YESIM NAZLAR:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Interest Working Group call held on Wednesday, the 21st of September, 2016 at 1800 UTC. On the call today on the English channel, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Alan Greenberg, Satish Babu, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Yrjö Lansipuro, Isaac Maposa, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Harold Arcos, and Kaili Kan. Currently, we don't have anyone on the Spanish channel. We have received apologies from Judith Hellerstein, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Bastiaan Goslings, Garth Bruen, and Wolf Ludwig. On staff we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Yesim Nazlar; and our Spanish interpreters are Renata and David. Finally, I would like to remind everyone to state their names before speaking; not only for the transcript purposes, but also for the interpretation purposes. And over to you, Olivier. Thank you very much.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much, Yesim. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. If I could just ask staff to do exactly what they – they might have not done it – which is to unlock the screen for everyone to be able to scroll through the agenda today. Welcome, everyone, I'm Olivier Crépin-Leblond. I'm replacing Wolf, as he has just informed us that he is not feeling well.
	So the point about formal appointment of co-chairs, which is the first point of our agenda – I'm not quite sure we can go through this at the moment. What I would suggest – first, are there any questions or comments regarding the formal appointment of co-chairs? If there are none, what I would suggest is that we move this to our next call. I'd

rather have the Working Group's chair in place to be able to conduct this. Are there any comments from anyone on this?

I don't see anyone placing any comments or putting their hand up, so – yes, I see Satish saying that we agree to that. So let's defer this agenda item #3 to our next call. And let's go directly to the discussion of the draft At-Large consumer agenda comment that is currently being drafted. As you know, in the last call, the discussion was had as to whether the consumer agenda was part of this Working Group's responsibility, and to some extent it certainly was. So we have Alan Greenberg who is with us at the moment, and who will be able to take us through where we are at the moment regarding this comment, and what kind of input is requested. And I would hope that this Working Group would be the right location for people to make suggestions for this statement.

So, Alan, I guess I can just hand this all over to you, and you can [CROSSTALK].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Olivier. First, a brief update on the processes that have happened until now. Garth presented this as a white paper or something quite some time ago, and the version that you're seeing that is on the Wiki right now that's in the pod – if you scroll down a little bit, you'll see "first draft submitted." And that's a revised version that essentially factors in some of the comments made and cleans it up a little bit, but is largely unchanged.

We did have a webinar on this several weeks ago, and the comments from the webinar have yet to be incorporated, but there were a number. The primary one was on the title. Garth had used the term "consumer" because he thought that, to be honest, it would catch more attention than the word "user," which people in ICANN often tend to ignore. He defined the term "consumer" in the document to be "any person who uses the Internet for any purpose." Nevertheless, that definition in bold notwithstanding, many people who have read this document have focused on not that definition of "consumer," but on the more traditional one, and that is "anyone who uses the web for commerce." I, in fact, interpret it even differently than that. I interpret "consumer" as "anyone who consumes Internet services"; and therefore, it maps pretty much equivalently to "users."

But there seems to be a widespread belief that, if we use the word "consumer," it will be interpreted – no matter what we say – as being either just people who buy domain registrations, registrants, or people who use the Internet for commerce, for buying things on the web. And that was certainly not the intent. So I think there was a general consensus that we have to go back to the word "user" in some form or another. Because redefining "consumer," no matter how clearly you say it, just doesn't seem to get past – people don't seem to get past that. So let's not focus on the word "consumer" versus "user" in this discussion; let's presume that it is changed to something which will not encourage misunderstanding.

So that's part number one. The rest of it – there certainly were a number of comments on individual parts of the document, and whether we should focus on this or that. I think there was a general belief that

this is a good thing going forward, and that we need to push it. If I can remind you, there was a commitment almost two years ago now, that ICANN handle someone who is in charge of consumer safeguards. For a variety of reasons – not all of them good ones – that position was never filled, and it has now fallen to our new CEO to take some action on that. Allen Grogan, who was supposed to be hiring such a person, has announced that he is leaving ICANN in the next couple of months. So the overall mandate of both compliance and consumer responsibility, consumer safeguards, is open at this point. And our new CEO does have a history in this area, so I'm looking forward to seeing just how he plans to address the issue. And I don't think recrimination over what happened over the last two years holds a lot of benefit right now, other than to point out we need some quick action and don't want it delayed for a long time.

I'll make a couple of general comments. I don't really think we have the time, or perhaps I don't have the desire to go over the paper in detail – it's not very long, and people can read it pretty easily. I see the intersection of consumer safeguards – sorry, user safeguards, to be clear – and public interest as not only overlapping, but to be blunt, if – from an ICANN perspective and within the scope of ICANN – if that is not the largest part of the public interest responsibility of At-Large, then I'm not sure what we're here for. We are here to be the guardian of the user and the user interests as ICANN fulfills its mandate of overseeing the Domain Name System, or parts of the Domain Name System. And that, I think, from a user perspective, maps almost completely to consumer safeguards – whether it's confusingly similar domain names, which might end up causing harm to consumers, or any of the other

things that we comment on, I think the overlap is high. That doesn't mean that people who don't view themselves as interested in the public interest may not have a more focused interest on safeguards; but I certainly think there is a large overlap between the two. I don't think I need to elaborate.

I'd like to open the floor at this point. Does everyone agree that, indeed, there is a high overlap and that a large part of ICANN's At-Large public interest has to focus on what ICANN does and how it considers users in making its policy? Which I think overlaps heavily with what we're talking about, here. Is there anyone who feels that it doesn't belong here, or that there's a large discrepancy between the two ideas?

Cheryl agrees. Anyone want to speak? I don't want this to be the Alan Greenberg Show. Go ahead, Kaili.

Can't hear you yet.

Kaili, if you're speaking, we are not hearing you. Is Kaili on the phone bridge, or just on Adobe Connect?

YESIM NAZLAR: Hi Alan, this is Yesim. He's on the phone bridge; I'm trying to [inaudible] operator.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you.

KAILI KAN: Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: Hi, yes, we can hear you now.

KAILI KAN: Okay. Fine. Okay, great. We do not want to be [inaudible]. I would prefer to [inaudible] that is Internet end user. I think that is completely clear about what we mean.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, yes. That is implied, but you're right. We need to make sure that it is well understood.

KAILI KAN: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else? Go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks, Alan. This is Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. You're too fast at giving me the floor. I was fumbling quickly for the unmute button. Just one thing. I totally agree with the process being used here, and the whole consumer agenda, or end user agenda. That's something that is really, really needed in ICANN. I've had some real trouble in understanding some of the programs that ICANN is sponsoring that

appear to be aimed at supporting the industry, when the industry is rich enough to be able to support itself. It's just a concern to me, and certainly when it comes down to the decisions of the ICANN Board, often you will hear, "Yes, we are here for the end users. They are so important." And yet, when it comes down to the decision, it doesn't appear to be putting the money where their mouth is.

So when you're looking at it this way – and start with the Standards for ICANN Work – the Preamble Principle – where every question that is being asked is asked with the angle of, "How will this impact and benefit Internet users?" Because there is the impact on the one hand, of course, where it might impact end users – and impact usually is a negative word, in most cases – but it's the benefit to end users that we're looking for here. And again and again, ICANN gets criticized by non-ICANNers, people who are not in the industry, not in the inside circles, as not being an organization that is there and looks at the benefits, or promotes the benefits to Internet end users and Internet users in general, and is looking more at promoting its own internal processes and its own industry. So I'm fully supportive of what's being said here, and I like the format that is being used here, in that it's a several-pronged format – from the Standards of ICANN Work, to the ICANN compliance, to the messaging and – these are all different ICANN departments, so each one of them has to do something; so I think that just pushing one and not pushing the others simultaneously will achieve absolutely nothing. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. Just to be clear, I strongly believe – as I think everyone knows – that we need a focus on end user interests and Internet end user interests – but ICANN does have other aspects to its mission. It is mandated with ensuring a competitive, healthy domain marketplace, and things like that. Now, whether that maps to doing work on behalf of supporting registries, or growing that part of the industry, is an interesting debate. But not everything is a user issue. But that doesn't mean that we shouldn't be factoring in user issues in all discussions. Yrjö?

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Yes, thank you, Alan. This is Yrjö Lansipuro. This – ICANN's basic documents, articles of incorporation [inaudible] speak about benefits to the Internet community. Internet community [inaudible] Internet community was [inaudible] And I think today, the key thing is really to make it make a [inaudible] the Internet community being recognized as comprising the end users – all 3 billion of them. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Anybody else? I think we're having general agreement, so it's just going to come down to actually re-working the document as something we could present directly to the Board. Aida?

AIDA NOBLIA: This is Aida Noblia speaking. Good afternoon to you all. I think the issue here is, we are in the legal field. So at the world level, there is a lot of legislation on the consumers' rights. But this is more related to

the market field, whether it is "consumer" or "user," but there is some economic benefit there. Usually, Internet end users, when you refer to consumers here, this is usually related to a consumer office, where you can start a claim against someone who is providing a service in exchange for money. And that is why there might be some confusion, in the sense that, for ICANN, the word "consumer" may have a different sense than in the rest of the consumer law at the level of many countries that I, at least, know. So we should not, then, confuse the idea that the rights of Internet users can have an economic benefit. That probably is the possibility of confusion.

Now, this does not mean that there is no difference, or that there are any other economic or other kinds of interests at play. This is the final user, the end user, but it's not the same as a consumer. And that is why it creates a certain need to be more precise, so that end users to do not confuse two different things.

So, here we see an inclusion in the word "consumer" at the societal level. Outside ICANN, we are including here an economic factor that is not included in the Internet end user, and that is the difficulty that I saw in that ICANN. Thank you, and I'm sorry, because this is what we see here. Now, we would need to clarify this so that there is no confusion. And we do know that there are other interests, of course, within ICANN. But just to be clear, I just wanted to establish who is the user for ICANN, and that that is different from what a consumer is outside ICANN. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you, Aida. To be clear, the document says – and I will read it verbatim: "For the purposes of this proposal, a 'consumer' is any person who uses the Internet for any purpose." So it is disengaging the word "consumer" from the traditional use in local laws, or in how it is used in relation to finance and purchasing. But it's quite clear that trying to redefine a common term does not remove all of the confusion. So I believe that the document will have to be rewritten so it does not generate that level of confusion, and makes it clear we're looking at issues related to anyone who uses the Internet for any purpose, from the point of view of ICANN policies and ICANN actions.
	Any other further comments?
	Then I encourage everyone to read the document carefully, and translating in your mind the word "consumer" to "Internet end user," any comments or thoughts you have, please put them on the Wiki, and we will try to make sure that a revised document comes out before Hyderabad, and we'll have an opportunity, I suspect, there to look at it again. Olivier, go ahead.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thanks, Alan. It's Olivier speaking, and since today's call is going to – I have allocated the majority of the call to this topic, I wondered whether you thought it might be worth you digging into any specific paragraph that you might think might be either controversial, or we might not be in agreement with, or that might need to be expanded. I don't know to what extent you've dug into this yet. I've spoken earlier of the fact that I like the multi-pronged approach. I find the Preamble Principle to be

quite well-polished. The restructuring of ICANN compliance is something that's a little difficult for us to understand, as in the actual structure – making compliance reports directly to the Board, separating legal contract education from technical compliance investigation, [inaudible] cross-constituency review committee for a compliance decision – at first, I'd say "cross-constituency" might need to be changed to "cross-community," because constituencies are GNSO constituencies. In general, they're understood to be that. But then, if one is looking at that, I would've thought that perhaps a diagram would have helped into how we wish the current structure is, and what the preferred structure would be. Bearing in mind our new CEO, by very design, is new – so going into the deep end on this one might be a bit difficult.

Next, direct messaging to the consumer. There are several beginners' guides, and we've already asked for them to be updated. I'm not quite sure where the work is on that, and what the topic is on this. I have never seen the guides for attorneys and journalism and law enforcement, so I'd be interested in finding out where these are, and whether these could be available to the public, or are these hidden?

And finally, the whole thing of the consumer guide to ICANN, or end user guide to ICANN, I thought was a collaboration between ICANN staff and At-Large to start with, so I'm not quite sure why this is mentioned as it is. Should I continue, Alan, or [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG:	I can certainly talk about my concerns with the paper. The fact that I strongly support the concept doesn't mean that I don't have concerns with particular wording and particular directions that it's suggesting. So I think that's what we're trying to get out of this – not just on these calls, but in a written form – so that we can come up with a revised version.
	For instance, there's a term of "DNS" under 1, the Standard for ICANN Work, that we should save as a focus on DNS expansion projects. That's not a term I understand. So just at a pure definitional term, we need to make sure that we are using words that are going to be understood by the rest of the community when we put this forward. Otherwise, we're going to end up getting criticism for reasons that are not rational at all.
	The concept of completely outsourcing compliance, I don't believe is legally possible. Because the end product of compliance is work – is enforcing the contracts which ICANN has signed – and it's pretty difficult to outsource that. But certainly, the investigation part could be outsourced, and there may be some merit in that.
	There are all sorts of things in it that I think need work. This was one person's work, and, as is usual, the community as a group is likely to come up with a better, more rounded document than a single person, and that's what this process is about. So certainly, you can go ahead with other things; but ultimately, I think, we need to look at them in writing, and in a form that we can then use to recreate a new version of this document for further comment. Olivier, back to you, though.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much, Alan. Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. So do you wish me to go on, and review the other – ?

ALAN GREENBERG: Nobody else has put their hand up, and you're chairing the meeting, so how much time you want to devote to it – I can keep on talking, or I'm happy to have you talk. But anyone else like to contribute? I think we should give the floor to them if someone else does.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not seeing anyone else, as you said, putting their hand up. I'm basically trying to also jog everyone else's memory and interest into this topic, so that perhaps they might wish to also comment as we somehow read through that. There's a link to the comment on the page, so you can have a look at what's there for the time being. And I was basically going to try and generate if anybody else has a view on any of these points. That's a sort of first step forward for our own colleagues to be drafting some responses so that – I do have the concern that there doesn't appear to be so many responses and comments so far. There's one from Thomas, there's one from Holly, from Sebastien Bachollet, but these were the first draft and the pre-work; not the current one, but the [inaudible], I think.

ALAN GREENBERG: My comments are on the last version, but I think all the other ones pre-date it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The process on the – I don't know whether you could explain this – the due process for domain disputes.   Because the statement here mentions just two methods for disputing a domain name, and I'm not quite sure what that entices, disputing a domain name. I'm aware of the limitation of ICANN not dealing with content, and I'm not quite sure whether that's – disputing a domain name seems to want to go further than this. Obviously, a domain name with an inaccurate WHOIS record is obviously a problem. A domain name with a trademark infringement itself, is a problem, and these two are covered. But the various issues which consumers or end users might have with domain names – what are they? And if they are to do with content, are they something that the ALAC should mandate and say, "Well, we want to be able to dispute the content of a domain name, an illegal pharmacy, or a site that sells counterfeited goods, or something."   I'm not sure, really.   The comments might just be thrown in our face and say, "You don't know what you're talking about." Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, the intersection of ICANN and content is a complicated issue. For instance, there are aspects of the UDRP and URS which do consider content. So a website that uses a trademark in its domain name is perfectly legitimate if it's being used, for instance, as a place for comment about the organization. So if we want an icann.net, and it's critiques about ICANN, where ICANN is messing up – or, for that matter, where ICANN is doing a good job – that's legitimate. On the other hand, if icann.net masquerades – ignoring the fact that ICANN is a protected term, but in the general case of some other trademark – if icann.net is masquerading as ICANN and trying to convince people that they are the

real ICANN, then that's an issue. So those processes do consider content.

Similarly, there are provisions within the RAA that have to do with illegal actions, and what a registrar has the right to take down a domain name for, or whatever. And in fact, most registration agreements include provisions that factor in content. So although ICANN doesn't have a responsibility for considering content, many registrars say, "If you are using your website for illegal purposes, or putting child pornography on," which is as content as it can get, they can take you down. So there are all sorts of intersections of where content gets involved in the ICANN processes, or in things that ICANN's contracts sanction. But that doesn't mean ICANN is acting as the censor or the deciding body, as to whether it's legitimate or not. So it's a confusing area, and it's not likely to get easier. But we can't pretend that there are no aspects of content that do not come into ICANN's purview – either in what ICANN requires, or what ICANN allows you to do as a contract authority. It's a messy area. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. It's Olivier speaking. So what I would suggest, then, for this paragraph, is to then list the various issues consumers might have with domain names. Because this paragraph says these two situations do not represent the various issues consumers might have with domain names. And really, what I had in my mind when reading this was, "Well, what are they? What are they, then?"

ALAN GREENBERG: Can I suggest as a model for what other people do – I took this statement, put it into a Word document, and then added comments. And I'd be happy to make the blank Word document available for people who want to do that, or simply take my version with comments and add yours to it. That makes it a lot easier to have a focal point of exactly what it is you're critiquing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this. It's Olivier speaking. So then, in five impact reviews of Internet use, [inaudible] is regularly provided with statistics on domain registration, but little data on the actual use of the DNS. And I thought that this is now slowly coming along with the consumer index discussion, and the consumer index side of things. This paper pre-dates the publication of the original consumer index, so that's why I'm not sure whether there's a date for this year, or whether we want to relate this to the consumer index. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, again, this is a confusing area. Certainly, yes, things have happened since this paper was first written. Number two, there's a lot of stuff that's published by other people. So the Anti-Phishing Working Group publishes documents. There are a number of other documents published regarding spam and things like that, that put some of this information at the availability of many of us. It's not clear to what extent ICANN should be doing taking responsibility itself. Not saying that it shouldn't; but I think it's one of the things that needs to be discussed. And on top of that, there are other things that I'm not sure

there are any mechanized ways of even doing. I don't think anyone surveys all domains to see how many of them are parked, for instance. I'm not even sure one can readily recognize a parked domain, as opposed to a domain which simply redirects to some other site, or something like that. Maybe the tools are more sophisticated than I'm aware of. So certainly, we need this kind of information. It's an interesting question whether ICANN should be doing it, or somebody else. Or maybe just ICANN should be consolidating and pointing to it. Certainly, I think we need the information to make an intelligent policy, going forward.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Alan. Are there any other comments or questions?

I don't see anyone else putting their hand up, so I guess that just serves notice for everyone to please type your input directly into this document, or send it as a Word response. If you want a copy of that, ask Alan to send you a copy of it, and then you can send back to this process. Is it Garth who is holding the pen on this, or [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: That remains to be seen. Garth is the original document. He hasn't been particularly active since then, so I'm not sure if it's turned over to a wider group, or still his, or not. It's a good question I don't have the answer to.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you're next in the queue.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Olivier. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the transcript record. I'd like to suggest, Alan, that [inaudible] of putting in here detailed analysis in the Word document format. And [inaudible] in even a shared Google Doc, or something similar, so that we can add our comments and opportunities for edits to this. It does need to be a next-generation exercise. I think it should be [inaudible] by this committee as a whole, because there are a few things and [inaudible] Alan and Olivier, who have done an excellent job of articulating some of the "Whoopsie, what does that mean?" and "Mmm, not sure about that" reactions I have, particularly on page 2, to some of the documentation here.

So it's always easier, I think, to get people to respond to a [inaudible]. I'm going to suggest that's the way we go forward. But I've been chatting to Isaac as well, and he's wondering about how we can perhaps look at taking the role for At-Large into a somewhat strengthened one [inaudible] interpreting his questions to mean [inaudible] correctly. He was wondering about provision of a channel for each 'net user's voice. And that's one that certainly since way back when when I started to be engaged with the At-Large community, that was something that could very much be considered part of our reason for being. So we now need to not only add some of the graphical representation – and I still want to keep the document lean; I think typing up many more words is not a good idea. A few pretty pictures or graphics is [inaudible] that might be useful, and perhaps looking at some opportunities [inaudible] from the what we can do from an At-Large community point of view, as well as

an ALAC point of view, to assist in getting a better model out on the other end of the proposed project. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. A couple of things. I realized, as Cheryl took the mic, that I had posted a PDF, not the Word document. So I will post the same thing in a Word document, both with my comments and without, if someone wants to work on a clean version. I'm not much of a Google Docs person, but if anyone else wants to transform it there, feel free; it's not a particularly hard thing to do.

In terms of – I don't think we want to unilaterally say this group – the Public Interest Working Group – is taking over the project. It was started in another forum and I think we have to be considerate of that. But certainly, the people in this group should be active contributors of it, I would think, at least until we come up with some better way of channeling this. And I'll point out, this is the start of a discussion. It's not going to be the architecture of something new within ICANN, but it's the start of the discussion. So it doesn't have to cover everything in extreme detail. It should, to the extent possible, not be confusing. But I don't think it has to be refined to the nth degree before we go forward with it and present it to the Board and, implicitly, to the rest of the community. So I'll certainly do my part, and I'll be talking to Garth and try to see how we move forward with it in the more general sense.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. So I think that as next steps, if I understand correctly, this document, your work would have to have a copy of this document in a DOC file, and perhaps we could have that put on a Google Doc page, and this can be publicized on our mailing list – on the Public Interest Working Group mailing list, and I guess – I'm not saying that this Working Group should take ownership of this issue, but I'm just saying that for the purpose that this is a meeting of the Public Interest Working Group, and we have people on the call that are following this, they might certainly have seen some interest in having this done so we can have at least a number of people working on this to fill in missing parts of the Google Doc. It should be in "suggest" mode so that people can make suggestions and comments directly in different parts of the paper.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. You'll see some action on that. Several of the people on this call were also on the webinar, so we have a fair amount of overlap. But certainly, to anyone who is new to this, take a look at it, and once it's a ready form to make comments, let's do it. Let's go ahead and do it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Well, thanks very much, Alan.

So the next thing is the review of the Public Interest High-Interest Topic Proposal. As you know, there has been – oh, you might not know, actually. So there are a number of sessions that will be used for high-

interest topics in Hyderabad, and there has been a call for all SO/AC, SGC, and RALO leaders to look at the different high-interest topics that were proposed by various communities and give them a mark of support or non-support. And I gather that the process will then choose the ones which has received the most support, and will effectively choose them as high-interest topics.

I'm not sure at this stage where we are, or whether we've had feedback on whether the Public Interest Group has had some positive response as a high-interest topic. I know that SO/AC, SGC, and RALO Chairs have asked for a reprieve of a couple more days before positioning their – I gather it's a vote, or their points of view – so we'll probably know in a couple of days' time. But I was going to say, as someone who's actually running another group, that there should always be a B plan, and in the case that the public interest discussion was not chosen as a high-interest topic, then we should ask for a public session or a room, and so on in a session to be able to conduct a discussion on the public interest. But I have no feedback on this, and I have noticed that Heidi has put her hand up. I think she was before Alan, and then I'll give the floor to Alan afterwards. Heidi Ullrich.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, thank you, Olivier. Hi, everyone. I do note that Ergys is on the call, so I'm not sure if he wishes to say a few words about this. I'm going to give him just a moment to respond.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Hi, everyone. This is Ergys. Can you hear me?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thank you very much, Ergys.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Thank you, Heidi. Just directly answering Olivier's question – I have not heard any particular feedback as to whether or not this will be approved as one of the high-interest topic sessions. I was expecting to hear yesterday, but the last I heard, they were still working on it. So I am hoping in the next 24-48 hours to have some sort of clarity on our next step.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks so much, Ergys. It's Olivier. And as I said, having a foot on different sides of the barrier at the moment, I see on the one side – certainly my community, being the Co-Chair of the Cross-Committee Working Group on Internet Governance – we are one of the sessions there, so we have submitted it as a high-interest session, and then the SO/AC, SGC, and RALO Chairs have asked for some more time, and I think that the deadline now is the 23rd. So it's in two days, by the end of the week.

The concern, of course, is that the deadline of the 23rd is also the deadline for submitting any type of workshop or room booking using the current system. So that's why I was going to suggest a B plan, as well. I've already suggested the B plan for the Cross-Committee Working Group on Internet Governance and we're working on that, and I was going to suggest that this group, as well, here – the Working

Group on Public Interest – would consider having a B plan, as well. Alan Greenberg, you have your hand up. You also are well aware of the procedures.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. I wish I knew what the A plan was; never mind the B plan. You said the AC/SO Chairs and RALO Chairs, whatever – have been asked for their opinions on which sessions we should give. In fact, that's not what was asked. What was asked is our opinion on whether the sessions meet the criteria that were stated – the criteria that it should have a large audience, that it should be within ICANN's remit, that it should have user audience participation. They did not ask us which ones we thought should be put on. So I don't know what the plan was for how to pick which of the ones to put on. They seem to have picked the gTLD ones that will go on and parallel with the high-interest topics. There will be multiple high-interest topics going on at the same time. One of the Chairs on that list asked a question today of – or not asked a question; made a statement, saying – "I'm not sure why this has to be made as complicated as it possibly could be." And there is some validity to the question.

So at this point, we are being asked not which sessions do we want, but which sessions meet the criteria. And I'm not quite sure what the process is then for picking the ones that are most interested. That question hasn't been asked. So it's a little bit fuzzy how this is going forward; and yes, with the extension we now have an overlap of when we find out what sessions are going on, and then the ability to submit new sessions after that, if they're not picked as high-interest topics. I'm

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. This is Olivier speaking. Permit me to also add my perplexity as to the process, because if it's just a case of saying, "Which ones meet the criteria?" I'm really surprised that several SO Chairs have said, "We need more time to make this determination." There are nine topics – it's pretty straight – is it nine, or a few more – ?

ALAN GREENBERG: Fifteen.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fifteen, was it? It's like a ten-minute job to look at this thing and say, does it meet the criteria?

ALAN GREENBERG: I would have thought that –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not even sure what –

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I would have thought staff could've done that part, but –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, it's a bit of an interesting one. Anyway, I see Tijani Ben Jemaa on the [inaudible] and the queue. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Olivier. Tijani speaking. I do agree with Alan that it was required to pick the subjects that meet the criteria, but I think that if they want to see that, they are able to do it, themselves. If you are asked to do that, the best product is to pick the topic that [inaudible] interesting [inaudible]. It is in our interest to select subjects that are our subjects, [inaudible]. Our choice. And I understand that – he is absolutely right; Alan is absolutely right – but for me, for my person, I choose the topics that I find interesting for end users, more than a topic that meets the criteria. Because we think the criteria is something that everyone can do. They don't need to go to the community and ask which topics you are choosing. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Tijani. It's Olivier speaking. So it looks as though there is certainly interest in there. The topic was actually filed by Global Stakeholder Engagement, so we'll just wait a couple more days to get the feedback on this. I can certainly see that there are quite a few people who have supported this topic. We did have such a topic at the Marrakesh meeting, and the action item then was to continue the discussion across ICANN, so I could imagine that this is going to be one of the selected ones.

But, anyway, so that's where we are now, and I guess that if we do have – if it does get selected, then the next task will be to define the agenda of this high-interest topic session. And in any case, we do have to have the agenda, because I would say that even if it doesn't get selected, we would still ask for a room and have this being discussed in public. There are quantities of rooms, and meeting sizes, and so on in the conference center, so it would just be at another slot during the week. This is an extended item.

So that's the facts. Now, when it comes down to the actual agenda of the session, I'm not sure if this has been worked out. I'm not Wolf, but I do open the floor, if anybody has any suggestions. I do notice that Ergys Ramaj has had his hand up, so I guess you have the floor.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Thank you, Olivier. Just a couple of quick points on the agenda. So, I obviously worked very closely with Wolf on putting the document together, which currently includes four components, and this is the proposal that we submitted.

The first one is to better understand the global public interest, and basically that includes the historical and political nuances in various contexts and regions. And the idea for this particular one is to have a few perspectives and shed some light on both how it is approached, understood, and applied.

The second component for the session is to try to reach a shared understanding of what the concept of public interest means in the context of ICANN.

The third one, which is related to the previous one, is to explore how public interest could – and whether it should – be operational as a basis for decision-making at ICANN.

And the last component is to determine concrete next steps. So, this is what the proposal included. These are the four components.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Ergys. It's Olivier speaking. Thanks for letting us know on that. Is there anything that we need to expand on at this stage? As in, has there been any thought given as to who would be invited to speak, and how this would have a cross-community component to it?

ERGYS RAMAJ: Yeah, so the idea was to have a panel comprised of a broad base of community members representing the different structures. And one part of the community that we really want to be involved in this – and I think this came up on the first call of this Working Group – was to have the GAC represented. Obviously, a lot of it will depend on the schedule, and hopefully, we will identify a time that does not clash with the GAC; but again, a lot of it will depend on the schedule and other requests that come in.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Ergys. Are there any comments or questions on this topic? Tijani Ben Jemaa, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Olivier. Tijani speaking. You are right to ask this question, honestly, because in Helsinki, we saw that the panelists are almost always the same, or the selection. We don't know how the selection was done. So this time, we need to intervene, also – to give our opinions about the way to select the panel. We need to [inaudible] the SO/ACs and all the community [inaudible], because this is what is [inaudible] model – what is those hot-topics should be organized so that everyone can express himself, and of course, someone on the panel, or on the table, will have more opportunity to express his or her point of view. So I think that this time, we need to tell them – tell the ICANN staff and ICANN deciders – that we need to be represented; At-Large Group to be represented on those panels. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Tijani. Well, let's do the first steps first – find out if it's there, and then let's have it as an action item for next week, then, once we've got the answer as to make it an express work to build the panel. And Ergys, I gather since it's your department that has filed this, would this Working Group work with you, then, on this to build the panel? Or how would it work?

ERGYS RAMAJ: The way – well, my liaison to this group to date has been Wolf. So I assume that he will continue, perhaps, with a few additional people, or whoever else would like to participate. Absolutely. There are no

restrictions when it comes to that. We want this to be a community-driven session.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. The question that I had, I guess, is whether – are you on the mailing list of this Working Group here?

ERGYS RAMAJ: I believe I am.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Yes, he is.

ERGYS RAMAJ: I don't know if Heidi can confirm, but I believe I am.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks, Ergys. It's Olivier speaking. I've heard Heidi in a very distant voice away, either that or she's speaking over my shoulder, but I can hear a little voice saying, "Yes, he is."

Okay. It's the top of the hour. We're into now next steps. I think we've touched on those. Is there any other business, or any other topics or comments on what we have discussed today?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up. We have two action items: staff to place the current version of the Google Doc on the working space for review, and the Public Interest Working Group to work on the details of the Public Interest Panel at ICANN 57 once confirmation is made.

Thank you very much, everyone. This has been an interesting call, and we've moved a little bit forward. I hope that Wolf will be able to recover soon, and we'll be able to hear from him shortly. And with this, we're only one minute late. I'd like to thank our interpreters for the call, and to adjourn the call.

Thanks, everyone, and speak to you soon. And keep on being involved with the Working Group on the mailing list. Good morning, good afternoon, and good night.

YESIM NAZLAR: This meeting is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]