we have even a greater responsibility to understand very clearly what is public interest. So, I'm looking forward to learning from this group, and I think that we need to, the mailing list is fine, and the dialogue needs to be kind of ongoing, and the activities, what we really would like to do, this need to be identified, but my priority would be to discuss rather than to act at this point. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks Satish. Louis.

LOUIS HOULE: Louise Houle, ISOC Quebec. And I'm from NARALO, [inaudible] to ALAC of course. Yes, just like Satish, I haven't been following all of the work that's been done so far. My first impression is

---

that, you know, public interest, as Evan mentioned it, needs to be define on the higher level priorities that we will see, but otherwise, and we would want to work on, otherwise, we could, as well, say that public interest has to represent the interest of all AC SOs, and we're going to get lost if we want to cover too much.

And if, you know, if you want to cover too much, you cover nothing. So, this is one of my fear. The other point that I want to make is that public interest, from my point of view, starts from a user point of view. Not only for me the user, reaches most of the topics that we could cover with public interest, and I think that this is the perspective I would be, I would agree to work on. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay, thanks Louis. Yes, Andre, you have another comment?

ANDRE:

Yeah, [inaudible] first, so I'm ready to come with a definition of public interest, if you don't mind. Okay, it's generic. The public interest is some or set, some or set, of all stakeholder's interests, relative to ICANN mission, and can be changed in time as the internet evolves.

---

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks. Sounds interesting. Can you post this in the chat somehow? That it can be recorded for the minutes. It's a session, we should also post on the list and discuss it. That's exactly how the whole thing should work.

Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you very much Wolf. It's Olivier speaking. Unfortunately, I have to go, but I like what Andre said, and I think we have consensus, so that's great. We have a definition, we finished the work of this group, and that's pretty super, thank you very much. No, I'm kidding, but no, I do like what Andre has said.

I also remind you that there was also a, there were a couple of points which were raised on the, during the discussion, where some definitions, of course, you gave a few definitions and so on, and perhaps we can also start with those, and maybe have them all on one page.

So as to start brain storming about it, and that's all. And I do apologize for having to leave now.



---

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay, thanks a lot Olivier for the contribution. I think it would be a good start for the next steps, to put as precise, concise as possible, some statements or some definitions, some attempts at a definition, on the mailing list, and put it there for discussion.

And we can start with the one, just a moment, we have already from the framework working group, which was on the screen on Sunday, but was from the strategy panel on public responsibility, ensuring that the internet becomes and continues to be stable, inclusive, and accessible across the globe, and that all may ensure the benefits of a single and global internet.

In addressing its public responsibility, must build trust in the internet and the governance ecosystem. So, this is one definition we had so far, we could now add Andre's definition. Let me... We now see how difficult it is to come up with definitions. I am sure there won't be one single definition. I don't believe in such an idea or such an endeavor.

And sometimes the whole effort we are doing now, to me, appears like the discussion about the truth. I'm a former journalist, and I was confronted, during all of my professional life, with people, readers, broadcasting, listeners, etc. telling me, but this is not true. Or what I just told you, this is the truth.

And I have learned that the truth is such, is nothing but a phantom, because there are different truths. If you go to a war

---

area, and talk with people, you easily bump in at least two opposing, few points, or truths. So, I have learned, as a journalist, that you can only try to come as close as possible to the truth.

And there are methods, or methodologies, for this to come as close as possible to some things that could be the truth, or a kind of truth. And this is by interviewing as many people concerned or effected by an issue. And the more people you ask, the more point of views you get, collect. Try to structure.

You can make a picture out of it. You can make an interpretation out of it, and the interpretation, when it's based on as much as point, individual point of views as possible, the picture may become better. But nobody can stand up afterwards and say, this is the truth. Because a picture you designed may still be conflicting.

And for me, it's the end we are doing now, trying to define the public interest, is, in my opinion, a similar issue. It's very conflicting, it's very contradiction, and we should avoid the impression that this working group, our group, may ever come up with one coherent, single, stupid, convincing definition of the public interest, and not even to [inaudible] the global public interest.

---

Because the public interest, we must be aware, maybe understood in different parts of this world, in a completely different way. Asian people have completely different rules in public spaces than in European public spaces. Latin America maybe quite different, therefore it is, in my opinion, nothing like a consistent definition of any global public interest.

But we can try, in our work, when we collect such suggestions like from Andre, or the comments from Evan, it's extremely helpful. We need such good ideas, discuss them in detail, in depth, and then try to find out whether they are useful, whether we can find a constant on it, or whether we may modify a suggestion. So, it will be a process. And I think this process will bring us to a lot of clarification, and I hope, that we will have, in a year from now, we have reached more mature level of the discussion than we have now. [Inaudible]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

I object to Andre's definition, in part, in the part that he says public interest is related to ICANN's mission. That seems to restrict the whole notion of public interest, and tries to make it, tries to distort public interest to certain extent, as a topic of ICANN's interest.

The definition has to be very broad to begin with. Maybe we could say that public interest has brought us in the global

---

interest, what is in the interest internet, and then probably we can come back to see how ICANN's mission fulfills global public interest or not.

See, the reason, one reason is that the moment we start defining public interest as something that is related to ICANN's mission, or relevant to ICANN's mission, or within the scope of ICANN's work, then there is quite a lot of politics comes in. The politics that, let's not look at content, because content, at the moment...

Looking at content hurts my interest. And let's not look at this, because that would hurt my interest. So, we should have an unrestrained definition for public interest, for global public interest to start with, and then come back to see whether, what we could do, or what is beyond our scope. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thanks. Good approach. So, this was the first contradiction to Andre's suggestion. I have now [inaudible] and then I will come back to you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

I think it's important to keep in mind one thing, that the discussion that we are having across the community, and anything that comes out as a result of it, is bounded by ICANN's

---

mission and scope. And so, one question I would like to pose to this group is, is ICANN in a position to define the global public interest? That's the first question we have to answer, as a community.

The second thing is, diversity. That is an element of the public interest, as an example. Multistakeholderism, bottom up policy development process, that's an element of public interest. So, it appears that the concept itself is heavily context driven. So, if you have any one definition, however high level you have it, it is highly likely to cover all possible scenarios that are out there.

So the question becomes A, is ICANN in the position to define the global public interest; and B, is a specific definition useful if the public interest is something that is fluid, and something that if you see it, you know it, or should we go back to the idea of a definition, keeping in mind that this is very, very context driven.

So these are some questions that I would like to pose to the group.

WOLF LUDWIG: Agree, before I hand over to...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I agree...

---

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, okay. One question, when you say, of course it's context driven. And then you say, okay, [inaudible] and you ask, is ICANN in a position? Then let me put a provocative question, would you [inaudible] in a better position?

Would the UN, United Nations, if you say, ICANN is not, probably not in the best position to define the global public interest, then my provocative question, because 20 years ago, if you would have asked me this question, I would have said yes. If you asked me now, whether the UN would be in a good position, I would simply say forget about it.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, this is [inaudible] from staff for the record again. Let me take my staff hat off for a second, okay, for the record. The short answer is no. And the reason for that is that the United Nations represents only one view and one view only, that of the governments.

WOLF LUDWIG: Very good point. [Inaudible]

---

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I would suggest that we can just try to define some possible issues, areas, of public interest, which we will be exploring, for instance, civil rights, liberty, communications, or maybe like accountability, transparency, intellectual property can be security issues related to public interest, personal data. So, public interest work essentially covers the high, huge range of areas.

And, for instance, I have just thought, does public interest cover corporate interests?

WOLF LUDWIG: Can be, but not must be necessarily. Jimmy and then Louise, and then Evan again.

JIMMY SCHULTZ: Yeah, that's an interesting question. Jimmy Schultz for the record. Is the public interest only unlimited to the interests of individuals? And again, we should limit our definition, or our aim to come to a definition to the area where the ICANN acts. It has to be limited to that, because as you already mentioned, we can't define, or try to define the public interest for the whole world here.

So, we should, or we must limit it to the ICANN world, and then I think, before we start to find the definition, well we have to

---

accept that we have to have, as I already mentioned, a procedure or rules, how we can set up a definition that is accepted by all constituencies?

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, thanks Jimmy. Louis?

LOUIS HOULE: Yeah, I agree with you. Here, we're talking about the truth. There is your truth, mine, and there is the truth. So, before you reach that, you have to go through a reflection. And on the definition of public interest, I think that we have to consider that we sit at ICANN. Of course, public interest is moreover, overarching ICANN, of course, but we must have an eye that, keep in mind that we were working in the interest, in the public interest in regard with internet, or ICANN, or brother.

So, this is why that I think we have to work on a definition. We need some [terms?], we need some milestones, we need to reflect on that. We need to work on that. We need to agree on that. And we also need to, right away, I think, or as soon as possible. We also have to target on what we will be watching public interest.

For instance, the new gTLD program that will be following the new gTLD program, is it of public interest? Is it a question that



---

we want to work on? Is that...? That kind of issues? Or, if we want just the group of reflection that will be looking at the thing from a bird eye view, and probably achieve very little, I think, I fear.

So, it's only an idea or two.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, thanks. [Inaudible] or Evan, I guess.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Yeşim Nazlar, ICANN staff. There is a comment on the AC from Evan Liebovitch, saying, "Wolf, may I suggest an alternate approach? Rather than spend most of our time on process, rather than substance, let us, as ALAC, define for ourselves what is public interest based on the specifications of substance that we can raise as important to us, such as public trust in domain names, or WHOIS privacy versus accountability.

Perhaps we should just pick the issues that matter in public interest for us, will be defined for us." And it continues, "We are now 40 minutes into the meeting, and have not spent any time on actual issues of importance to At-Large yet. To me, the issue of protection of Red Cross names is in the public interest, but the GNSO doesn't seem to think so. Thank you."

---

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, thanks a lot. Great comments, Evan. Frankly speaking, I'm missing you here. I would be pleased, Evan Leibovitch, by the way, is one of the co-chairs of the working group. We have Satish for APRALO, we have Evan for NARALO. We have [inaudible] for AFRALO. And Carlton for LACRALO.

And it would be good if the co-chairs could sit here and follow this discussion. I agree on your points. We should not waste too much time with always re-discussing procedures. We should more and more concentrate, focus on substance, and but I hope that Yeşim, you will record as the comments, that they don't get lost, and we can use, for example, the posting on the mailing list, etc. which could offer or provide a basis for the next working group call.

So, I would like to make sure that this reflections and observations are kept for the ongoing discussion. [Inaudible]?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: In the first part of what Louise spoke just now, he used the word overarching, I think that word characterizes public interest. Public interest is an overarching concept, so it's just limiting something. So, I foresee the way of looking at public interest is to look at your interest first.

---

Maybe, let's say the interest of a business cooperation, which is profit. So, it is, that would be the corporation's interest profit. Then we talk about public interest that expands from that sphere, and it is overarching, so we can't approach public interest without expanding the overarching.

So these are the words that should define rather than limitations of something, the same concept, corporations, mission, or an organization's mission. So I think that's a thought.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Louis, you want to quickly respond directly?

LOUIS HOULE:

Yeah, quick response. You're right. Public interest is overarching. In all the domains that you can think of. But the intent that I had when I said that is that I'm not really interested in public interest regarding transportation, for instance. So this is... You know, the way I just wanted to be more precise, and the fact that we are an internet community, and we are looking at end user needs, we must define a certain number of things, but we must also advance in priority of the priorities that we see right now, and that we've been maybe identifying during this current ICANN meeting, and those problems are probably the ones that we've been talking about in previous ICANN meetings.

---

So, when you pick up all of those priorities, maybe that are of public interest, I think that this probably something that we should focus on in this working group. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can I respond to that?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yeah, but I was just told we have eight minutes left, so if you can respond in one, two minutes maximum.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Louis, maybe we don't have to look at transportation, and we don't have to look at relevant areas, but at the same time, we should not restricted to ICANN's mission, and then start defining. We look at only the interest of, look at issues that are in the interest of being [inaudible] or the domain name system, but maybe we could expand it a little and look at the whole internet.

And do whatever part that ICANN can do, not necessarily going beyond every area, different areas, but we should have an unlimited definition to start with.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. We agree with...

---

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I said internet.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Let me try to wrap up and to compromise. Basically, as you bridging to what I would like to suggest. In my opinion, there are different approaches for the further discussion. And different approaches, different angles, or different interests. My interest, for example, is also to find definitions in a more general sense, then limited to ICANN.

But we should do both. But they should clearly name and label them. Whether this is like [inaudible] suggesting a definition, then we should make it clear on cases more in the ICANN sphere context limited to ICANN, or it's in the broader context.

So, there are a lot of open questions, like [inaudible] or Jimmy raised, does corporate interest necessarily exclude or contradict public interest. I would say not necessarily. In many or most cases, particular interests may clearly conflict, or challenge public interest. May, but not necessarily.

So, you have to see on a case to case basis. So, we could use most recent argument or the discussion we had in the public forum. I was told that story. Was this done in the context, recent understanding, of serving the public interest? Or, was there any

---

more limited cooperative interest who made or drove this decision?

So, there may be a lot of other showcases, or examples. We must, if they are suggested, as a study case, we must look into them, and to say, okay, in this case, it was reflected A, B, C, D, E, F, G, blah, blah, blah. So, there was a broader reflection, or in another case, there was a reflection of two, three points of view, or two, three opinions, and that was it.

And if you limited to two, three, the less number, I would say, the more probable it will be in the public interest. But this is very complex and difficult, and you must bring it down to the particular case, and therefore, I think, for the next steps, as a working method, we should do both.

This goes in direction what [inaudible] also suggested, not to limit it purely on ICANN. To have an open discussion, so people who want to contribute in a more general way, to find good, concise definitions for the broader public interest, and people who would like to limit, and to focus, ICANN context and mandate, are also welcome, and contribute to the other one.

And then we can perhaps, after listing [inaudible], we come up with some good case studies we can compare. So this would again, be a good approach, and this would be a study case, in

---

my opinion, and we could ask experts, for example, for their opinions about it, etc.

So, would this be an acceptable suggestion for the next steps?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

This is [inaudible] for the record. I completely agree. One thing to keep in mind is that we're in the very, very early stages of what's likely to be a very long process. We're not going to come up with a solution, or we may never come up with a solution. We... There is pre-baked, there is no final destination that anyone is aware of, right? This is what the community is supposed to do.

So, I think the process will be long, and if we continue to exchange our ideas, please start using the mailing list as a basis for communication among all of us. And as Wolf said, again, there is no limit of scope in terms of how we can approach this, the methodologies of the community determine.

There is no solutions at this time. It's very early, so thank you very much for a very good session, and thank you for having me here.

---

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, thanks. Before I give... This may also, since I must take into consideration, be very painful for old hands and very experienced excellent people like Evan Leibovitch, who will have difficulties with our slow move, and there may be expectations, etc. that this discussion could be accelerated, etc.

But I think it should be an inclusive discussion, also including let's say, new comers of people from different angles, from different backgrounds, etc. So, this, I agree, this presumably will take more time, but it should be a very intensive discussion. [Inaudible], short comment? Okay. Louis?

LOUIS HOULE: I agree with you, but I still believe that we have a double thread here. If we don't have something concrete to work on, if we don't agree on something concrete to work on, if we go around definitions, and if we go around the global interest, and we talk around the global interest, and topics that are up in the sky, I don't think that contributors will be contributing that long.

We need to put something on the table as soon as possible. We have, each and every one of us, we had some ideas of what's going wrong with the public interest, regarding the [inaudible] that we will want to put on that.



---

So, I think we must not be only taking into consideration what you've been saying, we also must advance.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay, thanks. Well, I think the most difficult part is, again, it's very easy during meetings that you have the physical opportunity to exchange, but in the time between, it's more difficult. It can be done by monthly calls. We have a mailing list, which is already operational, unfortunately it was not used so far, so much.

We have a work space, etc. So, all the ideas from the mailing list or from the monthly calls, I would like to invite people, please post the work space as well, because this work space should be the basis for the discussion. Therefore, we can say okay, suggestion one is not bad, but not convincing.

Suggestion two is, this will be a work in progress.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

I was just going to say, I totally agree. I think talking in the abstract forever and ever, will indeed lose people's interest, but I also caution that because we feel that may be an outcome that we need to rush into something that may not necessarily have been thought through. But again, we are in a process, and I

---

think any and all ideas are welcome, and they should be welcome.

So there is, the door is now being closed to anything.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. Let me sum up now. I think this was a good meeting again, after the Sunday meeting. The Sunday meeting was more of a showcase type of meeting, a debate again, reaching out to the whole community, this meeting was closing, now more concentrating on the At-Large community, but it was, in my opinion, it was very protective again.

As I said before, it will be very difficult to follow-up until Copenhagen, and it's my aim to have a monthly call, etc. and I invite all of you to use the mailing list, get subscribed to the mailing list, use it, and use the Wiki, etc. So, we have the necessary fodder for the next calls, because so far it was a little bit difficult when you are in a sort of a chair position, and the chair position, I do not really understand myself as an entertainer.

So, it's difficult to stimulate a debate when people are leaning back and where is the show now? Who are the actors? What are the songs? Etc. This is not the sort of endeavor I would like to have. This is a working group on the public interest. I would like

---

to see it as a community effort, and I would like to see my role more as a moderator of different opinions and different inputs, etc.

And try to moderate a discussion to come up with a good results. So, thanks again for your inputs today, and I hope we will have you on our next monthly call, which will be, I guess, in December, yeah. I may have a little conflict of time here, because early December, I will be at the IGF, most probably in Mexico, therefore we could do it...

Send out a Doodle, yes, okay. Okay. Thanks for the support. [Inaudible], thanks for coming here, contributing, and I think we had a good meeting, and the meeting is now adjourned. Thanks.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**