
WOLF LUDWIG:

We are now to the full hour. Let me suggest to start this first call of the public interest working group. I would like to welcome all of those who have joined us so far. Maybe some more participants will join us in a few minutes. And while it's always difficult once such a working group is created, it was finally approved by ALAC at the last meeting in Marrakech.

And we now have the opportunity to have this first call, and to make our some outlines for our future work. Let me suggest that we start now with the agenda item two, which is a roll call by staff.

TERRI AGNEW:

Thank you Wolf, this is Terri. And good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large public interest working group call, taking place on Thursday the 16th of June, 2016 at 21:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Wolf Ludwig, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Matthieu Camus, Howard Deane, Kaili Kan, Harold Arcos, and Alberto Soto.

We have listed apologies from Bastiann Goslings.

Also joining us is Alan Greenberg.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, and myself, Terri Agnew.

Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and Claudia.

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.

Also joining us is Avri Doria.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking, not only for transcription purposes, but to allow our interpreters to identify you on the Spanish channel.

With that, I'll now hand it back over to you Wolf. Please begin.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay, thanks a lot for conducting this roll call, and welcome to Avri and welcome to Alan, who joined us just now. The next item on our agenda is aims and objectives of the working group. And [inaudible] charter question mark, and let me suggest that we start with this question first. I think, like any other working group at ALAC, it would be useful or necessary to have a charter also for the public interest working group, but as we have Alan and Olivier, the old hands onboard, who are much more familiar with such formalities, I would suggest either to Alan or to Olivier, to step in and to make suggestions, whether we can just adopt a charter we have from other working groups.

And we have to adapt them to our purpose, or what would be the best way forward to formalize the working group on the public interest? Either Alan or Olivier, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'll take it since I got here before Olivier. To a large extent, ALAC and At-Large working groups have not had formal charters in the sense that we do for the GNSO working groups or CCWGs, however, it's one of the items on our list to talk about in Helsinki. And I suspect, but I'm careful

to not always predict what the ALAC will decide, but I suspect we're going to go with something relatively light weight, that is at the very least, we need a mission statement, we need statements about membership, whether it's open or specific people per RALO or things like that.

So without worrying about the format of it, I think we can start working on the content without worrying about the formalities. Certainly from what I understand, we are not planning to do this with formal membership per RALO, but whoever is interested, can and should attend, and participate.

I don't think it's going to be a decision making group, to a large extent. None of our working groups are really decision making, other than perhaps making a recommendation to the ALAC. So I'm not particularly worried either about the, you know, the processes of who votes and that kind of thing.

The mission statement, however, I think is the critical one, that I think we need to work on, and perhaps somebody should draft one and then bring it back to the group and refine it. You know, clearly we are looking at the public interest from At-Large point of view, but I'm expecting this group to be feeding into whatever ICANN wide process there will be.

And it's not clear exactly what that will be, nor [inaudible] is leading, who is leading the charge, so to speak, on that. And I'm not quite sure where that is going to be going, but I'm presuming there will be some

ICANN wide process, as mandated for a number of different reasons. And I'm presuming we will be feeding into that.

So that's really all I have to say. I'll turn it over to Olivier.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, thanks a lot for this comment and recommendations, Alan. I will now give the floor to Olivier now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Wolf. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And a couple of things. First up, I've just battled with someone to put my hand up. Please do not give any speaker the speaker rights, otherwise their hand is put down, and I don't know how Wolf will be able to know who is in the queue, if that's the case. So that was one thing.

Secondly, the link that we have in our agenda sends us to exploring the public interest within ICANN's remit home. That's actually the home of the ICANN wide public interest sessions, the Department of Public Responsibility. The current home for this working group that we are in now, is the one that I've actually given in the chat, and that's an excellent starting point to have our front page on this.

At present, the mission statement that is given here is just a one-liner. The one-liner is said, this working group will discuss issues related to the public interest, in the context of ICANN in the manner in which end users are impacted. Good mission statement. If you compare this to other working groups in At-Large, whether you're looking at the At-Large new gTLDs working group, which has a much more detailed

mandate with an original description of the working group, but then a mandate with several bullet points, one after the other.

Or the At-Large technology taskforce, that looks at the actual recommendations that were made out of the At-Large improvements project final report. So providing some historical reason why this working group was created, I think that we have enough to put this together pretty quickly. So first, a reason why the working group is there, and perhaps there was a report, or something, which pointed to this, and I know that there was, so that's why I'm mentioning it.

And then the main lines, and perhaps this, one of the first goals of this working group is to perhaps define the work for the next year or so. What goals do we want to achieve? What is the aim of this group? Is it there to feed into the ICANN wide public responsibility framework? Do we want to go further than this? Do we want to build links with other parts of ICANN?

As well, maybe other, let's say, likeminded people around ICANN. And do we want to establish any participation requirements? And that's the question as to whether we wish to, make sure that we have a balance between the different regions, and therefore encourage regions that are underrepresented in the [inaudible] working group that we have at the moment, to provide people to join the group.

That's all I wanted to add. It's pretty open, and it's really down to the people who are on the call today, to, I guess, make a choice. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. Thanks a lot Alan for this additional comments. It was my understanding from the beginning, that this would be an open working group. A working group in the sense that we are not going for any decision, but we are to discuss the scope of the public interest, and therefore, I think, it should be open to everybody who is interested.

On the mission statement, let me suggest that we enter into this discussion, perhaps in Helsinki at the upcoming next ICANN meeting, not to waste time tonight with first a consideration of this. In my opinion, it will be a little bit broader what is said in the link of the work space, that this working group will discuss issues related to the public interest in the context of ICANN, and the manner in which end users are impacted.

I think we can give a little bit more flesh to this mission statement, but as I said, I think we should and could do this better, when we meet next week and the week after, in Helsinki, to complete this part of the work. Therefore, I would very much like to focus this first starting call tonight, on the question of, and definition, of aims and objectives of the working group.

It was also my understanding from the beginning, after I have gone through a previous material from the strategy panel on the public responsibility framework, which was chaired by [inaudible]. In my understanding, this framework was far too broad, and too general, in my opinion, and therefore we should focus a little bit more precisely on possible definition of the public interest.

As we have repeatedly heard over the last couple of years in other constituencies, for certain groups at ICANN, the public interest seems to be a sort of an unknown animal, or some are going even so far by saying the public interest, that is nothing that can really be defined, etc.

And therefore, it should be given so much importance. I have a completely different approach. I think when you really focus on it, and if you try a bit hard, to make first attempt for a definition, and actually that's what we do at the EURALO level before our last General Assembly in October in Dublin, when we dedicated for our General Assembly a first part of the this, effective to this question.

And we started the discussion with a short paper, tracing the public interest, and in the short paper, we tried inter-regional context, okay, in a very limited context. It was not about global public interest, but when I compiled this paper, I tried to find out where the definitions were of the public interest in various or different European societies historically come from.

And therefore, I was more or less raising the origin and the involvement of the term in the European context. And I think this is still a valid approach, and I would be very grateful if we could keep this as one of the aims of our working group, and to invite other regions to have a look in their casual and historical context, and I think in a similar way, as we can find the term public interest in various constitution in European countries.

I'm sure you can find it as well in other parts of the world. And therefore we can enrich the original input by EURALO, by some more

experience, and by some more findings, etc. to make it a little bit broader and to make it more consistent. This would be one of the angles I would suggest.

And a second part of the aims and objectives of this working group would be, in my opinion, at least to see what are the concrete fields of application of our discussion, in the context of end users, there was, in the past, repeat discussion that the public interest commitments, they are really not really taken seriously over the last time, and I think it could be a task of this working group to define such or similar fields of application.

But I think it should be a collaborative process, and I invite all members of this working group to come up with ideas. So we should start tonight with this definition of aims and objectives. I think we cannot complete this in one call. Under the agenda item three, as you may have seen, there was a reference page posted exploring the public interest since ICANN [inaudible], where you can find a lot of related information from workshops at the last IGF in Brazil.

And from some other events, and I think this could be a starting point to find out what we should do. What we shouldn't do, in my opinion, is just the application of discussions which have been done before. And we should somehow find and define new challenges.

Any further ideas? Any further comments? As I said, this should be a collaborative endeavor, and I see that Alan Greenberg has raised his hand. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Wolf. This session that you mentioned at the IGF, what I thought was very good, it's one of the few times I can honestly say I went into a, whatever, 75 minute session or an hour and a half session, and my ideas really evolved as the people were speaking. I thought it was very well done, and perhaps as important as the overall session, there was an introduction by [Janette Hoffman], that I thought was quite useful.

She looked at the origins of the term public interest, largely from a regulatory point of view. You know, in her view, that's where the term actually became into common use. And of course, from an ICANN point of view, although we're not a regulator, by means of our contracts, we do effectively act as regulators, or perform similar functions to regulators.

So I think it's a very useful look at the origin of it, and the discussion itself, I thought was quite interesting. And particularly one of the things that came out of it, at least, what I took out of it, is that it's not clear that we want to define the term. But we have to understand the term a lot better than we do to start with. And certainly we need to understand it a lot better before we could even contemplate defining it, but it's not clear that we want to define it.

Clearly, any definition of the public interest may or may not be applicable the next time we need to consider the public interest. And you know, maybe we need guidelines, rules, processes, more than definitions. And I think that's one of the more substantive discussions that we have to have going forward. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thanks a lot Alan. I've just seen that Avri posted a comment in the chat, Janet is brilliant. [Inaudible] would be a good reference for this group as well. This is a point I totally agree with. I also think what I've seen from [Janette] is one of the most solid and substantial approaches in this direction.

And I also agree with the intro that the public interest refers to regulation. Also in a historical context, in Europe, it always goes in line with regulatory issues, or attempts in the public sphere, and therefore I think this is a good approach and we should explore a little bit more from the inputs, from Janet, etc. what could offer some valid elements for our work here.

But I've seen some more [inaudible] raised his hand. First, Alberto Soto. You have the floor, Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO:

This is Alberto Soto speaking. Thank you very much Wolf. Well I do believe it is necessary, perhaps not having a definition, but at least to understand, as Alan said before, what public interest is, because based on that comprehension, we would be able to develop properly the rest of our work.

I mean, the scope of this working group, the objective, and so on. I mean, I am not saying we should make up a definition of public interest, because perhaps we can analyze two or three sources, and then

compare those definitions and perhaps then, be able to define the scope and objectives. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks for this input, and I think this could be a valid approach as well. Next on my list here is Olivier Crépin-Leblond. Olivier, you have the floor.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. It's Olivier speaking. You mentioned the excellent discussion that took place at the Internet Governance Forum. I was going to suggest that we make it an action item to have, to find the link to the session itself with its recording, because I gather that most people on this call, and me included, have not been at that session, and perhaps could listen to it, or read the transcript.

And I know that the IGF has good archives. So if we could have this then in the reference documents of the home page for this working group, that would be really helpful, as one of our input documents. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes. Thanks a lot Olivier. If you go to this reference page, exploring the public interest, it's a collection of inputs and links. And I've seen that a link to the Brazil session of the IGF is also available there. So you can also have access to the recording of it, and I would like to invite all participants tonight and all members of this working group, to have a closer look on this reference materials and input, because I think we can

get a lot of ideas and a lot of inputs from those, works from those documents and discussions, which have been around the last IGF.

And there was areas, other sessions as well. So the next on my list is Alan. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry, that is an old hand. Sorry.

WOLF LUDWIG: Oh, this is an old hand. Okay. Do we have any other comments from other participants here on the call?

I can remember for several years, that we have a lot of related discussions, not about the definition but the fields of application of public interest issues, starting to my memory from the first ATLAS in 2009 in Mexico, and I have seen Evan is on this call. Perhaps Evan who is also, was also involved in this earlier discussions besides Carlton. I think we should collect a lot of ideas at this stage, and then try to compile our aims and objectives out of this ideas.

I've seen the link to the IGF session doesn't work, okay. The link to the documents work, perhaps not to the recording. Any further comments? Yes, I've seen Evan has raised his hand. Evan, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hello everybody. The concept of defining the public interest has always been a real strange thing to me at ICANN. The main purpose to me is

the public interest is to allow people to disagree with you to disagree with your definition of the public interest. In that way, it allows them to totally dismiss what arguments you have.

At-Large and ALAC specifically, has a very specific bylaw, a bylaw defined role to essentially assert what we believe to be in the interests of the end users. I've encountered in the NARALO mailing list, contracted parties that have subscribed to the list and said, well I am part of the public too. Doesn't my interest matter? And it's literally just done as a matter of derailing arguments.

We have within ICANN, contracted parties and vested interest who adhere to assert themselves, in any time arguments that come up that gets in their way. My experience is that whatever rhetorical tool is used to try and discredit where we're coming from, our point of view, either we don't represent enough people, are how do we plan to speak for billions, or whatever.

And the definition of the public interest, to me, is another red herring of this. So, I mean, we're here. I think it's enough to be able to say, we have a bylaw mandated rule to try and speak to the end users, and that is why we have a position in the public interest. If we spend a whole lot more time going into it than that, I think we're literally just wasting our time, and what I think would be a futile, you know...

WOLF LUDWIG:

Have you finished Evan? Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think we lost Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Sorry, no. No I'm still here. Sorry, the network cut out here. Anyway [CROSSTALK]...

WOLF LUDWIG:

...your last remarks.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Well simply that we really ought not to spend a lot of time...

WOLF LUDWIG:

He's lost again.

He's now typing in the chat. The network keeps dropping off.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I'll try this again, and I'll keep it brief, in case it cuts out again. All I'm trying to say is that we ought not to spend a lot of time on the definition of the public interest. We have a bylaw mandate through the Board to speak on behalf of end users, that is our entitlement to define our point of view of the public interest.

And I really think spending a lot more time on it is really just diverting our attention away from actually dealing with the issues. And I'll leave it at that, thanks.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. To collect our sort of mandate, may I ask everybody who has spoken so far, and make a suggestion, to shortly put their ideas and their inputs on our mailing list, that we can collect it from the mailing list. So also people who couldn't join the call tonight, maybe in a position to benefit from this approach at this stage, to collect ideas and inputs, and to compile it to our mandate, and to our goals and objectives, as a next state.

I give the floor to Aida, please allow me another comment. The public interest is usually a fixed notion in the context of the GAC. And it's partly seen, or perhaps misunderstood, that as a GAC is the only constituency which is dealing with the public interest definition in their roles as governments.

But it's my understanding that this is not exclusive, and it should not only be a matter in the GAC, but it also should be a matter for ALAC in the pursue and defense of consumer interests or [inaudible] interests. And I'll now give the floor to Aida, please.

AIDA NOBLIA: This is Aida Noblia speaking. Good afternoon, good evening everyone. Can you hear me?

WOLF LUDWIG: Can you speak up a little bit?

AIDA NOBLIA: This is Aida Noblia speaking.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, go ahead.

AIDA NOBLIA: I was... I heard, in some other meeting, I don't remember exactly which one, I heard about public interest, but this was referred to global public interest. And this was also referred to certain articles within the bylaws. So as not to pay attention to private or particular public interest. In this case, they were talking about global public interest.

And they were referring, in that meeting, they were referring to article or section three in the bylaws. So I believe, if I'm not wrong, that that was the article that they were referring to, and that was related to global public interest for internet stability.

So, this means that there are documents, this is being documented and that this issue has already been discussed. That's it. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks a lot Aida for this comment. If you have a look to the EURALO input paper for the Dublin General Assembly, there are some clear remarks on this issue. It was one of the pre-conditions led from a regional point of view, we didn't find anything to define the global context, or anything like global public interest. There may be something like the global public interest as referred to in the bylaws, but we

contented ourselves just to respect inner-regional contexts, that's a public interest, and a regional context is a valid and it's a very old term.

Therefore, I think if they want to find the conclusion about global public interest, you should look into the different regions, and histories, and culture, whether there are certain similarities. And the global public interest could possibly be understood as a summing up of different inputs from different regions.

Therefore, I think it will be extremely difficult to come up with anything which oddly shared by everybody on a global definition of the public interest. I think this is far too complex, etc. and this will be a very difficult endeavor. Next on my list is Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO:

This is Alberto Soto speaking. Thank you very much Wolf. I fully agree with the fact of having a regional focus, and not only GAC should be interested in public interest. So when we talk about the GAC, we are referring to the political definition of public interest. And if it is only GAC, well, that would be quite...

Let me give you an example. In, for example, internet is it clear of public interest in a certain country. So certain government declares internet as a public interest. If this is a democratic government or not, well, so in that country, internet could be regulated because it is public interest.

And within that concept, it is a global concept, and the government should be responsible for the words of the people. And that's why the

government will be regulating internet. So I agree with the fact that we don't have to devote so much time to this, but we have to agree on certain important issues. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay, thanks a lot Alberto for this comment. I think at a later stage, in the course of our work, it could be an interesting idea, let's say for the Hyderabad meeting, a common session between GAC members and our working group, and to discuss this with GAC people, their approach, etc., and understanding, and to find out we may find some common grounds between members of this working group, and members from the GAC side.

And I know some people in the GAC who are very knowledgeable about this issue, and it could be a very interesting exchange in the future. But this shouldn't be our first priority. It's just an idea in the working process at a later stage. And I see that Alan has raised his hand. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I have a very different opinion on the concept of global public interest. I don't believe in the ICANN context, it is talking about a public interest that spans the ICANN regions, for instance. As Alberto said, the public interest is going to be very differently defined in different countries or different regions of a particular ICANN region.

My understanding of the global public interest in the ICANN context, global is not a geographic issue. But except the fact that there are very

different factions and groups within ICANN, representing the different interests, and the global public interest is the one that spans all of them and balances them. So the Board is charged, and it's the only group in ICANN that is, is charged with addressing the global public interest.

That is, they have to balance the various competing views of what public interest is, or indeed, private interests in many cases within ICANN. I don't think it's a geographic thing, I think it's a spanning thing of how do you balance the various public interests? Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thanks a lot Alan. I think this is a very good point. And I would like to ask all of those again who have now contributed so far during this call, with their ideas and suggestions. Please leave your comments on our mailing list, that we can compile it from there. I think that we have limited time and we cannot come up with a conclusion tonight, or with... This is sufficient list defining our aims and objectives of the working group.

I think we should postpone this until our next call, and meanwhile we should collect such ideas, etc. and come up with a compilation of ideas, what we can discuss in detail at our next call again. Due to the constraints of time, I would like to continue with our next agenda item. What are operational items. And the first sub-point is, as leadership of this working group.

So far, I was in a bit sole position, then I got the mandate from ALAC at the Marrakech meeting to start with the creation and initialization of this working group, but I think the leadership should be more broadly

composed. And my suggestion is that we should have at least two co-chairs from different regions, co-chairing this working group together with me. And I'm awaiting your ideas, who is interested to step forward to co-chair this working group together with me.

You can either speak up now, or you can put your interest forward on the mailing list after the call, and we can take a decision on the leadership at our subsequent call.

But do you agree in principle? I think it's a good rule. In any other working groups, that are always at minimum, two co-chairs, and I think we should proceed in this direction for the public interest working group as well. And I guess it may be agreed among the participants at this call.

And I just see a comment from Alberto, I suggest, did you say two co-chairs plus you? Yes, I said, yes, three co-chairs altogether. This may not be exclusive, so if we find enough people who are willing to step in, so we, that we are broadly based. I think three, two co-chairs and the chair should be the minimum, but if there are more people interested, yes and this would be sort of leadership team as Heidi mentioned in the chat.

The next question on our agenda is working methods. I can only say, at this stage, it's a working group. We do not need to come up with any decisions. Therefore, in my opinion, what is typical or basic for working groups, it's a collaborative process. Anybody interested to participate to this working group is strongly invited to do so via the mailing list, and I hope one day you may have intensive exchanges on the working, on

the mailing list, which is a bit dormant so far, but as I said, it should be a collaborative approach with utmost inputs from different sides.

And this should be the basis regarding our working methods. And the next point, under four operational items, point C, is the frequency of calls. I would like to suggest that I think one call per month should be a good starting point. If one day we realize that we have a very good dynamic in this working group, what I do hope, so at a later stage we can discuss to even having closer intervals for our regular calls.

But for the starting period, I would like to suggest to have one call per month. And I see Heidi is taking notes, under the action items. So if this idea or this suggestion is approved, we can always come back on our next call, when we see that there are better ideas to re-discuss it.

Any further comments from your side?

Yes, I see Alberto has raised his hand. Alberto, you have the floor please.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you very much. Alberto Soto speaking. I suggest that our comments, or this has been requested. Instead of putting it in the mailing list, it should be included on the Wiki page because it would be easier if all of us can go to a single place with all of the comments and not to check mail after mail. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay, this is a very good idea, and a very good, let's say, alternative. I would somehow, well, we should offer both options. I know from the past that certain people have some difficulties to go to the workspace and to post their comments and ideas, on a workspace. Some people are more easy to do it on the mailing list.

So I think there should be two complimentary options. Whoever wants to use the workspace for comments is invited or encouraged to do so. And those people who posted on the mailing list, I will have looked there and I can more or less from time to time, add the very important comments, etc. to the workspace as well.

And I agree with Alberto, the workspace is a basic platform for a working group. It's a much more comprehensive tool, and it allows a quick overview for anybody else interested or for newcomers, etc. to get a great overview. So we should consider this as two complimentary tools.

Any further comments on agenda item for operational, on leadership? I see there is some approval regarding the suggestion of the model of having three co-chairs. What I think could be a good starting point. I think we all agree on the basics for the working methods that a working group can never be a one man show.

It should list and expound on as many contributions from working group participants as possible. And you are all invited to participate, either via leaving comments and ideas on the workspace, or via the mailing list. And I guess for the continuation and the frequencies of calls, as a

starting point again, one call per month for this working group would be, I think, a good beginning.

Any further comments, questions, regarding this agenda item four? I do not see any hands raised, at the moment, therefore let me continue with agenda item five, priorities. I think the priorities for this working group is as we said, are the next steps for the moment, to clearly define our aims and objectives, by reviewing references from other discussions, from other programs, what we have seen before.

And a very important element is I will try to get some more background info from what [Janet Hoffman] has published in this context. And I will submit it to this working group as soon as I, the more findings, which is documented under the workshop on the global public interest, and critical internet resources, which was workshop 55 of the last IGF in Brazil. And I'm sure [Janet Hoffman] has certainly a lot more references to this. And we should collect all of this ideas and input to define our aims and objectives for the next call.

But in my opinion, this could also be work in process, the more inputs we get, the more clearer we hopefully are about what should be or could be our focus. So this, in my opinion, is one of the next priorities to come up with a decision on the operational aspects. This we can also re-discuss this as the mailing list that had some more ideas bumping up, over the next weeks to come to conclusions for the starting and the creation of this working group.

Are there any other ideas regarding priorities? Please speak up.

I see no more hands raised, therefore I take this silence as approval so far. And of course, the next step to continue with our discussions, at least among those who will be in Helsinki, it's a perfect opportunity to use the Helsinki meeting for some more fine tuning, and sometimes in on spot discussions among people, a lot of creative ideas spun up and it's a better context then just a first and opening working group call.

And for the next call, which would be agenda item six, I would suggest the next call in July, July may be a difficult moment, or a difficult month, because... I see a comment from Heidi says not specific time in meetings on public interest. So yes, I was thinking about informal discussions among people participating at this call tonight. I know that there is no time for anything more official in Helsinki, it's a possibility for informal exchanges and discussions among the group members in Helsinki.

So regarding the next meeting in Europe, normally July and August are very difficult, yes, and around [inaudible], Alberto, you are perfectly right. Very good idea. July August are difficult moments, but if we could try to organize a next call around in the middle of July in collaboration with At-Large staff, I think it would be a good next opportunity not to lose too much time between this starting call tonight and the following one.

So we should foresee the next call for around middle of July. Any objections? Any other ideas? I see no hands, I see approval from Olivier agreeing, and Kaili Kan is typing. Is there anything from your side? Alberto has also agreed.

Is there anything from your side among any other business? What is the last agenda item of this call. Yes, I see Olivier's hand raised. Olivier, you have the floor.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I just wanted to point your attention to a recent blog post by Göran Marby, the new ICANN CEO. [Inaudible] was the person in ICANN leading the DPRD department, which is the Department of Public Responsibility that I mentioned a bit earlier.

And that has also created these pages which we have a link to, and which includes all of the links into the Internet Governance Forum, and an enormous amount of background, all in one page. Nora is leaving at the end of June, but the new person has been appointed to pick up the work, and that's Sally Costerton, the Vice-President of Global Stakeholder Engagement.

So I gather that maybe one of the things that you should do, Wolf, as chair of this working group, is to get in touch with Sally and to perhaps have a short discussion with her, letting her know about what this working group is doing.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, thanks for this update Olivier. I think this is a good idea to get in touch with Sally. I don't know whether the upcoming Helsinki meeting would be the right moment. At this stage, we could only inform her that a working group is now in process to be created, etc. but we do not

have so much further and detailed information, that it's a better idea to contact Sally at the later stage, when we are, when we have defined our thoughts and objectives, etc. and if once we are a little bit clearer about our working process and methods, etc. and anything else.

Any further questions, comments from your side for this call? I see no hands raised. Then let me thank all of you who have taken the time to attend this call. Part of you are under incredible time constraints, so I think it's my feeling that it was a good starter to come together and to make some first outlines, etc. and as I said, it will be a collaborative process, and I hope that you will come up with a lot more ideas via our working tools, etc.

And I hope that I see many of you in about two weeks in Helsinki. And at our next call around the middle of July. Thanks to all of you, thanks to staff for making this first call possible, for sending the Doodles, etc. for all of their support, and I wish all of you an excellent day, night, or whatever. Thanks and goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]