At-Large Workspace: Invitation to Provide Feedback on the ICANN Board's Proposed Public Interest Framework

Public Comment Close	Statement Name	Status	Assignee (s)	Call for Comments Open	Call for Comments Close	Vote Open	Vote Close	Date of Submission	Staff Contact and Email	Statement Number
18 October 2019	Invitation to Provide Feedback on the ICANN Board's Proposed Public Interest Framework	SUBMITTED	Hadia Elminiawi	16 October 2019	18 October 2019			18 October 2019	GPI Toolkit <gpitoolkit@icann.org>	**AL-ALAC-ST-1019-02-00-EN**

Hide the information below, please click here >>

See: GPI Toolkit

See: At-Large Public Interest Working Group (archived)

FINAL VERSION SUBMITTED (IF RATIFIED)

The final version to be submitted, if the draft is ratified, will be placed here by upon completion of the vote.

AL-ALAC-ST-1019-02-00-EN.pdf

FINAL DRAFT VERSION TO BE VOTED UPON BY THE ALAC

The final draft version to be voted upon by the ALAC will be placed here before the vote is to begin.

The public interest is more of a political concept that usually accompanies other main principles like transparency and accountability. As mentioned in the paper there were many attempts in the past to define the public interest in relation to ICANN's remit that did not succeed. This is understandable because generally speaking it is difficult to pin down exactly what public interest means. Usually we look at the public interest in relation to the common good and common interest. The public interest in relation to ICANN's work should be scope and purpose specific. Therefore, trying to identify the public interest in relation to specific purposes or instances and how these instances link to ICANN's work as defined by its mission and bylaws makes sense. Also, in determining the public interest one should not only look at the outcome, but also at the process and procedures that led to the outcome and the proposed framework, takes into consideration ICANN's multistakeholder community and the policy development process. So, Conceptually speaking the tool developed seems logical, however the problem lies in how we practically apply it or make use of it. In an attempt to actually use the tool, one could argue that two stakeholder groups with opposite opinions on the same subject matter could equally use the tool and each prove that his decision or comment is in the public interest. This is because both opinions could be complying with the mission and bylaws. Using the tool to justify one position over the other could prove in some cases to be not useful. However, after reaching a certain decision, the tool could be used to make sure that the decision or comment is in the public interest.

To conclude the proposed GPI tool could be useful in determining what is not in the public interest and in noting how an already taken decision or comment serves the public interest. However, it will be challenging to use the tool to favor one path over another.

DRAFT SUBMITTED FOR DISCUSSION

The first draft submitted will be placed here before the call for comments begins. The Draft should be preceded by the name of the person submitting the draft and the date/time. If, during the discussion, the draft is revised, the older version(S) should be left in place and the new version along with a header line identifying the drafter and date/time should be placed above the older version(s), separated by a Horizontal Rule (available + Insert More Content control).

The public interest is more of a political concept that usually accompanies other main principles like transparency and accountability. As mentioned in the paper there were many attempts in the past to define the public Interest in relation to ICANN's remit that did not succeed. This is understandable because generally speaking it is difficult to pin down exactly what public interest means. Usually we look at the public interest in relation to the common good and common interest. The public interest in relation to ICANN's work should be scope and purpose specific, therefore trying to identify the public interest in relation to specific purposes or instances and how these instances link to ICANN's work as defined by its mission and bylaws makes sense. So conceptually speaking the tool developed seems logical, however the problem lies in how we practically apply it or make use of it. In an attempt to actually use the tool, one could argue that two stakeholder groups with opposite opinions on the same subject matter could equally use the tool and each prove that his decision or comment is in the public interest. This is because both opinions could be complying with the mission and bylaws. Using the tool to justify one position over the other could prove in some cases to be not useful. However, after reaching a certain decision, the tool could be used to make sure that the decision or comment is in the public interest.

To conclude the proposed GPI tool could be useful in determining what is not in the public interest and in noting how an already taken decision or comment serves the public interest. However, it will be challenging to use the tool to favor one path over another.