MICHELLE DESMYTE:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Joint Operations, Finance and Budget Working Group FBSC Call on Thursday, the 27th of October, 2022. On today's call on the English channel, we do have Holly Raiche, Aris Ignacio, Bill Jouris, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Dave Kissoondoyal, Denise Hochbaum, Hadia Elminiawi, Jonathan Zuck, Laura Margolis, Marita Moll, Raymond Mamattah, Ricardo Holmquist, Sébastien Bachollet, and Judith Hellerstein. We do not have anyone on the Spanish channel. We have received apologies from Satish Babu and Vanda Scartezini today.
	From staff, we currently have Heidi Ullrich, Chantelle Doerkes, Silvia Vivanco, and myself, Michelle DeSmyter on Call Management. Our Spanish interpreters today are Paul and Claudia. A friendly reminder to please state your name before speaking and to please speak slowly and clearly for our interpreters. With this, I'll turn the meeting back over to Holly Raiche. Please begin, Holly.
HOLLY RAICHE:	Thank you, Michelle. The overview of the meeting. Today, we're going to look at a couple of items under the open for public comment. There's one we haven't discussed before, which is the CSC Effectiveness Review, and the other is a short presentation from Ricardo, looking at the Draft IANA and PTI operating budgets. We're going to, because the ABRs have opened up, we will have a discussion from Heidi on ABRs, the rules around ABRs, so how to actually make an effective application for ABRs. And we're actually going to have a little chat with Jonathan actually looking at the role of FBSC and the interaction with us.

So with that, actually, let's get started if we could, and if you can scroll back down just for the agenda. Thank you very much. In terms of now the open public comments, we have talked about the holistic review, I think, at least on a couple of occasions. Its terms of reference have been available on our own site, and the deadline has been extended to 10 November. So anyone who has not had a look at the holistic review, please do so. And if you feel there are comments to be made, please add them.

We have not put not for profit operational concerns constituencies up. We also have not decided to comment on the GNSO operating procedures, but that deadline has been extended. Now, the two things that we are looking at and will comment on, the comments that Ricardo has done, and that's been up for a while. He's going to talk briefly on that. Then I will talk on the—we have not talked before on the CSC effectiveness review, so we'll actually discuss that. So, Ricardo, do you want to actually talk briefly, walk us through the draft IANA and PTI operating plan and budgets? Thank you very much. Over to you, Ricardo.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you, Holly. This is Ricardo Holmquist. I don't know if we can have our actual comments. Can we have them in the screen? If not, we just mention three things. The first one, this is the PTI and IANA operational plan and budgets about the IANA. It seems to be the same one since three years ago. And we're just mentioning that we think there is no inflation related to this budget. The other comments we made were to the PTI Operational Plan and Budget.

Basically, that PTI is saying that they might need people, they might need extra people, but they are not budgeting these people. And it seems that this additional work is going to be handled by professional services. So we are first telling them that please include the people they need in the budget because this is a budget to do this kind of thing. And the second one is our concern as ALAC that that a critical service like the PTI and IANA is to be done by people directly related to ICANN and not professional services. And that's basically what we mentioned in our comments. If anybody has a question, I can answer.

HOLLY RAICHE: So thank you, Ricardo. And thank you for the highlights. They are on the ALAC policy page where, in fact, you can read Ricardo's comments in full. And as I said, the deadline has been extended for those comments until 17 November. So if you haven't had a look, please do so. Can we now have my slides on the CSC Effective Review?

Okay. The CSC is Customer Standing Committee, and it's gone through the second review. A review is required every couple of years. This is the second one. Could we go to the first? Next slide, please. Okay. The CSC for people who don't know or don't remember, back in 2016 when the IANA functions went from the US NTIA to ICANN, one of the things that happened was the need to have oversight within ICANN of IANA. And the CSC was established to oversight the naming function.

It's got two things that it does. It actually looks at the performance of IANA, and it monitors PTI's SLAs of the naming function. It meets every month. We look at the reports that are provided by PTI, and we actually

suggest if there's any remedial action that needs to happen. In my over two years and looking at being a member of the committee, we haven't had to have—the SLAs have been, I think, almost entirely 100 percent.

When we refer to members of the CSC, members are appointed, and they are people with direct experience of the naming function. And so there are four actual members of the CSC: two from the registry, two from ccNSO, and then there are liaisons from the other SOACs, including the GAC, the RSSAC, ALAC—I'm the representative—the GNSO, and the GNSO non-registry members—and there's a person from PTI as well. So that's a bit of the background for those not familiar with the CSC. Next slide, please.

Okay. The effectiveness review was undertaken in August, actually end of July, beginning of August. The effectiveness review was released on 14 September. This is the first time we've had the talk about it, but we have a comment period until the 1st of December. So this is in plenty of time. This is the link to the actual effectiveness report. It's a fairly—I won't say—well, it's lengthy, it's several pages. It includes discussions about the things that they recommend, but it also has charts as to all of the findings of both the first and second reviews if you're interested. Next page. Next slide, please.

Okay. Going through the recommendations, there are six of them, and these are my suggested comments. One of the first issues raised by the review was that the chair and vice chair be members. And remember, members, are either the representatives from registry or the ccNSO, rather than liaisons.

Now, currently, because for the last year or so, there wasn't someone from the registries available. We've had somebody from RSSAC. So the recommendation was to continue to say that the chair or vice chair be the members. My suggested response is, you retain the existing requirements; however, because the past chair was a liaison, but someone with a great deal of knowledge and experience with the CSC's role that we would support the retention of the requirement, but add that if no CSC member is available to be chair, that it's filled by someone with direct knowledge and role and processes of the CSC. And that can be somebody like RSSAC who actually is involved in some of the naming functions.

Okay. The second recommendations. The CSC meets every month. And let's just say it's only a half an hour meeting. We look at the report, we note that the SLAs have been met, most of them, all of them, 100% performance. So it's a fairly short meeting. And one of the concerns was that, in fact, should we meet that often for such a brief meeting. My suggested response, again, that we retain the existing arrangements. If there is a decision not to hold a meeting—and that's happened on a couple of occasions, particularly for the North American continent holiday period—that we meet at least bi-monthly. And that we get reports every month on the SLA performance report that we continue to get that monthly. And if there are any concerns from either a member or a liaison with a report, that we have the ability to call for a meeting to discuss a report where there's one or two indicators that, in fact, have not been met 100%. Next slide, please.

The concern that was expressed in the review was they don't name names, but poor attendance, and they do say liaisons. Now, I have to

say straight away, that does not refer to me. It refers to the fact that the GNSO has got a representative who doesn't think that the CSC is terribly important and doesn't show. That is a matter of concern. The recommendation was that there be consultations by the CSC in how to attract new—and they're calling it adequate volunteers, so somebody that actually shows up at the meetings. We would be happy to participate in any consultation on the matter.

The next recommendation. Another issue that was raised by the effectiveness review was, well, if there are so few—if the attendance is down and it's down, not only with the liaisons, but with members occasionally—should the CSC have a broader role than simply looking at the naming function? Now there was some discussion as to whether that focus is too narrow or not. I did not write up all of my concerns, but my concerns would be, if you're talking about more than naming function, there's a lot involved in the numbering functions and in the protocols that if you're looking for expertise, it would be a much larger area. It would be more interesting, but it would actually be probably challenging to find the people with all of the necessary expertise.

So my draft response is a shorter one. We support the continued narrow focus of the CSC on the naming function. However, the recommendation—and it's not an official recommendation, it was in the introduction to the report, but it was that at least annually, the CSC meets with the organizations that are responsible for the numbering function and the protocol parameters. That'd be the RIRs and the IETF at least annually, because those are the three bodies that between them have oversight of all of the PTI IANA functions. Marita, you've got your hand up. Go ahead, please.

MARITA MOLL: Thanks. Thanks, Holly. Marita speaking. I just had a question about—back to the slide with the business about the chair. That was the first; that was the first one. So I was just wondering: does this committee ever vote? Like it was only four people, members. Are the three people voting or four people voting? Or is there never a vote?

HOLLY RAICHE: Oh, there are votes. There are votes to approve. There have to be votes. And if all four members are not there, then, in fact, a vote cannot be taken. And so that's part of the concern of attracting new members, is we need to have four members who show up. Now, I have to say when we rotate times—and so it's a really great time for me—those people who live in North America are very loath to attend at times that are less convenient for them. And I am remarkably unsympathetic.

MARITA MOLL: Yes, I don't blame you. So the question is what happens if there's a tie? Who is the breaking vote?

HOLLY RAICHE: There isn't one. There isn't one. Everybody has to agree. Now, and it would be very rare that there would be any disagreement because it's really, it's about approving the SLA report, and you have to accept it or recommendations that relate to it. And there'd rarely be a situation that would be controversial, really.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. That is just—I was just curious.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, that's fine.

MARITA MOLL: I find it kind of weird with only four people that you would not want to have someone else as a chair. So at least you'd have your four people available to not chair, right?

HOLLY RAICHE: Most of the time, most of the time, four people are there. But a later recommendation will be that there should be the appointment of an alternate to address the times when they're not there. And my suggestion would be that the alternate live in another time zone, frankly, just for the times when the poor [inaudible] have to get up at a ridiculous hour.

MARITA MOLL: That's a good suggestion. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Now, Siva, you have a hand up?

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHASAMY: I'm quite surprised that the CSC has only looked at the numbering function. There's a lot of work, quite a lot of work to be done on numbers and protocols is also an area of concern. And so I think along the lines of your thinking, it's important that CSC expands to include numbering and numbers and protocols. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'll take that on board. I think my concern is that numbering is a fairly large area. You're quite right to say if numbering will be fairly large. If you expand the CSC to include numbering, you are including another whole set of people with expertise in the numbering function and all that goes with that. You would also be expanding, again, asking for the protocol parameters, which is, again, a very large area. So if you are asking that the chair have direct experience, I'm not sure you could find a chair with direct experience in all three areas.

It's a big area. I mean, this is why I think I support the fact that the three groups meet at least annually and talk amongst themselves. But the feeling was that you are asking for—because I know naming does not look like a big function, but if you look at the pages of SLAs and what has to be measured every month, it is a big area. And then you add to that all of the numbering functions and the protocol parameters, you suddenly have to have a fairly large group with a lot of expertise. And I think the concern would be, number one, you wouldn't have—it wouldn't be an hour meeting, it would be three hours, and it would be people who would be—some of whom would have expertise areas, and some would have different expertise areas.

So I appreciate your comment. What I'm thinking is that the way through is to say that the three groups should meet annually and at least understand the complexities of the other groups. But if you just look at the SLAs, there are pages of SLAs that we look at just for the naming function. So each area is complex. But thank you for your comment. Next slide, please.

And this would be the final slide. We made this—actually, we met with the PTI management chair last year, and with the PTI board present, and at that stage, I think it was Xavier himself who was a bit surprised that, in fact, the SLAs had not been reviewed. And we agreed amongst ourselves that, in fact, there should be regular reviews of the SLAs to accommodate the fact that over time, clearly new technologies are developed, new processes are developed and the SLAs have not been reviewed probably for about three years. We think that it's important that they are reviewed. And so we very strongly support that the process be put in place so that they're regularly reviewed.

And the final recommendation that—I think this is the final recommendation—to address the fact that the members or liaisons can be absent, that there be an alternate, so that we do not have any more meetings where, in fact, all of the members are not present, and therefore the vote that's necessary to pass the SLAs can't be taken. So that would be that each SO/AC would nominate and alternate. And my suggestion is that they be from a different continent so that when we do rotate for the times of the meetings that the alternate can attend if it's inconvenient for the either member or liaison. Now that is the final slide. Are there any questions? Siva, you've got a question? Another one? Or is that an old hand?

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHASAMY: It's an old hand. Sorry.

HOLLY RAICHE: Cheryl, go ahead, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Holly. I just, as I put in chat—but you were presenting, you may not have seen it—I think all of your proposed responses here make perfect sense. I would, and certainly, I'm happy to support them and I think they should go ahead. It's only a short comment, but I think it's an important set of comments that we could be drafting for potential ratification by the ALAC as a statement.

But I did also want to draw your attention while I've got the microphone to what was also going on in chat, and at least on the performance aspects, I think we can probably use the tools GNSO has developed as examples. There are a whole lot of requirements and expectations that members of things now, PDP working groups, etc., have to agree to. And that includes certain performance aspects.

There's also the precedence of the alternate. So I think if we cross-reference with some of these responses with what is now current practice for the GNSO, that will also give some power to it and certainly reduce the potential for arguments. Thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE:	Thank you, Cheryl. And maybe I'll look at the chat later, but if there is an easy way to find–
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	When you put this up as a draft, ping me and I'll put the references in comments so you can insert them.
HOLLY RAICHE:	Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you. And could we go back to the agenda again, please? If there are no further questions? Excellent. Now the next—actually, if we can have the agenda page. Thank you. Okay. Heidi.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Hi. Before Heidi, sorry. Again, it was in chat, so you won't have seen it. I wanted to reopen—after you finished your presentation—the full agenda item, which was looking at the comments that are open for public comments at the moment. And we had previously, under my recommendations, in fact, decided not to make a comment on one of the GNSO ones. Can I just speak to that very, very briefly?
	I've had an interaction recently with our current and she's dug in and understands exactly what's going on, so I'm absolutely happy to take her advice on board, and I promised I would bring Justine's words to this meeting for our consideration. Justine has requested—and I'll just put it in chat—a very short, very simple statement, which she hopes—and I agree with—if we can get that embedded into the new procedures in this updating that's going on, that it will help tie into a GNSO document,

a point of clarity on the difference between ALAC, the 15 persons, and At-Large.

So that text that I've put into chat, I would like to propose now that we consider putting that into its normal format – Chantelle can do that magic—and have the ALAC look at that. It's been extended so we've got a little bit of time, but it's just a very simple tidying up of terminology that could be useful to us. I'm proposing that. I hope it gets support. Thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE: Look, that sounds like an excellent plan. Thank you, Cheryl. So we can— this deals with the section on comments for review and we've addressed them all. So thank you, Ricardo. Thank you, Cheryl. Thank you all for your comments, and I will have a look at the chat now that I am not presenting. Heidi, you've got 15 minutes. The ABRs have just—well, not just, but they've opened, they can get going for a little while. It's a part of the budget that is actually one of great interest to the At-Large community.

And what we need to do understand is about the ABRs, about the rules around their use. And I don't know if Jonathan at the end wants to add a little bit about his successful application using an ABR for some work on public opinion in relation to IDNs or UA, but that's later. Over to you, Heidi, if you'd like to talk about the ABRs.

EN

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Yes. Thank you very much, Holly. And I'll try to be brief and not the whole 15 minutes because I know that you'd like to speak. And there is, immediately following this item, there will be a discussion with you and Jonathan about the interaction between the two groups. So Michelle, if we could just go back, not quite ready for this page yet, we can go back. Thank you so much. So I wanted to first welcome everyone. This is a joint meeting of the Operations, Finance and Budget working group, and the brand-new 2023 Finance and Budget Subcommittee. So welcome to all the new members there. This is going to be the first discussion on the ABRs and the FBSC. There'll be a lot more of those.

I wanted to first just briefly introduce what additional budget requests or ABRs are. This is part of the annual ICANN operating plan and budget planning cycle. So this happens every year. Many of us, many of you in the community have been working—have submitted ABR proposals or have been on the FBSC, but for those who are new I just wanted to clarify what these are but also what they are not. So as it states on the agenda, these are not, these additional budget requests are not meant to be part to cover items that are already in the ICANN budget. So these are basically special activities, something that you'd like to pilot. But, again, not part of all of the resources that the community is already provided by ICANN. So I wanted to clarify that.

So let's now go, Michelle, to that Fiscal Year '24 workspace. And this is really the key workspace. Sorry, not this one. Is it the one I gave you? I'm sorry. I wanted to give you the one—yeah, that one right there. Thank you. So this is really the place that At-Large uses for the development of their additional budget requests. And it has all of the information from ICANN that you need to know, but also, very

importantly, all the information for the additional steps that At-Large has. And this includes a criteria that we'll go over in just a moment. But also all the extra steps that At-Large takes, and the FBSC in particular takes to make sure that what they're submitting reflects what the At-Large and the ALAC would like to see in terms of activities.

So let's go through. This is the At-Large Workspace. And, first, we'll have the ALAC GSE criteria. Pretty much the same, proposals need to make sure that they include At-Large, particularly in the policy advice development area. Outreach should not be a major focus. They're really trying to make it more of an engagement sort of activity. Also, if there's—for outreach, it should likely go to the CROP, which we're hoping to have reopened soon. Or there's also the RALO discretionary funding for the RALOs. And that is now open for [items,] for example, promotional items, etc.

So RALO request, this is new for Fiscal Year '24. RALO requests should be strategic and in line with the region's strategic plans and the RALO strategic outreach plan and At-Large priority activity. And this year, what's new is that it must be endorsed by not only their RALO leadership, but also the RALO-relevant GSE regional vice president prior to being submitted for conservation by the FBSC. And, again, as the RALO partnership program that is now being rolled out in the regions, the RALO leaders have been in contact with their GSE regional vice president. So they can start talking about what possible ABRs they would like to develop.

Again, priority is going to be given to those who are provided draft reports and it should be the Fiscal Year '24 approved language. And

then most of these, for the most part, will be—sorry, this is Fiscal Year '23. And most of those requests will require a final report by the end of Fiscal Year 20—should be '23 there. Apologies for that. Okay. So let's go ahead. This information here. The next section is about information about the ICANN finance, and I have put that page under the resources page a bit here on the agenda. And please do read the principles. All of that, the FBSC in particular, should be reading what that is. It talks a little bit about what they're looking for in terms of the additional budget requests and what they're not looking for. So do take a look at that. It also talks about the issues about travel-related requests. Okay. So now if we can go back to the agenda, please.

Oh, sorry. This is now the process here. The kickoff was on the 17th of October, that ending on the 30th of January. Then today we have this joint call. What we need to—and I've just put these tentative dates in, and that's something that the FBSC will need to agree on these dates. So I've put that tomorrow. We will send this information to either the FBSC representatives or staff will be sending the notice to the RALO about the opening of the additional budget request to the RALO on the 8th of December.

That is, there's going to be a community-wide webinar that will be able to outline some of the principles, as well as answer any questions. Then on the—and I've again put these dates down as a tentative—I would like to see just to give the FBSC more time to look at the requests, more time to have anybody who has submitted requests review them, make any revisions as necessary. So what I'm proposing is that by the 23rd of December that the RALO leadership should review with their GSE teams

relevant [inaudible] requests, looking at all of the [ALSes] coming in from the RALOs, again, by the end of this year.

Then, as we start 2023, they'll have a discussion of the draft proposals by the FBSC the week of the 9th to the 13th, any of those ABRs that might need some revising will be sent back, and there'll be some time for the RALOs or the ALAC to review them, make adjustments. Then from the week of the 16th through the 19th, they'll have a chance for the FBSC to review all of the RALO revised requests. Then what happens is that those that are endorsed by the FBSC need to also go to the ALAC. And that will be on the 24th of January during their January monthly call.

30th of January is the deadline for all ABRs to be submitted. It's important that we, At-Large, will submit them so we can track all of them. Then once that happens, then during ICANN76—I'm not sure why that's 3 there—then if you would like to raise the discussions with the relevant staff during ICANN76. Then as we move into that planning and budget cycle, we have an ICANN Org assessment. By the 24th of April, the ICANN Board and Finance Committee will review and have their recommendation for approval to the board, and then the ICANN board will consider the ABRs within the budget in the late May period. Okay.

Yes, a lot of activities. But again, if we start now, every year, it seems the launch starts earlier. And this is the earliest that this call has ever been held. So we have time now, I hope, for this. So I wanted to come back to the agenda, please, and take a look at what is new in Fiscal Year '24.

One of the nice developments is that there's now an online form to submit your request once approved by the FBSC. And we're going to have Michelle pull that up. Now, there is also a Word version that you can prepare your request just to submit that to the FBSC. So as you're preparing the initial request, please use the Word version. It's pretty much the same. And then once they're approved, then either staff likely will be able to submit the online form once all that information is included. So Michelle, if you could just click through this, you're going to have to put your email quickly in there, but then just put test and you can actually just clear the format at the very end. There we go.

And you just wanted to take a look at some of the new features that are in these forms. Now, the first are—as we click through here—this is all pretty regular. This is all what we've seen in the past. Which community group? Who's your liaison? That's usually myself for this one. If we can, yeah, just—oh, that's ALAC. Just put test for right now, Michelle.

On the next page we'll see some new features here. So as we go through, then you'll see first we have purpose. Please describe the purpose including intended scope, proposed activity, and also this time indicate if it's a single activity or recurring. There's also another one on alignment. Describe how proposed activity directly aligns with the ICANN mission and current strategic plan. And also interestingly, how does it demonstrably relate to ongoing policy advisory or technical work? So that's going to have, I think, a new feature there.

Category. This is also new. You're going to have a dropdown allowing for outreach, research, training, travel support, or other. So we need to click on that. Again, identify which of these activities your requests fall

under. Then there's also the next page, we'll have one on audience. Who is your target audience? And also the relevant demographic data. Then there's also on outcomes. And then also very interesting, this is new.

Next one we have—well, I think we've skipped one because there's also one on metrics. Yeah, sorry, we've had this in the past, what you've seen. Also, total estimated costs in the past, that switched back and forth. Sometimes it would be ICANN Org who would put that in. Sometimes the community. Looks like this year they're asking the community to put a tentative cost in there. Thank you, Michelle. You can see it. It's really a nice form. It goes very quickly.

Okay. So next page, and you'll see that here we have one on metrics. Please describe what metrics will be used to measure the impact of the proposed activity. Also, new this year is sustainability. Please describe how the proposed activity will sustain its impact beyond the specific ABR allocation.

And also new is, "Please rank the priority of this proposed activity if submitting multiple requests." So this is something that I would think that the FBSC is going to need to do is, again, once they see all of the requests coming in, once they go through that process of reviewing them, asking them to be revised, if required then the revised versions come in and then they're going to—the FBSC will likely need to rank those requests before they take it to the FBSC and definitely before they submit here, okay? So thank you very—okay. I think that's it there. Thanks, Michelle. Also, new in this year as I've mentioned earlier is that

requirement for the RALO request to make sure that they are endorsed not only by the RALO, but also the relevant GSE regional vice president.

And then finally on the agenda, I have listed some resources. First, is the ICANN Fiscal Year '24. This is the ICANN version, this is the finance page, which, again, I've pretty much taken most of the information and put it on the At-Large session workspace. But that's just there for your resource there. Also, as I mentioned, there's a community webinar on the 8th of December. And if you have any questions prior to that or even after that, please contact the staff who are organizing or leading this, and that's at abr@icann.org. So if there are any questions, I can answer those. Or, Holly, I think you might wish to say a few words as well.

HOLLY RAICHE: First of all, let me take Cheryl's question and then a couple of minutes, and then we can have a session with Jonathan. Cheryl, go ahead, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Holly. Cheryl, for the record. Just a little bit of feedback on the form which doesn't mean that I'm suggesting a change to the form, but I'm suggesting some advice to give our potential applicants. It's all very nice to say USD on the form, but USD at what exchange rate on what day? So if people are putting their own estimates of costs in, I think we should advise them in our support for them to put in the local costs, so their estimate basis, and an exchange rate on a date so that the USD could be hugely different by the time it gets to be spent versus

when the application goes in. So I just think we need to do something to help that little bit of oopsie if it happens.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent. Thank you very much. I was going to say a couple of things. If you are applying for an ABR, we have a page within ALAC on ABR requests that have been granted in full or part. And before you apply, I think the suggestion would be you read through both the successful applications and the partial applications to understand why, for example, some of the applications were successful and Jonathan may want to talk about the one that he suggested, or what was the reason that it was only partially successful. And sometimes, that has to do with travel or other, but it's a useful page to look at before you actually make any applications.

And the other thing that I looked at and realized that really throws this whole schedule off is the announcement of the grants. ICANN has announced that it's opening up grants for the money from the first round, which is a lot of money. And I was hoping that we could have some kind of briefing from ICANN planning for this session. We couldn't but they're doing lots of rounds in terms of explaining. And we will have a session as soon as possible, but it's another source of money and it's kind of, as I watched this, and, Heidi, your presentation, I'm thinking, "Oh my gosh." And we have to fit the grants program in that's available for the SO/ACs. That is huge. So that's just more fun.

But thank you very much, Heidi. It was a very good presentation, and there's a lot to take in. So my suggestion is, from memory, Heidi, was

the links to these pages on the agenda so that people can go back and look at these pages again.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, Holly, so it is on the agenda. This link is on the agenda. It's also on the ALAC portal, that main ALAC workspace. And, again, we will be sending it out to the RALOs, probably the first RALO leadership. And just to make sure that they have it, and then they can make sure that it gets to their members, their RALOs reps. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Okay. Thank you. And the final item is a discussion with Jonathan and me on how we work together, because if you have just listened to this presentation, there's a lot of roles for the FBSC and the OFB-WG. So, Jonathan, do you want to start off with discussion or shall we just say, well, we'll take this whole line and have a very long chat?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I confess to having been pleasantly protected from this process in previous years. And now I'm the chair of it, and so I'm spinning up in some respects to the work of the FBSC and how it differentiates from the OFB-WG. And so as far as the interaction, I would like to see an evolution towards this being a subcommittee of the OFB-WG, as opposed to this sort of weird orthogonal group that gets created externally. But I'm trying not to change too many things in the first two months of my tenure and have all the staff quit on me before we even get started.

So long term, I think that that relationship will be even tighter. But in the meantime, it still operates under the auspices of the OFB-WG, and I think ideally would behave, as much as possible, like a small team of the OFB and have regular meetings to come up with some conclusions about the applications that go in and then bring them to the OFB for discussion during its regular meetings so that there's a broad understanding of what's been submitted and what changes might need to be made.

I mean, part of my experience with this was just throwing some things against the wall to see what might make it through. And so I can share that experience and my impressions as to what led to something being accepted or not accepted. Because I tried a number of different things that year, and the poll was one of them. And it was interesting because the poll came back as a pilot project. And so that begs the question whether or not we go in for an expanded project under the same offices of an ABR or if we need to take another approach such as the grant, as you mentioned, etc., if we want to do more expansive surveying of individual end users.

And so that's part of what's interesting about the sustainability section of the new form is that it's sort of asking how this can have a lasting impact on the At-Large Community or on the work that we do. And then that's an interesting question, and what that means, because in some ways, a lasting impact might be one in which we ask for money on a regular basis to continue to get more information or continue a particular process, etc.

So, I think this is something we'll have to spend some time figuring out, but I, in my mind, ideally the FBSC would work very much like Cheryl's small team on prioritization, for example, and operate under the auspices of the OFB, and report into a regular basis, hopefully early, so that people have a chance to revisit or change their proposals before the FBSC makes final decisions about what to pass on to the group. So those are my initial thoughts.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Jonathan. I like the idea. I think we are going to have to work closely. There's a lot of work, and I think the thing that is almost scary for me is that we now have to fit in somewhere in this the huge grants program that ICANN has just announced, it's a lot of money. It's all of the money that they collected on the first round. So there's going to be some briefing on that. And we have to fit that in with this schedule. So, I mean, I think maybe we work on a program as to looking at the dates, looking at how this all works together, as well as the new grants program, because there are two separate roles.

There's one which is commenting on budgets. And that's been something that Ricardo does absolutely brilliantly in terms of doing some of the initial work with priorities and stuff with ICANN planning. And then applying for money is almost—it's almost a separate sort of activity, and combining the two is going to be something that I think we have to work through so that we're both commenting on and taking advantage of ICANN money, if that makes sense to you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Yeah. Thanks, Holly. This is sort of getting discussed in parallel here in the chat, and Cheryl raises the question, "Is it automatically the case the FBSC would be involved directly in grant applications?" And I would agree that that's probably not a given. In fact, I mean, given the absence of the legacy requirement to use the FBSC, we might try to handle that in a more straightforward way via a subgroup of the OFB that acts as a coordinating agency within the OFB in terms of grant requests and things. And I think your impulse to coordinate the applications for grants will be a good one.
	But I don't know that we should try to blend these two things together. I think we should probably just forge ahead with the ABRs given the timeframe and just handle the grant program separately. And the grant program may end up being a place between where we can go to things with a different set of criteria that are available in the ABRs.
HOLLY RAICHE:	Oh, yeah, no, I totally agree with you. The grant thing is something, it's new. We haven't even had—I mean, right now the board is starting to work through what the program's about. They're working through processes. So it's really early stages. They haven't even had all the webinars that they were going to have. So we don't know a lot about it at this stage.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	So we should pretend it doesn't exist, for now, I think.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And, in fact, continue to pretend that until well into the 2024 financial year planning process because the implementation on this stage of the work, which, and we also need to go back to the report from the cross-community working group—and Judith served on that—that isn't even going to be hitting funding for the implementation for this until the FY 24 period, if it gets the right prioritization and the right resourcing. So I'm pretty sure it will get the right prioritization and the right resourcing because Jonathan and I spending some time in meetings trying to make sure that that happens. But we're way ahead, that's way down the track. And it will be, I think, very easy to see it as a standalone activity and not limited for internal funding opportunities at all. It will be wider than ICANN, at least if the design goes as currently envisaged. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, it's very early days for the Grant Program. The board is still working things, they're just now starting to have a webinar program to start to talk about it. But it's this is very early days for this new thing. We're all learning, so we're all going to attend the webinar when it's available, and then down the track we'll find out more about it. So, at this stage, it really isn't part of our kind of calendar yet. We'll just see what happens. But there we go.

I'm thinking, Jonathan, maybe you and I sit down some point and go through this and work up some kind of—look at Heidi's proposed schedule and how we can make it work so that, in fact, we have a little oversight group on both our responses to things like the budgets and our oversight of applications from the At-Large Community for funding

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHASAMY: So ALAC's work on ICANN planning processes is of paramount importance, and when that gets mixed up, clashes with ALAC's budget request, then the work is optically compromised. And so if there is some way by which that could be separated from this core work of participating in and in advising on ICANN planning process, it'll be wise.

What we could do is—I mean, what comes to the top of my mind is that ALAC does not need any more than one or two members or experts and making a budgetary estimate for ALAC, be it routine ALAC requirements or ALAC's requirements from the funds that are to be disbursed by ICANN sort of surplus funds. And so that can be handled within ALAC itself and not brought to this committee, which probably has a higher priority. Just a thought. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, thank you very much. Is there any more discussion on this presentation, on the very useful timeframe that was put up by Heidi that I think Jonathan and I can pore over in terms of –

HEIDI ULLRICH: Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Sorry, just, I wanted to, because I'm seeing some discussion in the chat about the online form. As I've noted, please, as you're preparing your additional budget request, use that Word version. You'll see it's on this agenda, it's on the agenda for the Fiscal Year '24 budget development workspace. Please use that one. I believe—I think it'll be easier for staff. Once the requests made their way through and they're approved to be submitted, staff will go ahead and submit the online forms. So we'll do that for you, but it's just easier using that Word version.

And also, Holly, you've mentioned earlier to take a look at some of the successful ones, some of the ones that At-Large has had in the past. And it's really interesting to see how this ebbs and flows. In Fiscal Year '22, we had five that were approved and there were really very good ABRs. And there was considerable funding committed to those. So look at those. This past year, there was only one that was approved. So, again, take a look at what some of those others were.

But also, I just wanted to put a link into the decision. This is what—this is the Fiscal Year '23 ABR decisions. And even if the ABRs were not approved, it does state what was behind that decision, whether they were approved or whether they were not approved, and why. So before you—if you have something that you're thinking about submitting or developing, please look at this document here. And it's really useful to

take a look at what the thought process when they're reviewing them internally. So thank you very much.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Heidi. And in the chat, there's a good example of the RTTs, which actually went from being an ABR to being absorbed in the budget because it was absolutely seen as something, if you will, if we're having a multi stakeholder model and we want discussions, to have the ability to have different languages so that people actually can attend and participate in the discussions. It's really interesting how successful that was. So what was behind saying, look at the page, the ALAC page for our ABRs and look at what was successful, what wasn't, and why. So it's a very useful thing.

I think at this stage, Jonathan and I, I'm not sure that we need to have any more conversation right now, but I think that we do have to sort out the various work streams, and I think we have to work through how we're actually going to organize ourselves so that we've got a fairly streamlined process for applications for not only the grants to come, but for ABRs and for other comments on budgets. So, Jonathan, I think it's a conversation we can have.

Are there any other questions? In which case I would like to thank everybody. I'd particularly like to thank Heidi for the presentation. I'd like to thank Ricardo for the presentation. And I imagine we will be meeting very soon, if nothing else, to hear about this new grants program that just adds to our workload.

So are there any other comments? In which case we can talk about, Heidi, if staff can look at the availability of someone to talk to us about the new grants program, we can schedule a meeting around that and probably there'll be a further conversation with Jonathan on progress on ABRs and other work. Go ahead, Heidi, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. So, Holly, so I've been in touch with the team that is going to be implementing this, and they will be at first a community webinar by the end of the year. And after that, if there are additional questions, then we can go ahead and schedule that. I did want to just raise the requests that I've had from the team that Giovanni runs, whether you or the ALAC would like to have a presentation. It's an interactive presentation on the MSM, the Multi-Stakeholder Model Program. I know that we have had that. So was that something that you would like to have on the OFB, Holly, in the next few weeks?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, absolutely. I would. Thank you. And, Marita, I'm sure we can work with Marita because this is her area of expertise, and so we'll first find out if she's available. But, yes, absolutely, that would be excellent. Marita, go ahead, please.

MARITA MOLL: Yeah, hi. Marita speaking. I attended a number of those sessions that Giovanni, and I forget who, were doing. And they were doing polling on these from different communities, and I just don't really understand

what the purpose of that polling was. They were asking questions, and questions that not necessarily would elicit the same kinds of answers from different communities. So I'm more interested in what they're doing with the answers to their questions they're getting than anything else. I'm kind of concerned about how that kind of falls into, "Evaluation of the Evolution of MSM".

HOLLY RAICHE: Marita, I expect you to be there and I expect to ask that question right up front.

MARITA MOLL: Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you very much. Okay, well, with that, Heidi, if you can actually figure out when we can do that and how that fits in, then we can schedule a meeting around that, okay? Are there any other questions or comments? And if not, I can wish you all a—have a very happy rest of the morning, afternoon, or evening. And we will talk soon, I'm sure. And, Heidi, we can ticktack on the next meeting. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: NetThing 22 is [inaudible]. If you can join NetThing 22, registration is still open. Bye for now.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you, Cheryl. Bye.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Thank you so much, everyone, for joining today. Meeting is adjourned. Please take care.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]