EN

DUBLIN – At-Large EURALO General Assembly Part 1 [C]
Wednesday, October 21, 2015 – 10:30 to 12:00 IST
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

WOLF LUDWIG: Ladies and gentlemen? Dear member. Hello. Hello. Okay. First of all, welcome to the first part of the EURALO General Assembly 2015, which has convened, as you know, in line with the Dublin ICANN meeting.

While preparing this over the last couple of months, we decided this time to have two parts; to conduct our general assembly in two parts. A content part in the morning – let's say late morning – and a statutory part in the afternoon.

I think, meanwhile, all of you have received this nice folder with some key documents in it. Key documents are supposed to be as a general assembly; the agenda for the general assembly part one; and the agenda for part two in the afternoon, together with some key documents like the annual report and we have prepared some more documents like a draft paper on EURALO outreach and engagement which we will discuss in the afternoon, like some criteria for support and secretariat election, and we also have an overview of our agenda and

reginal distribution of EURALO positions or functions held by members over the last eight years.

So you must have the key documents in this folder or on the stick, which was prepared by staff. So a document what you will not find is a hard copy. In the folder, you will find on the stick at least.

So to somehow a little bit protect [inaudible] we made the selection which documents are really essential to bring. and which documents you just get via the [inaudible].

This folder is important particularly for the second part of our general assembly in the afternoon, which is a little bit more complex than the morning part. The morning part will concentrate as we said on the issue of the public interest.

Before I make my introduction, I will hand over to Oliveira again, because Olivier is the moderator of the session, as I'm somehow personally involved with this input paper.

I leave it now to Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Wolf. I think that the first thing just before we start, should we have a quick – I'm turning over to our chair here – should we just have a quick roll call of the people who are

in the room so that on the transcript it might be easier to identify when you say Yuliya or Mathieu, etc. We'll just say your name and your RALO and your At-Large structure. Be quickly. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Quickly. Because we have to do it in the afternoon also.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We have to do it in the afternoon as well again, yeah. Because it's for the transcript. It's mechanical. Otherwise it will say, male voice/female voice. Doesn't really help when you have a debate. So let's start on the table starting from this far corner. Just your name and your affiliation and then we'll go around the table. In the meantime, I'll ask staff to be ready with the flying mic. Thank you.

[Ina Aldermont]:   I'm from Dominion [inaudible].

[Van Fuzman]:   German Association for Data Protection and Privacy.

JIMMY SCHULZ: [inaudible], The New ALS in the Future, and ALAC member.

STEPHANE COILLET-MATILLION: Stéphane Coillet-Matillon .Wikimedia Switzerland.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: ISOC [inaudible].

[ANNE-MARIE JOLY]: [Anne-Marie Joly por E-Senior].

MANUEL SCHNEIDER: Manuel Schneider, Wikimedia Austria.

PLAMENA POPOVA: Plamena Popova, University of Library Studies Bulgaria.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Oksana Prykhodko, Ukraine, European Media Platform.

OLIVER PASSEK: Oliver Passek, Digital Courage.

MATTHIEU CAMUS: Mathieu Camus, ISOC France.

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: Mikhail Medrish, Internet Support Foundation Russia.

YULIYA MORENETS: Yuliya Morenets, TaC Together Against Cybercrime based in France and EURALO secretariat.

FEDOR SMIRNOV: Fedor Smirnov, ISOC Russia Chapter.

LAUREN ALLISON: Lauren Allison, Development and Responsibility Department.

BILL DRAKE: Bill Drake, Departing EURALO board member.

WOLF LUDWIG: :   And representing the German Association for…

BILL DRAKE: I'm representing the German Association for [inaudible].

WOLF LUDWIG: Yeah. He's an ALS rep, just for the records. I'm Wolf Ludwig, Comunica Switzerland.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, outgoing Vice-Chair of At-Large.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Silvia Vivanco, At-Large Staff.

HEIDI ULRICH: Heidi Ullrich, At-Large Staff.

GISELLA GRUBER: Gisella Gruber, At-Large Staff.

CAROLIN SIBERNAGL: Carlolin Sibernagl, HIV Initiative.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yrjö Länsipuro, ISOC Finland and also EURALO representative to NomCom.

BREDA KUTIN: Breda Kutin, Slovenian Consumers Association.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

ANNETTE MUHLBERG: Annette Muhlberg, Netzwerk Neue Medien.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Sandra Hoferichter, [inaudible] and ALAC.

STEFANO TRUMPY: Stefano Trumpy, ISOC Italy.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Roberto Gaetano, European Internet Users Association.

VOLODYMR KUKOVSKYY: Volodymer Kukovskyy, Ukrainian Internet Association.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Lutz Donnerhacke, German VTOC.

BOGDAN MANOLEA: Bogdan Manolea, APTI Romania.

PEDRO VEIGA: Pedro Vega, ISCO Portugal.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And at the back?

ARIEL LIANG: Ariel Liang, At-Large staff.

SANA ALI: Sana Ali, NextGen program.

TAMARA BIZYUK: Tamara Bizyuk, NextGen program.

[LARA ABBOT]   Italian National [inaudible] and ISOC Italy.

GABRIELLA SCHITTEK: Gabriella Schittek, ICANN staff.

JEAN JACQUES SUBRENAT: Good morning. Jean-Jacques Subrenat, member of ISOC San Francisco Bay Area of which I am the – unbelievable - Global Ambassador. I'm also a member of the ICG and of the NetMundial Council. I am with Roberto, one of the founding members of the Individual Users Association. Thank you.

MAYA ANIS: Maya Anis, ISOC Norway.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Eric [inaudible], ISOC Norway.

NARINE KHACHARTRYAN: Narine Khachartryan, Fellowship Armenia, Media Education Center ALS.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And then on the other side of the room. The mic is working.

MONIKA ZALNIERIUTE: Monika Zalnieriute. I'm from Center for Internet and Human Rights in Berlin.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Hi everyone. I'm Bastiaan Goslings from ISOC Netherlands.

[SHADIC BATOR]:   [inaudible].

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [Inaudible] ALAC. Sebastian Bachollet.

[STUART CLARK]:   [Stuart Clark]. I'm just an internet user.

[ADITYA LORENZO]:   [Aditya Lorenzo] from [DotCal].

[LENA RYHEM]:   [Len Ryhen], ICANN Staff

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, it's not working. That one microphone had died.

LIANNA GALSTYAN: Lianna Galstyan, ISOC Armenia.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Siranush Vardanyan, ISOC Armenia. Individual member in EURALO and APRALO chair.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. And there's somebody who's holding the mic at the moment and that's a staff member with two mics.

ARIEL LIANG: I already – Yeah, At-Large staff, Ariel Liang.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I think we've gone through the whole round, thank you. Apologies for the time it's taken, but it will help with the transcription.

The second thing I need to also quickly say on the housekeeping is when you speak, we have interpreters. Please say your name before you speak. Otherwis, it will be very difficult to recognize all of the different people. You can say your first name in general and that would work.

We have interpretation in Spanish and in French, I believe it is. It is French, yeah. You will be able to… You can also speak French or speak Spanish, if you wish. Everyone should have their little headsets ready just in case somebody wants to express themselves in their native tongue or in a tongue that is not English.

We have a topic for discussion today. It's about the public interest – big, big word at ICANN, the public interest. We have to define this. Well, no, we don't really have to define it, but we definitely have to discuss what the public interest is and perhaps try and see if we can get a better idea of what the public interest means for our community, the community of end users.

Some parts of ICANN are saying it is undefinable, and yet, the public interest is actually inscribed in many different official documents that pertain to ICANN'S mission that pertain to

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

EN

ICANN's contracts, the Affirmation of Commitments; a whole number of documents that speak about the public interest.

So what is it? We have a few guests who are with us. The paper that you have in your hands – or rather on your computer is drafted by Wolf Ludwig. We have Bill Drake who has joined us who is, as we saw, he's with an At-Large structure, but at the same time, also, has been very much involved in issues of public interest.

We will be having – Constantine Roussos is not able to make it?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So we'll have the points made by both of our, I should say panelists, I guess we could call you, or intervenents. Then afterwards, I hope we can engage into a discussion and start building from there whether you agree, you disagree, what you feel is the public interest. How do you think we should define the public interest at ICANN? Hopefully, at the end of the time that we have allocated to this discussion, we will be able to come up with a consensus – or maybe not a consensus, but at least we'll know where we all stand.

Let me turn the floor over to – shall we start with Wolf? Wolf, please, take us through your paper. Wolf Ludwig?

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks, Olivier for the introduction. A pre-remark would be when I joined the ICANN community in the larger sense around 2006 one of my key orientation points was the public interest.

Having been at ICANN for quite a couple of years and at conferences, I had to realize that public interest always were… Somehow [flew]. It was always mostly somewhere in the air. You could guess it must be like a star somewhere around, but it was not really crispy. I couldn't catch it.

Over the years, I realize that from certain constituencies are part ICANN, it became more and more contested, particularly among contracted parties. Always arguing whenever there is a consultation, the public interest is nothing really to define, etc., nothing's clear, it's a [inaudible] term.

Then we had the contradiction. It is mentioned three times in the bylaws and five times in the AOC (Affirmation of Commitment). That paper is patient as we know. As long as people do not clearly refer to it, it has more or less no importance.

ICANN|54
Dublin

Then suddenly last year, I got a consultancy mandate from Swiss Off Com and part of this mandate was, "We need a working paper on the public interest. Could you please provide?" I started tracing the term. When you start tracing the term, it becomes immediately clear if you stick on public interest, as a legal term, or legal category, it's getting more and more complicated.

For me, it was always a political category from the very beginning. I'm not a lawyer; therefore, I never looked on it from this lawyer's point of view or as a tourist. I always felt myself as a political animal and I looked on it from political and a historical viewpoint.

An advantage in this respect was set by some very good support. Most part of the thesis paper of my wife's around [inaudible] their own public interest and when public spaces were historically evolved.

Having been involved in her research work, it was easy for me to trace it back now in our context. After several introductions here on this thesis paper, I think we all have a copy in front of you, I tried to trace some basic terms. You can find in various European languages starting from the term [inaudible]. Then you have the Greek term [inaudible]. I don't know if I pronounced it properly. Now you have in Latin salis publica

bona communia, bona chavalis; in French, bien publics; in Italian beni comuni; and in English, common goods.

So they are in various European languages, equivalence – what we call public interest. If you do not trace the right equivalence, you may run into the wrong direction. I have seen a lot of papers on the public interest, which did not reflect this historical origins of certain towns.

For me, it was my first consideration to look in what part of Europe and what language and what cultures you have similar [inaudible].

Then it became clear that it starts – I do not have to read the paper again. It starts with Aristotle in the ancient Greek period with his concept of police.

Police was simply set afterwards, not really taken over, but the Roman concept of [inaudible] was largely influenced by Aristotle's concept.

Therefore, it's rather clear as far as ancient age period – for the antique period in Europe – it's clearly traceable. You can really break it down.

Another step was then this research work said a guy called Michael Stolleis, a German law historian, has wrote a lot of books about [inaudible], meaning public interest formulas. He

has also, meanwhile, accomplished three volumes tracing public law all over Europe.

It's exciting work. You must be deeply interested in history and in public law to get into the details.

Then afterwards, we have from the Middle Ages onward. Early modern times. We had the concept of [inaudible] bon police in France, what is more or less the basic of modern interior policy.

All of them in common, however you call them, they justify new laws, new ordinances in the interest of the general or the broader public.

This is the key element. You can really trace from the ancient Greeks over the Romans, even in old Middle Ages time; even at the times when we had mostly [futilist] structures in Europe. Whenever there was a commune or a city independent from Aristocracy all the laws and ordinances were made in the interest of the general public or the citizens.

This is so evident that, in my opinion, there's almost no doubt in the European cultural historical context. Afterwards you can follow up. There are related terms equivalent. A lot of them… Like in German later, we had [inaudible] or the commons. I do not go into details here.

You can trace, even in European Constitutions. I give some examples here from the Swiss Constitution two centuries ago; the French Constitution 1958; the Spanish Constitution '76; and many more. There is clear [inaudible] and evidence to it.

My conclusion from this is it's not a phantom. The public interest is some people pretend. It can be clearly, if you are interested, you will find it. If you're not really interested, of course, you can just overlook it.

If you're interested, you can pinpoint it, you can nail it, you can really make something out of it. And for me from an Internet user point of view for At-Large as a community, I would like to see having the public interest as a guiding principle of ICANN's board decision.

Whenever there are different categories to be considered, to be reflected, and when there are some conflicts of interest, in my opinion the final decision should be based on public interest considerations.

This would be my… Like Martin Luther King said, "I have a dream." This would be my dream. The opposite would be my nightmare.

It's a very regional approach. I cannot talk about other regions. I don't know enough about the history of Latin America. I know it

was basically Colonial history. The same was for most countries in Africa and Asia. It's a very Eurocentric European point of view and approach, but I can imagine in other parts of the world you have a lot of similarities. Therefore, my aim was after we have discussed this, we have modified it. We have extended it. It's a working paper. It's a thesis paper.

Once we may agree on the substance, at least, to take this and to give it to other RALOs and to invite our colleges to continue and to trace the public interest, once all five RALOs did it.

I think we could come up with enough of proof to say that maybe an animal called global public interest.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Wolf. One additional bit of housekeeping with regards to the Adobe Connector that we have in front of us. You can log into this room and you can consult any documents that we are sharing –or the staff is sharing documents and so on in there.

I know you have the document also on your USB stick which was included in your welcome packs. Could I perhaps ask if we have a spare staff member? I don't know if we have anyone spared to do the rounds and help people to get on the Adobe Connect or let them know how to find that because we're going to need that

room all of today. We're going to be sharing documents and so on in there.

Over to Bill Drake.

BILL DRAKE: Hello everybody. I'm actually here wearing multiple hats. I've been on the EURALO board, although, I'm going off. I'm departing chair after three years of the Non-Commercial Users Constituency in the GNOSO and I'm an incoming NomCom person. None of those are relevant.

What is relevant is that I teach International Communications and Internet Governance at the University of Zurich. I have been working on these kinds of issues for the past 30 years. And I have a long engagement with groups in the U.S., where I'm from originally, that call themselves public interest groups.

This is to me a very interesting set of issues that people have had trouble with this concept in the context of ICANN and I'm really glad that we decided to talk about it here. I think it's really interesting and important to have a conversation at the European level about how this is viewed from a regional perspective.

Wolf's paper is a wonderful historical background around broader concept and I really wish I could see the longer thing

that it's pulled from, but it's written in German, right? I'm out of luck on that.

WOLF LUDWIG: No, it's written in English.

BILL DRAKE: It's written in English? Then I would love to see it.

WOLF LUDWIG: It has to be released by [inaudible].

BILL DRAKE: Okay. Then I look forward to that, then.

In any event, I think he's put this into a wonderful broader context. I want to bring it back just by way of booting up conversation to the immediate problems of the relationship between public interest and Internet governance.

I just want to note to start that the notion of the public interest is used in a number of international instruments, not just in the ICANN mechanism. For example, the NetMunidal multistakeholder's statement that was agreed last year in Sao Palo says that the Internet's a global resource that should be managed in the public interest.

The International Telecommunications Union has adopted multiple agreements referencing this. The core treaties of the ITU, in fact, with regard to Internet governance specifically, say that IP-based networks must be interoperable and globally reachable in the public interest and that governments must work to ensure adequate protection of public interests in the management of Internet resources, including domain names and addresses. And as we know the ICANN bylaws and Affirmation of Commitments invoke the term three and five times, respectively. So the term is very much in usage, and yet the problem is there's no real agreement what it is.

I remember ten years ago when we were at the World Summit on the Information Society and everybody was walking around saying, "Well, we don't know what Internet governance is. How are we going to negotiate?" Well, similarly, we're facing the same kind of challenge here. We can't be holding up as the ultimate standard of behavior and analysis of policies something that has no clarity at all as to what it might mean.

It may not be so easy to come to a singular bounded definition of the public interest. This young lady gets to try to write the report for ICANN that does this, or at least helps to move it along. But I think we can at least to bound the concept better; at least try to. I think this has some urgency and not just because it's in the strategic plan that we should do this

ICANN|54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

I think it's important to recognize in the ICANN context where a lot of the references to the public interest are coming from. That is, as it happens, the U.S. domestic political process.

The National Telecommunications Information Administration, of course, is part of the U.S. government and in its various efforts in working with the community to boot up ICANN and create the bylaws and those things, and then of course later defining the Affirmation of Commitments, was using this terminology which has long standing currency in telecommunications and broadcast regulation in the United States.

The term really goes back to the Radio Act in 1927 in The United States was then incorporated into the Communications Act of 1934, which is the founding document for much of U.S. communications law and created the Federal Communications Commission and things like that.

I thought I would just mention a few of the concepts that are potentially of relevance here to us. And again, I don't think they can be simply generalized into the ICANN space, because it's a different environment. But yet, there's some things that are at least worth noting.

It should be said, by the way, that the question of exactly of how the public interest is defined has been fought over by telecommunications lawyers, scholars, and policy makers in the

United States for a hundred years, or since the Radio Communications Act.

Even though the standard has been used constantly and invoked constantly, there's never been a singular definition.

Here are some of the kinds of things that have been pursued as over-arching principles of communications policy in the name of the public interest. Universal availability of telecommunications networks. Everybody should have the ability to connect to the net. Whether they actually service or not, of course, depends on cost considerations, local availability, etc.

In principle, the telecommunications network is reviewed as essentially common carriers that should be made available to everyone. This is in traditional regulatory policy.

There were notions of price management. I don't want to say price controls, but prices for telecommunications were regulated in the public interest.

Market concentration. The extent to which you could have market power and concentration in the industry in a particular segment was considered to be a key question from a public interest standpoint.

Consumer protection. The notion that consumers should have some recourse if they are treated badly by service providers. A

broad balance of commercial and non-commercial interests so that non-commercial spaces were reserved in the radio frequency spectrum and so on. This was also part of the concept.

A broad balance between particular individual interests and a broader public interest which can be thought of either as the aggregate of all individual interests or something beyond, you know.

With regard to radio frequency spectrum, the allocation of a scarce resource to different services and stations was done in the public interest and the radio spectrum was viewed as something that could not be owned by any party, but could only be used. If you were a broadcaster or other user of spectrum, you were being given a license to use it for a while, but it was not yours.

Some of these concepts don't sound completely remote from ICANN in the world of the DNS and so on.

Here's one that is remote in the broadcast environment: content regulations. I personally do not want to see ICANN too involved in content management issues, but there were things like the Fairness Doctrine in broadcasting; the requirement to air public service announcements on private broadcast networks and so on; public safety announcements, for example.

Now much of that has changed with the deregulation of telecommunications in the move towards a multi-provider competitive environment.

The point is these are some concepts that were fundamental to the notion of electronic communications regulation. And while there are a lot of people who want to believe that ICANN is not a regulator, ICANN does sign contracts that specify terms and conditions with the registries and registrars. So from my standpoint I do think of ICANN as being a regulator.

The question is, then, by analogy are any of those concepts relevant to the work of ICANN? And are there other concepts from other countries, other regions?

One of the things that I'm really looking forward to the research from staff and to the larger dialogue that I think will happen over the next half year within the community – one of the reasons I'm looking forward to that is because I think what we need here is to have. As Wolf said, I don't know too much about what's going on in other regions, I don't know how the notion of public interest has been defined or implemented in Latin America, in Asia, if there are cognate concepts, if the words are different but there's a similar sort of general overarching requirement, and so there's a real research project, I think, that has to be done there.to try to bound this question a bit in the ICANN context.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

Let me conclude by simply saying, because Wolf referred to this, whether or not one can come to some sort of agreed definition or it's even productive to try, is indeed controversial in the ICANN community. There are a lot of people in the business community who say this is pointless, we've never been able to do this in telecom. And I have colleagues in civil society who also are of that view.

I personally think that we nevertheless have to give it a shot to at least come to a closer understanding together. I've organized a workshop at the IGF meeting in Brazil in two weeks that will have many ICANN people on it where we will talk about these issues, and I congratulate Wolf and others in EURALO in agreeing to launch this conversation here. It's really needed. We need better research and we need a full dialogue involving the whole community. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Bill. Now, I note there's already a hand on Adobe Connect on the screen here. We'll take the questions and we'll launch the debate and discussion afterwards.

Let's go over to Lauren now, for another view.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

LAUREN ALLISON:	I am program manager at the Development and Public Responsibility Department (DPRD). That's the one you've been hearing from all week on the online learning platform or fellowship or NextGen. I see we have some in the corner. Thanks for coming.

Thank you very much for having me here as well to talk about this topic. I must give apologies as well for Nora. She was hoping to make it and was unable to because of some travel.

As everyone is very well aware, the topic has been one that has been of a lot of importance for different groups within ICANN as well as through all of our documents as being already mentioned.

There was an attempt to try and define this back in 2013-2014. [Nick Raynor] led the strategy panel on the public responsibility framework. It was tasked with two things: looking at how ICANN approaches the term "public interest," and also looking at how ICANN approaches public responsibility work.

What the panel did, they had open community sessions in Buenos Aires, Singapore. They had webinars, public comment period. They took all of the input from the community and what they thought the public interest was and put forward a proposed definition.

I know that ALAC had sent in a letter to the board to strongly support the report in its output; however, as many of you are aware, the panels aren't very, well, for one reason for another weren't adopted very strongly, so that definition is there to be looked at and to be referenced, but it has never been formally adopted.

What we have realized over the last four or five meetings is this topic keeps coming up and up. We got together a group of staff to look at internally from our operational standpoint how public interest is understood within our ICANN operations. The different documents that we have that reference the term "public interest," any understandings departments have about the topic as well, and how any definitions or a single definition or parameters of a definition would impact operationally, whether that it be fiscally or legally, any of our work if we adopted certain definitions.

That work currently is ongoing. This work is just to understand from an internal perspective what sort of understandings we already have. And then what we're looking to do is just compile some output that will be able to be used by the community when they're ready to start discussions on this topic.

One of the things that has been said in conversations with community members, particularly in Buenos Aires, is – I don't

know if anybody's noticed, but we are quite busy. The community is quite busy at the moment with a number of different issues. There currently is not enough bandwidth for people to work on this; so as staff what we are doing is making sure that as most possible we have resources available for the community to commence discussion when they are ready to do so.

I know, Bill, we've talked about this as well, the need to have different resources possibly on a Wiki space, that people can access which would have things like Wolf, if agreeable, your paper as well. Just all the different resources that kind of cover the complexity of this issue as well.

I think that's it from me from that. I'm happy to take any questions on that. Also, I'm very, very interested to hear, particularly from you, what would be useful in taking this conversation forward. As noted, it's in the strategic plan looking at a definition or parameters of definitions, so what from your perspective would be very useful when the community is ready to start making conversations on this topic?

Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Lauren. So, we've had some definitions, some various points of views, some of the history, some of the reasons why there isn't a real definition of the public interest yet on the table.

We'll start on the discussion. We have two ways of being in the queue. You can either put your hand up in the Adobe Connect room, but for those people who are based around the table, the best way is to use your card. You would wonder why you have the card. Put your card as such so that I can put the list together and then call upon you in succession.

Let's start with Jean Jacques Subrenat who was first to put himself up in the queue. I'll go on through the list of people. Jean Jacques, you have the floor.

JEAN JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. First, I'd like to commend those who took the initiative on the EURALO who put the leadership team on concentrating on this very important issue. I'd like to thank you, Wolf, for the work you did on this. And thank Bill also on the very valuable additions which you brought to us this morning.

I'd like to make three remarks. The first is about a point of legal fact. It's that in a very small number of countries – I'm thinking of Finland, specifically – the right to Internet access is now an

opposable right. Of course, underline the word "opposable." That's the important part; opposable right. That means if you're a citizen of Finland, in Finland you can claim if you don't have access to the Internet that it is your right.

I am citing this as an extreme example, a desirable example, but of course, most parts of the world are not in that situation.

My second point is that I'm aware of the work which has been done, Lauren, by your team with members of the communities in ICANN. I think it would be useful if you could convey to us two things. One is all the links to the documents and the discussions which you have had so far. Unfortunately, I was not able to take part in that.

The second point is, although it may be a small additional work I'm asking you, I think it's very simple to do. It is to make a list of very specific reasons which have been invoked by businesses or some governments against including this notion of the public interest. Because I think that whereas both Wolf and Bill have given us a very good overview, I think our difficulty as community members is we don't want to inundate the world a sort of Wikipedia view of or definition of the subject.

It's rather to identify the sticking point, and I don't know as a community member what are all the arguments opposed to the

public interest. If you define them and bring them to us, then we will work more efficiently. Thanks very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean Jacques. Next in the queue we have Annette Muhlberg.

ANNETTE MUHLBERG: Well, thank you, Wolf, for trying to give an overview on the European approach. I really think that's very valuable to have something that unites us to have a discussion. What are the basic interests that we really share and what are the cultural aspects behind it so that it makes work so much easier.

Lauren, I would be extremely curious to see what Wolf already mentioned. Are there really similar approaches all over the world? What is it that we can say that we really share? I think that's a great approach. I also would like to thank Bill to start to apply this a little more on the ICANN world.

In the discussion up to now, I would like to add two aspects. The one is we are talking about in the ICANN world now about a basic IT communication structure. My neighbor just said, yeah, basic services. That is something we should have look at.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

The other issue is it should be available and accessible. So there are two key words here – available and accessible – to everyone.

Then there is another importance here that comes up is that it has also to do with decision-making processes. So just defining a public interest is not enough. It's not enough to talk about accessibility, but we also have to talk about decision making processes. It's also about avoiding monopolization.

We have an interesting example to make it a little bit more practical now in the ICANN context. For example, should the company be allowed to make the TLD .food as a closed TLD or not? Is that something of public interest? Is that something of consumer rights?

Just to give a feeling what in reality in the ICANN world the discussion could be and should be about. This is what I just want to add. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Annette. It's funny you mentioned the closed generic top level domain issue, which has been discussed in At-Large and we've had various points of views, some being for it and some being against it. So there was some really strong discussion on this.

Let's go down the queue. At the moment I have Stefano Trumpy, Carolin Sibernagl, Oliver Passek, Breda Kutin, and Mathieu Camus. Next is Stefano.

STEFANO TRUMPY: Thank you, chair. This discussion is really very, very interesting because it is the task of the At-Large structures is just to figure out what the public interest is and then to elaborate some statements and then try to merge in European area, because you mentioned that Europe may have different ideas from other regions for historical and cultural regions.

The point is that the At-Large Structures should, first of all, listen to the people. Listen to the problems. You mentioned, and I agree, the fact if you look at the general principles, something that was made in Sao Palo a year ago, it is easier.

But when you have to create a public interest opinion on something that is more practical, as some questions were mentioned by my predecessor here, then it becomes more difficult because certainly the multi-stakeholders that are involved have possibly some conflict of interest or they have the fear that there is a conflict of interest.

So it is very, very important to talk with the stakeholders and to let them admit or elaborate if from the users and from the private sector there is or not an area of conflict of interest.

Those that are involved with this have to apply some [inaudible]. Also, we have to take in mind the fact that historically a year, two years, later maybe the problem of defining public interest may change.

Simply to make an example, before the starting of the new gTLD program, the contribution of VeriSign to the budget of ICANN was 55%. Is this something that is of public interest? It might well be that at the point when you consider this, you say there are historical regions and then in order not to interrupt or to make some damage, then it's better to accept this, but provisionally, let's say. Then try to enlarge the distribution of the [inaudible] in the private sector.

We need this relativity in judging and forming the public interest. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Stefano; another interesting angle.

Earlier there was a mention of individual interests. I think Bill mentioned that as well. Are these vested interests? There was a

question mark at the end of my sentence. I'm sorry. Individual interest, vested interest – is that the same thing?

BILL DRAKE: Well, not necessarily. It depends. Part of the question is how are those interests represented within the process? For example, you can argue that there are individual interests of players who may not be party to the decision-making processes and don't get directly represented. On the other hand, there are people who are actors who may be engaged and indeed may try to capture. So that's one of the challenges is how to have representation of the non-involved as well as ensuring that those who are involved do not unduly steer things.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Bill. Carolin Sibernagl is next.

CAROLIN SIBERNAGLE: This is more a question to Lauren. I thank you for the three of you to give us such a good introduction and overview.

I wanted to ask you something just to get a better grasp on how I can address this and not dive deep into the topic. If I understood you right, ICANN is trying to kind of create a case law – so how the public interest has already been implemented, where it

appears in different documents, not only the bylaws and the regulatory framework around the organization; but also in the gTLD programs. Is that correct? You're reviewing all of these important milestones of ICANN history for the implementation and the actual usage of the public interest as a concept?

LAUREN ALLISON: Rather than it being a case law of such, it's more that we're just creating background research so that it's available. For instance, one of the things we did was an inventory of any reference to the term public addressed and any documentations that ICANN. So we have all of the different, whether it's affirmation of commitments, whether it's the public interest commitments.

We've gone through all of the documents at ICANN to see where the term is so that when the broader conversation starts we can see where this is going to have to be considered. Whether it's decision-making or not, what does public interest mean for At-Large? What does public interest mean for the Board? What does public interest mean for the communications department?

So looking at what the implications for each individual group and organization that makes up ICANN, and then also just having all of the resources available so that everybody has proper background as well.

CAROLINE SIBERNAGL: My actual full question is are you also looking at the usage of the concept by the powerful stakeholders, like the constituencies or the GAC, especially linking it to the case is where ICANN board followed these argumentations? From my point of view as an observer of ICANN decision-making, the concept has been used by a lot of constituencies and stakeholders over the last years – and intensely so – but in very different angles and very different schools of thought.

For the moment being, I don't have a clear grasp on if ICANN actually follows what the multi-stakeholders or the stakeholders kind of push into the process as the concept of public interest or if there is a core understanding of that at ICANN that relates to or confronts the interpretation of the stakeholder groups themselves.

LAUREN ALLISON: That's a fantastic question and it actually will lead me to asking a question to this group as well.

One of the things we had done with the departments at ICANN is created a survey that went through all of these questions basically asking them to highlight where it was used, what the understanding was in each department, if there was one,

whether it was implicit or explicitly referenced in department work.

We have a survey that could be used by the community groups. We haven't extended this to the community groups yet because we wanted to see what would be most useful for all of the different groups. So we have a survey that we could circulate at the community groups if that would be useful.

What we would do is take that survey and the responses from that survey and build a similar report that would give an overview of, like you said, how is it used at GAC. How does it come in to play, whether that's at the GNSO level or NPOC level? Where is it used? How is it referenced? It might give us more background, and like you say; a better overview as well.

If that's useful, we're certainly happy to facilitate something like that, but we want to make sure that it's a very bottom-up and it's inclusive work as possible. That question I would bounce back for anyone speaking after. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Lauren. Let's got to the next person on the list, Oliver Passek.

OLIVER PASSEK: Yes. I would also emphasize that a global public interest is a kind of DNA for what the political ambitions of EURALO mean, so we have to take that into the processes. I think of outside processes, but with very strong political links to users' topics.

Let's take, for example, European Union law making and copyright. There are issues on the table like the licenses for hyperlinks, for embedded videos, some discussions, again, about restrictions for providers and consumers to contents.

Then, of course, we have the more closer ICANN links and topics processes in which also questions of public goods are very important –IANA transition. And, of course, not to forget – I think this might be added, the transparency inside ICANN structures, things like transparency and things like a portfolio management system, public comment possibilities and those things. This should be integrated in this theory and with practical issues.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Oliver. In the queue at the moment we have Breda Kutin, Mathieu Camus, Miguel Perez Subias, Bogdon Manolea, and Yrjo Lansipuro. .Quite a long queue. Let's try and see if we can go through it. Breda, you're next.

BREDA KUTIN:	Breda Kutin from Slovenia, but I also quite heavily work in consumer work on European on the global level working with European Consumer's Association, [BELK], with the Transatlantic Consumer Dialogue. So I would say that in ICANN we are not quite visible or loud, but the question of public interest for me not being a lawyer, because it's a lot of legal work on the European level – not even a politician, but a consumer activist. It's rather simple: What does it mean practically in everyday life. What does it mean a "public interest"?

Public interest for consumer activists is consumer or citizen wellbeing. It depends when you put a limit between consumers and citizens. Sometimes it's quite simple. Putting the public interest in front of profit for business – that's a very key question, which now a days I think it's coming back quite heavily on the agenda.

If I look this from consumer rights perspective, we are talking about availability [access choice] safety. Some of the services are already considered as universal service and access to Internet and net neutrality are, from our point of view, universal services nowadays.

Based on European legislation, we have, for instance, a right for a basic bank account. So it's considered to us a basic right; so

the access to Internet should be also a basic right, something that we wouldn't discuss 10 or 15 years ago, but nowadays, it's sort of a basic right. Without that we cannot function properly.

It's also important that decision-making process is open for public interest. That means for a consumer or civil representatives, and of course, the question of transparency, which we can see it's highly appreciated in speeches, but very, very difficult concept in everyday life.

I would say we should actually start from the point of what we can do from the merit of the responsibility of ICANN, and from that cross-cutting what can be done in what way to achieve a public interest.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Breda. Next is Mathieu Camus.

MATHIEU CAMUS: Thank you, Wolf, for your work. It's very difficult to provide a true definition of public interest, and I was looking on the webpages of the European Commission. There is no definition. Even if in your paper there is a section with constitutional advisements. But in [inaudible] values of European countries, we have several definitions on public interest. European Union provides a definition of public interest entities, but it's not really

interesting in all case. In North America, the public interest could be understood like some of the individual interests, but in Europe, it's more than just some of individual interest to something else which really depends of the social general interests.

I think that to be closer to the public interest definition, we could take up the definition of common good and think of the Internet as a common good, which lies to the fundamental rights of the end-users to preserve the accessibility or the availability of the Internet. Following a public interest in your case, of EURALO, it could be something like respecting the fundamental rights of end users. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Mathieu I think Wolf might have a response or comment on this.

WOLF LUGWIG: Yeah, just a quick one. Perhaps a polemic one. Thanks for delivering the key word.

If you have a closer look on the European Commission over the last 30 years, I had to realize because the European Union became, key principals from the early days, more or less, disappear or are not visible any longer. If you see the power of

corporate lobbying in Brussels and how much you [inaudible] Oliver Passek, he worked with [inaudible] in Brussels, so he could tell you stories about stories

To keep it short, take [tip] and other examples. There is bureaucracy with vested corporate interests and even parliamentarians in Germany are not allowed to see the negotiation paper, so this is quite opposite what we understand on the public interest.

For me on the European level, my framing was always close to the Council of Europe. Our key documents come from the Council of Europe. The Council of Europe is for me, more or less, as amongst the terms of preference, for me as a commission, became a nightmare and over the last years I do not trust them at all anymore.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Wolf. Next is Bogdon Manolea.

BOGDON MANOLEA: Thank you. I'll follow up on that debate because I think that if we're talking about the definition the public interest, we could discuss three days in a row. If we will ask constitutional [inaudible] for us to come with these costs two weeks in a row. Maybe that shouldn't be our main focus only, but rather to get

an idea of what public interest means and to see how practically affects the ICANN.

I think there are two directions in which we need to look. It is the public interest in ICANN decision-making. Here the practical aspects would look into details such as transparency of procedures, the receiving of comments from everyone, what businesses are involved in the ICANN decision-making process, and then there is the public interest in ICANN activities.

I think here there are simple issues that can be done even tomorrow if there is an interest where ICANN really stands up to its principles. For example, I will just name two. For example, to Creative Commons license all the content that is available on the ICANN website or, for example, to use the free tools that are available for everyone. Because now we may try to collect to a Adobe Connect, but if you're Linux users you get an error, so that doesn't work.

This kind of practical issues of implementation of a public interest is something that needs to be in ICANN before the next steps. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank for this, Bogdan, and I note that some of what you said was applauded by some people in the room.   Next we have Yrjo Lansipuro.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you. Okay. I think that in discussing public interest it's useful to take a look at the concept we use pretty much, which is the Internet community and go back to the role this concept, to my mind, used to have by the time everything started, really. For instance, the Articles of Incorporation of ICANN Article IV: "The Corporation shall operate for the benefit of the Internet community as a whole. I think it depends now on our definition of what the Internet community is. Does it include users?

I think we think…Now how has this concept been able to scale? Because at a time of the setting up of ICANN there were a couple of million – couple of hundreds of million – users, I think. It was still a minority and we were looked at… Even users were looked as some sort of [inaudible].

Now, with three billion users, what does it mean for the Internet community to have so many end users? I think that this discussion could be brought in when we discuss public interest. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Yrjo. Next in the queue is Miguel Perez Subias.

MIGUEL PEREZ SUBIAS: Hi, my name is Miguel from the Spanish Internet Users' Association. I want to share with you a reflection about what will be easier for us [inaudible] for ICANN. Okay. Probably we tried to find what we have in common, but nobody knows what we are doing in our country or in our local activity.

For us it would be very easy to know what is [each one in] this community was doing in each country. For instance, for me, just now, I'm focusing on privacy. There are probably two people – two organizations – that are working on privacy. Then for me, it's enough to [contact] with these two organizations. It's enough.

Then if ICANN can give me a tool in order to know what is the general interest is. The specific interest for each one probably would be a way to build something interesting for everyone because I have no time. I probably have time, but it's not my priority to have time to discuss about the global. I prefer to focus on my local interests, but sometimes I need help in order to push in the European Union in order to do something for copyright, for privacy.

But if I found three or four organizations that have the same interest than I have, then it would be very interesting for me. That is my suggestion. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Miguel. We are going to all have a lunch together and it's going to be – it's exactly for what you wanted – being able to network. You're all here face-to-face. Use this opportunity to talk to each other. You can continue discussing the global public interest or discuss anything else that you wish to discuss. But that's the time for you to all get to know each other.

We have worked on a survey. It's a bit difficult because surveys – one never knows how to ask the question, and you get different answers depending on how the question is asked. You never get the answer that you wanted because the interpretation of the question was not the question that you asked anyway. When you see each other face-to-face, it's the best time.

Next I have Yuliya Morenets.

YULIYA MORENETS: Thank you, Olivier. Yuliya Morenets, TaC Together in Cybercrime. I actually would like to follow on what was said by Wolf concerning the basic principles which were discussed at the

Council of Europe. I remember the discussion which started in 2008 actually in the working group of the Council of Europe working group on cross-border Internet.

When the public interest was already discussed, and actually mostly which was discussed is the access to the Internet as a basic human right and the right to be users of the Internet. I think it was an excellent paper which was produced as a recommendation to take the access to the Internet as a basic human right. I definitely think we have to have a look on this paper and to have this basic paper because it was produced at the level of the Council of Europe for this discussion. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for that, Yuliya.   Wolf Ludwig?

WOLF LUDWIG: Just a small comment. To my knowledge, Finland, it was mentioned before by Yrjo ready. Finland is the only European country which has it as a constitutional element already. If I'm not misinformed, this goes back to the basic idea of the Council of Europe. It was discussed in various other countries, but no other country where as consequent as a Finnish at the time and I

think it was three or four years ago and they strongly applaud and said Finland finally made it.

For me, it's the best practice. And for me it could be implemented in other European countries because it's well founded. It's a recommendation of the Council of Europe, so it could be easily applied all over Europe. But for the moment it's wishful thinking.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Wolf. You might just went past because I saw Carolin Sibernagl, and then I saw you, and I thought that's not Carolin. Go ahead, Yrjo.

YRJO LANSPIURO: Yeah, it was nothing in the Constitution. It's just the universal service thing, but nevertheless, the effort is the same.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Yrjo. Carolin?

CAROLIN SIBERNAGL: My question would be a little bit to procedures because looking at the time, we have, I think six minutes left. So what is the goal to this discussion? Do we kind of approve anything today? I think

it will be difficult to do so. And if so, there is just an open question to the panel or to the moderation.

The other thing is that I just wanted to – I just opened the EURALO bylaws and I think 3.1, the introductional section on purpose of the association might be a good guide because our group has the purpose to consider and provide advice on activities of ICANN insofar as they relate to the interest of the individual European Internet users.

I think just standing [inaudible] behind what Wolf started, the European tradition on public interests and how this region of the world sees it could be an angle to address it and to kind of break it down to something that we actually are able to agree on, and the other hand to actually focus on the purpose of our structure, which is providing advice from the perspective of the Internet user. It's a smaller piece of the cake. Still a huge piece, but a little smaller than what we are addressing right now, I think.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Carolin. On the process, yes, we have about ten – well, not ten, five minutes left to this session. We have that paper in our hands. I think that it was the aim of Wolf to try and get this paper adopted by everyone here. There have also been very interesting contributions here and Lauren has been taking

notes, I believe. I was hoping that Bill would be here just for closing statements.

WOLF LUDWIG: He may come back. His watch is still here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So that's good. So I hand the floor first to Wolf and then we'll get to it.

WOLF LUDWIG: Just to contextualize it properly again, it was first an idea. Then I tried to break the long paper – the long working paper – which is more than 15 pages down to two pages really to reduce to the essentials, and deliver it as input to this general assembly. What I understood, what I've heard from your feedback and contributions; I think we share this common value here.

As Carolin properly said, this was also reflected at the very beginning in submission order. Somehow it [inaudible].. So it was always part of the political identity of our community. For me it was always sort of pleasure to count on this common understanding whether you look on it from a consumer point of view, whether you look on it from a privacy point of view.

So all this has to do with basic rights and fundamental freedoms, but it's all oriented in the tradition of the original Bill of Rights. It's oriented into public interest. The idea was if we can agree, not word by word. I'm not a native speaker, and a native speaker may find some very substantial mistakes, etc.; but I tried to make it as clear as possible so that it could be re-edited to make it better.

But if we can agree on the substance and on the spirit of this paper, we could approve it by this general assembly together with the mandate to hand it over to other RALOS and to ALAC, inviting them – we cannot force them. We can impose nothing on other RALOS. But we can invite and encourage them to read it in their original context and perhaps to find out what are the similarities, etc., or equivalence in this context, so it could be enriched by some more RALOs and perhaps after a year we come up with a paper including contributions from three to four other regions.

This would be another point and we could adopt it on the ALAC level, and parallelly we could think about – I think it's a shared value with NCUC. It's a shared value, I know, with certain GAC people. So this is from me, also, in a strategic consideration. This could be an alliance between a public interest oriented or based constituencies.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

We could work together into this direction. So this is the framing under which this paper was written, so an adoption of the spirit would be nice here, and then we could forward it, hand it over to other regions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Wolf. We have Sandra Hoferichter.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you. I think this is a very good idea to what you were proposing, Wolf, especially to share this paper with the other RALOs because historic backgrounds may be different in that region, but I think it's very, very good approach to look at the history first, what public interest means. In each region it will be totally different, I guess, in Asia-Pacific, AFRALO, or Latin America.

I think this community is really the right place to kick start such a discussion about the public interest, because as it was mentioned here during this session already, public interest is claimed by many stakeholder groups, but I think this group, the Internet user, has the reliability and the [legability] to really kick-start a discussion and pave the ground for a broader approach within ICANN.

I very much agree with what you just proposed and would also like to thank you for putting this together. This was a really great thesis paper and kick-start for a very enlightening and interesting discussion today. Thank you, Wolf.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sandra. Carolin Sibernagl. Okay. Mikhail Medrish?

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: Thank you, Wolf. It's very interesting, and for me maybe to add a bit. You see, what I'm looking and seeing what interests, I'm searching for subjects of interest. Public is very general. Maybe to add something about what is inside; public users, governments maybe, business maybe to think about it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Mikhail. I think we're going to have some more discussion of this over lunch. Bill Drake?

BILL DRAKE: I agree with the idea of sharing the paper around, and so I just wanted to fly at one concern: Just be aware. You are aware, but just underscore – that there will be efforts to sort of capture the term. We already see all the time GAC and various grouping claiming—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Please don't use the acronyms; Government Advisory Committee.

BILL DRAKE: Government Advisory Committee. Governments and various industry factions often say that they are doing something because it's in the public interest and their conceptions of what that involves may be very different from, say, Wolf's. So therefore, this is why I think it would be at least useful to try to reach some sort of consensus on some basic guiding elements. Because Lauren didn't mention [Ni Quanar's] group said, "ICANN defines the global public interest as ensuring that the Internet becomes and continues to be stable, inclusive, and accessible across the globe so that all may enjoy a single and open Internet.

Now, stable, inclusive, accessible; I would say we might want to start by trying to focus on a few core concepts that are potentially generalizable and ask are there ways in which these don't map to ICANN? Are there ways in which these do inform the range of ICANN activities? And try and build from there. I think that that would be a way to try to start that dialogue because I think you would probably find Asia, in Africa, elsewhere, that similar core concepts do occur.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Bill. I note there's more hands coming up. Annette, we don't have the time and you've already spoken; but we have Bastiaan Goslings who hasn't spoken yet, so if we could have the microphone for Bastiaan; Jean Jacques, just two words; and Lauren, you'll be closing. And I think the way forward is to just ask then one question: Are there any objections to the way that has been described both by Wolf and by Bill?

I will be connecting a consensus call and asking if there are any objections. If there are, then we'll need to discuss this further in future. If there are not, then we'll at least know a way forward.

Bastiaan?

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Thank you very much. Bastiaan Goslings, ISOC Netherlands.

Thank you for the opportunity to add something to this. Not a question, but maybe a comment related and I think very important for the end user constituency.

I was invited this morning to comment on a report that was published: ICANN's Corporate Responsibility of Human Rights. There's a working party for that inside the Non-Commercial

Stakeholder Group. Constituency, if I'm correct. One of the reason's—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's actually a cross-community working party, now.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So the ALAC is also part of it, so.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: That's why I'm asking. I don't know how much ALAC is aware of this, but as Wolf referred to the Council of Europe. One of the things that spurred this was a report of the Council of Europe and paraphrasing; their conclusion that public interest, as such, is too vague, and this would be our way, not maybe covering the entire concept, but make it more specific. There is a lot of work of that being done. As far as I'm aware, also in the CCWG there's work on it being done to corporate and the ICANN's bylaws.

I think that's very important for ALAC as well to be involved. If that's the case, I'm very happy about that, but I want, for the record, to include this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Bastiaan. That will be included. We have to clear out. Okay. Jean Jacques, can we maybe defer? Jean Jacques Subrenat?

JEAN JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thanks. Two points; two requests. One, continuing Bill's remarks. I think that to be the most efficient we have to actually get, as I requested earlier from Lauren, a list of the specific objections we have heard so far from business and some governments, etc., on the public interest.

Two, I want to strongly support Wolf's suggestion. I was about to make it, in fact, a half an hour ago, that we go to the RALOs. But more importantly, I think, we should inform ALAC immediately and ask for ALAC's support as a collective effort. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Lauren Allison, you have closing words.

LAUREN ALLISON: Just once again thank you very much for inviting me along today. I have been taking note of all of the suggestions that people have been making of things that will be useful.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

I just wanted to know as well, in moving forward, what is the best way to communicate? I think we've had suggestions several times [inaudible] Wiki space, so we'll certainly look into that and see if we can put all of those links up there as well. Then, also, possibly some planning for whether it be Marrakech or next on from there. It would be great to have a point of contact. Super. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you .Finally, consensus call. Are there any objections to approve the plan roughly brought forward by both Bill and by Wolf? Any abstentions?

Okay. So we're all there. Thank you very much. This meeting is closed. We don't need to record the housekeeping, the meeting is closed. And thanks to the interpreters for the additional few minutes.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN | 54
Dublin