

ICANN

**Moderator: Glen Desaintgery
January 5, 2012
9:00 am CT**

Chris Chaplow: This is Chris Chaplow introducing the CSG Business and Operating Plan Working Group call on Thursday the 5th of January, 2012.

And on the call we have Tony Holmes, Chris Chaplow, Steve Metalitz and Marilyn Cade. We have apologies from J. Scott and from Jaime Wagner. And we're expecting Xavier Calvez and Juan from Staff to join us in about 10-15 minutes.

That's good, okay. And we can start the call. Thank you.

So we were just talking or just thinking of preparations. And a key question that's come up that we'll need to ask Xavier is how we divide the requests. Do we have multiple sheets or do we go for a single sheet?

Are there any other questions coming to mind particularly that we'll be wanting to ask?

Marilyn Cade: Chris, I have a question and it's a threshold question. And that is, you know, this is the - although we have complied with and done the work on presenting

requests before -- and we have really met what appeared to be what ICANN was asking for -- there'd been two significant and distressing disappointments.

We need to know if they're a threshold or if areas that ICANN will not fund. If ICANN's not going to be willing to fund something because they think it gives them liability or they've got a competing proposal of their own.

For instance, I was on that call with (Curt) in the presentation of the framework. There was work that they were supposed to do and follow up, including doing a little mini survey of all of us and others on what's going on in outreach. They haven't done anything on that.

And if they have a competing proposal that's going on at the same time that has implications for what they will fund for us, we need to know it now before we keep working on this and adjust both our expectations and how we work in whatever else they're doing.

Tony Holmes: Marilyn, before you joined I was just having a quick conversation with Steve and Chris about that. And the approach that I was looking to take was just to use the one request form and supplement that with an additional sheet that sets out the detail.

But one of the things I've struggled with in looking at this is putting elements of funding - hard elements of funding against the various initiatives we want covered by this.

And I think the issue you raise is similar to that as well because I was very worried if we went down the line of taking a separate request form for each of the elements, it really plays straight into ICANN's thinking that they can scratch some of those things.

Marilyn Cade: No, I think it's a slightly different problem. There's receptivity on Xavier's part to the idea that we give them project proposals and we manage the project proposals and get paid, you know, for deliverables, so to speak. There are other people who seem to think that ICANN should be doing this stuff themselves and we can just eat the chicken food that is, you know, and...

Tony Holmes: I'm aware of that. And also what's being setup in terms of their current thinking, whether it sounds -- from what you're saying -- is it's thinking and nothing behind it.

Marilyn Cade: At this point the problem is it's got to move very quickly because there's this silly thing going on in the council where, you know, there's this kind of silly infrastructure big committee, blah, blah, blah, but no work for - no deliverables for quite a long period of time.

And I think we can ask the question of - I think - and we haven't had a chance to match our - I haven't had a chance -- Chris, and I'm sorry about that -- to match our request against the strategic plan. And my understanding is that's a really important thing for us to do to sort of look at the things that they say they're going to do and say, "This is in Category whatever, A, B, C or D," you know.

Chris Chaplow: Yes. Yes, it's almost the sort of thing -- Chris speaking -- you want to do first but, you know, we do it the (wrong) way around. But yes, we've got to do that.

Tony Holmes: That's actually a question on the template as well.

Marilyn Cade: Yes, that's what I mean. And so be really clear that you've done that. That you have matched it against whatever the strategic objective is.

The other quick thing that I would say is the reason that it was really important that they do this survey work and come back to us is that there's a lot of money this year to the ALAC and a lot of money to the GAC.

And the GAC in particular is not going to be able to effectively use all the money they gave them because of this meltdown in their secretariat and having to start over. But the ALAC has very substantial plans and ideas. They have staff, they're moving ahead, they're talking about a leadership boot camp. I have the documents on that. I'll share them with everyone.

I'm not in support of the approach that they're taking. Not that some elements of it don't sound very useful, but I'm not interested in ICANN picking the winners and leaders.

And I think the other threshold question, Steve, Tony, Chris, would be \$500,000, who all is that addressing? Is it addressing just the seven constituencies? A really important thing to me is to say constituencies, not stakeholder groups or (MC) or new constituencies won't be fairly treated.

Chris Chaplow: Yes because \$500 -- Chris speaking -- \$597,000 was the sum of the allocation last year to the (AC)s. So if that's recurring then we're already negative \$97,000.

Marilyn Cade: But Chris, we didn't get any money at all. So that - oh, to the (AC)s, sorry.

Chris Chaplow: Yes, that's why your question is very valid, yes.

Marilyn Cade: Not to the SOs?

Chris Chaplow: That's correct. But the introduction that Xavier gave in mentioning that is (SO-AC).

Marilyn Cade: He may be confusing this. Remember we say SO/SG, stakeholder group. So maybe we need to clarify that as well, because actually the funding for the Advisory Committee is not in - that is not in the same bucket.

Chris Chaplow: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Maybe we just need to verify that.

And that's important because the ALAC gets a lot of money, they got a lot of money last year. And, you know, they're looking to do a summit again, etc.

So those are threshold questions and we're running out of time.

Chris Chaplow: The operator will announce Xavier on the call, so we'll know when he comes (on).

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Tony, I - so what you were proposing to do is have the (unintelligible) statement about who the IPC is and their mission and then do separate attachments.

I was going to propose that we approach it separately, which is we write a cover memo and then we would fill the form out for each of these things because they will serve as project management documents for us.

And there may be some things we all want to do that we would agree to pool resources on, and I'll mention one. We want to do a senior business event summit -- I don't know what I'm going to call it -- a senior business event in Prague similar to what we did in Paris and with the kind of reception that we organized in Brussels.

Steve Metalitz: Marilyn, this is Steve. Isn't that...

Coordinator: Hello, excuse me for interruptions. Xavier Calvez now joins.

Chris Chaplow: Thank you. Xavier, Chris Chaplow here. Welcome to the call.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you, Chris. Hello everyone. Am I too early?

Chris Chaplow: No, you're just fine. Thank you very much for getting up early and joining us. I hope you've had a cup of coffee there.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you. No, that's no problem. (That's) my time.

Chris Chaplow: Okay, just to let you know we've got Tony Holmes from the ISP on the call, myself, Chris Chaplow, Steve Metalitz from IPC, and Marilyn from the BC.

Xavier Calvez: Hello everyone.

Man: Hello.

Marilyn Cade: Happy New Year.

Coordinator: And thank you for the - thank you for the interruption once again. We have (Janis Kolong) on the line as well.

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry, I was not able to hear who joined.

(Janis Kolong): Good morning. This is (Janis).

Chris Chaplow: Hello (Janis). This is Chris.

(Janis Kolong): Am I a little early?

Chris Chaplow: No, you're just coming in spot on.

(Janis Kolong): Okay.

Marilyn Cade: Chris, can I just respond to that question and then just turn it back to you, of course as chair to keep this (unintelligible). The question you were asking - and we'll talk about this later. But the question you were asking is I understand the relation of that event to the budget. I was merely describing it as a example of something that the three constituencies might decide to collaborate on in the future or even for Prague. But I understand your point about the budget (unintelligible).

Chris Chaplow: Good. Well I'll just make a start. We've just had 10-15 minutes chatting, Xavier, sort of just planning a few questions. And I think if it's alright I'll just start with one question, with two fundamental ones that were on our minds.

One was regarding the overall budget. And you mentioned in your email attachment there was a placeholder of \$500,000 allocated to this (SO-AC) requests.

Xavier Calvez: Right.

Chris Chaplow: Noting that in the FY12 last year, really to the (AC)s there was \$597,000 allocated or approved. So if that is recurring items -- as they look like they will be -- are we - were you really saying that it's \$500 for the constituencies, the SO constituencies as opposed to the SOs and the (AC)s? That's the question.

Xavier Calvez: Oh, need to be very careful with the vocabulary here because I'm not sure I understand it as well as I need to, the vocabulary that you're using in order to answer your question.

So what you're saying is that in the FY12 budget there was \$592K of actions basically -- or requests -- granted for SO requests only, not (AC) requests. Is that what you're telling me?

Marilyn Cade: No.

Chris Chaplow: The other way around.

Xavier Calvez: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: Chris, just let me (unintelligible).

Chris Chaplow: Go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Last year you gave that amount of money to the at-large...

Xavier Calvez: (And the) GAC.

Marilyn Cade: ...which is - well there's separate funding for the GAC, but there's additional funding for the GAC on top of that. But those are advisory groups, right, remember that chart we did and handed out?

Xavier Calvez: Right.

Marilyn Cade: So those are advisory groups. The SOs would be the ccNSO, the GNSO...

Xavier Calvez: Right.

Marilyn Cade: ...and the ASO.

Coordinator: And excuse me for interruption. We have Juan Ojeda on the line, thank you.

Marilyn Cade: So the language that we normally speak in -- because of the reorganization that the board mandated -- in the GNSO there are things called stakeholder groups that are abbreviated as SGs. And sometimes it gets confusing and the SGs and the GNSO have the seven constituencies.

So what we are talking to you and your team about is financial support for projects at the constituency level in the GNSO. The budget last year, of course in a separate bucket you had toolkit funding, which is policy support oriented, the conference calls -- stuff of that nature -- which is going to be requested separately we understand.

So what we are talking to you about is filling these forms out for you guys to help to fund outreach participation, officer travel, but it's all focused on the constituencies.

So Chris' point is last year in the budget there was no allocation for the work we're asking for. You funded something else, we're assuming you would be receiving requests from the (AC)s -- the advisory groups -- but if the \$500,000 is allocated to cover what you're - ICANN's going to spend on (them) and on us, it looks like a zero sum gain.

And I'm not saying it is. That's what we're trying to understand. Are we competing with the (AC)s or is this money actually about the SO support, the Supporting Organization constituency support?

Xavier Calvez: And I'm going to speak into the controller of (Janis) and Juan. First of all we're talking about additional requests, which excludes ongoing recurring support.

And when I'm saying that - and again, I'm the one in this audience that has the least experience in (probably clear) understanding of the subject, so I'm expecting you guys to correct me if I'm wrong, as you have well done so far.

When I say additional, that means that if we have -- for example -- in the base budget today ten people traveling to ICANN meetings for a given organization that are sponsored by ICANN, it could be an additional request to say this year we would like five more people to be sponsored. It's the same type of expenses than the ten people, it's just five additional that are formulated as an additional request.

And under the scope of the \$500, only the five people would be included, not the base ten, so that's a beginning of an answer. I know it's not yet answering fully your question, but just wanted to clarify that we're talking only about additional funding to activities that may exist already in the base budget that we want to expand in volume or in number or new activities.

So now having said that, rightly or wrongly the perception that we have - and we probably will need to go back to the (unintelligible) to reconfirm what I'm going to say. But rightly or wrongly we have assumed that we worked last year with an envelope of \$500K for those additional requests for everyone. So (AC) plus SOs plus everybody basically.

Now again, in the structure of the process for this year, the point is that this envelope -- which we may need to re-qualify based on the outcome of this discussion in terms of amount -- this envelope right now is a placeholder.

What I mean by that is this is trying to give everyone an idea -- as I indicated in the email -- that it's not \$5 million, it's not \$50K, it's in the range of \$500 or \$600 or \$700 or \$400 or \$800, but it's not the extremes that I just mentioned before. And what we are working on together formulating these requests will help us determine what the final amount is.

So I'm not telling you it's \$500K and you guys have \$365 and the other guys have \$135 and this is what you need to deal with and this end of discussion. This is a placeholder for people to have an understanding of what we're talking about.

And I would expect - I'm expecting -- honestly -- that the ALAC requests will add up maybe to \$500 or more and that the requests from other organizations may add \$200 or \$200K and a third organization to another \$150K or \$300K. And the total is going to arrive at \$1.2 million and we're going to have to come to a compromise on the volume of the requests on the number and on the amounts that lets us come back to what we consider is a reasonable amount.

And what I mean by reasonable is what we need to define, but it will have to take into account the revenues of ICANN and the other elements that contribute to (expenses) variation as part of the budget, which is why at this stage it can only be a placeholder.

So let me stop there because we may have suggested an envelope that structurally is not taking into account what has been correctly - what has been done last year. So again, I was under the impression that last year we had an envelope for all the additional requests from the ASOs and (AC)s of about \$500K, and that's why we replicated this amount at this stage of the budget process as the placeholder envelope.

So having said that, can I have either (Janis) or Juan chime in and let me know where I may be missing something or if that's what we thought it was.

Juan Ojeda: Hi Xavier, this is Juan. Good morning, everyone.

No, what you said was correct, Xavier, in that the basic set of services -- which was for the stakeholder group as part of the basic toolkit service -- that was not part of the \$500,000 envelope, if you will. That was above and beyond or that was included as part of the core operations.

The \$500,000 were for those requests above and beyond what would've been captured under the basic set of services, which a little more expensive than just the toolkit. It was also the travel support for the ICANN meetings and what have you.

So correct in that that envelope was for these special requests. And to a previous point that I think was being brought up, the request on the stakeholder groups were (seeded) on a (lower) level playing field in terms of

the prioritization process, the stakeholder group requests with the SOs and (AC)s. So it wasn't necessarily a \$500,000 envelope intended solely for (AC NSO)s.

But I just want back to the prioritization process that we have to go through. And as (I already) pointed out, I'm sure the (AP) requests are going to come in at over \$500,000 alone, but unfortunately it took the prioritization process at this point, and so that's what we're trying to fine tune and develop a process that we can all buy into.

Chris Chaplow: Okay, thanks Juan.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry, I just need to clarify a question - this is Marilyn from (unintelligible).

Xavier, for two years in row - and I want to say this as positively (unintelligible) and productively as I can. For two years in a row we and one other constituency have presented requests and through a variety of miscommunications and -- in our view -- significant disappointments, our requests have not - other than the toolkit -- which we've worked on separately -- our requests have not been addressed.

Last year the - and they had been perhaps in our view - they perhaps have led to some confusion and even anger and frustration, which is not helpful. Last year the significant amount of funding that was allocated went to the advisory groups, the ALAC and the GAC. All very appropriate, but my point is we're not created equal in the mechanism of influence and decision making.

And so I think we might ask that after this call we all think about whether we really can be thrown into a pool of competing with the ALAC and the

Government Advisory Committee for financial resources, if that's really realistic.

Xavier Calvez: Okay, so just to - so that first I understand correctly your question and making sure that I understand the words that you've used.

So when you said addressed, does it mean your requests have not been granted but have been considered or have not been considered at all?

Marilyn Cade: We wouldn't be able to tell you what ICANN has done to evaluate our requests because there's no transparency on that.

Xavier Calvez: Okay, because that's what (therefore) I expected the problem to be. So either the request was not considered -- which in itself is a problem -- or it's been considered and not granted, which could be valid. But even if valid should be explained and communicated.

So in both cases it seems to me from your answer that you don't know what's happened -- if anything -- which in itself is what I perceive as the main issue. Because when you say we're not created equal I'll respond to that. The other aspect of your point, which is we can't be put in a competing envelope with the (AC)s.

The way I'm looking at it is holistically and objectively. So when you say that we're not created equal, I don't know about the past, but from now on I have no prejudice, I have no preferences and I will look at things fairly.

One, because I don't see why that would be - anything should be different. The matter of influence -- which is existing in any organization, in any environment -- I'm sure exists here as well but will be -- in my views -- dealt

with, with respect to - as much as possible principle, procedures explicitly formulated and communicated.

What I mean by that is if we have a process to perform selection, that's transparent and that's communicated in advance as well as the results and the analysis of the decisions communicated (was) formulated. The notion of preferences given to an organization versus another -- in my view -- does not exist or will need to be explicitly explained.

So from my perspective there's no preference to anyone and we have to look at everyone in the same pool. We don't have a choice because we have one resources budget.

I don't have revenues that I know I can allocate for GNSO expenses versus another budget of revenues that I can allocate to ALAC-type of expenses, we have one revenue budget.

As a result, I can only look at everyone together. And -- exactly to the point that I was making earlier -- for us to be looking at everybody on an equal footing I need to look at everyone together.

So I'm not clear as to how we could do differently in order to make sure that we consider everyone with the same amount of chances and with the same voice basically.

Chris Chaplow: Xavier, thanks for that...

Steve Metalitz: (Unintelligible) can I get in the queue?

Chris Chaplow: Yes, you get in the queue, Steve. Go ahead, Steve.

Steve Metalitz: I had a different question. I look at your template that you've sent out and I'm not quite sure how to fit our requests from the intellectual property constituency into it.

We're planning to request a sum on which we could draw for several possible activities which would be specified later. So for example, one such activity might be an outreach function in association with an ICANN meeting.

Since at this point we only know the location of one of the ICANN meetings that is taking place in the next fiscal year, we're not really able to specify, you know, where it's going...

Xavier Calvez: Right.

Steve Metalitz: ...(unintelligible) outreach would take place or check how we would do it and so forth. So I mean that's just an example. Does your system accommodate this type of request in which we would say we would like a sum of X dollars kind of reserved for us on which we can draw by providing you with proposals for specific activities?

Xavier Calvez: So I understand. (Janis) will jump in because she's worked a lot with the outreach working group on this.

But my perception would be in principle any request can be made under this process. I recognize that at the stage where we're at we may not have enough information to formulate a request in a very specific manner. And I would say I think - yes you can make the request. You should make it with as much information as you have.

In the example that you're taking, I would only say that if you can formulate that either the type of actions that you would consider doing. So is it an outreach and possibly what kind of outreach actions you would like to consider under this request.

Or alternatively if you cannot formulate those because you don't know (necessarily) the region or you don't know the specific country and dependent on the country it could change, maybe you can provide historical actions that have been carried out in the past in different regions. That could be examples of what these funds that you're requesting for could be used for in the future.

At least it helps qualifying the request. And so first your question, yes this process aims at grasping anything that you would like to do as imprecisely defined as it could be. And anything that you can do to qualify the request is helpful.

You're mentioning the fact that we only know one meeting, which is Toronto. We know - the only thing that we know is the next one is in Asia. So I don't know if it helps.

Steve Metalitz: Well that's an example. I mean, we might have a very different strategy if the meeting is in Japan -- where there are a lot of intellectual property organizations -- or (contracting) if the meeting were in Bangladesh we might have a very different approach.

Xavier Calvez: I'm sure. I'm sure. I was just trying to make sure that at least we're speaking about (already) one region rather than any of the five, right.

Steve Metalitz: I understand that. But that's kind of the dilemma. But I think your answer is helpful.

Xavier Calvez: Understood.

Steve Metalitz: We'll provide as much information as we can, but we can't be as specific as we know we would ultimately have to be.

Xavier Calvez: I agree. I recognize that and I think we're all constrained by, you know, the fairly extensive sequence of steps that the budget process needs to have which requires us to start fairly early in order to finish it on time.

So I recognize that. And by the way, everybody's in the same boat on that, right, I think everybody will have the same type of issues.

Another issue that we have been faced with and that some people have formulated are the fact that some requests can pertain for actions that need to be carried out early in the fiscal year, let's say in August. And to plan an action for August it probably needs to be worked on prior to that to maybe the extent of let's say work on it in April or in May to plan for it. And you don't even know yet whether the budget will be approved for that request or not at that time and therefore there's a little bit of a difficulty to work on that.

So there's also that problem, that paradigm that we need to work on and try to address so that we can make sure that people who need to schedule actions in a given timeframe that's early in the fiscal year, we can try to address those more specifically so that they can be either decided upon or cancel or not happening, but at least let people have an answer timely.

Chris Chaplow: Thank you, Xavier.

Tony, you had a question about filling in the forms (one or many), didn't you?

Tony Holmes: Yes, that's right. So thanks, Chris.

Yes, my question, Xavier, was that the approach that we considered was to actually use one form - the request form as the template. But obviously we can't get all of the details of what we want to embrace by the funding within that one template, but to attach to that a separate sheet that will be appended and will give all the details of the various elements. Is that an acceptable way to do this?

Xavier Calvez: Oh entirely. We wanted to make sure that we provide a template to guide the type of information that we believe is necessary at a minimum for us to be able to understand and take into account their request. If you can provide more -- because there's more detail to it -- it's great. It's just helping us much more understand the request and have its rationale and so on and so absolutely. And the appendix that you would like to add to the template is very welcome.

Chris Chaplow: Okay. So there's no need for us to fill in a separate plate for an element such as funding for travel or funding for outreach. All of that can go on the one request form with an attachment.

Xavier Calvez: Yes.

Chris Chaplow: Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: I...

Xavier Calvez: And again, we're talking about additional funding to...

Marilyn Cade: (Vladimir) - yeah.

Xavier Calvez: ...what can be already in the base budget, right?

Chris Chaplow: Of course, yes.

Xavier Calvez: Understand.

Marilyn Cade: (Vladimir), I have - it's Marilyn. I'm going to ask a further clarifying question about that. I don't want us to run the risk of being so complex that we get lost in the shuffle again this time. And I think that is a little bit of what happened in the past.

So if we give you a chapeau form, it - I don't - it would be - for us it'd be very complicated. We have five small projects that add up to a total program. But if we - so we give you a form that allocates those, that means in that complex quarter-by-quarter allocation on the form, we're going to have to have Project 1, Project 2, Project 3, Project 4, Project 5 hypothetically or Project 1, 2, 3.

That's going to require your team to do a lot of manual sorting across the, you know, maybe we could - should use an example of Chris giving you an example of a couple of the activities that we had in mind because I'm looking at this and thinking it would be very, very complicated if we did that that way, if the BC did it that way.

Xavier Calvez: So I'm sorry. Let me make sure I understood correctly your question. You would find it very complicated to put several requests under one form and you would prefer...

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Xavier Calvez: ...to use as many forms as there are individual requests?

Marilyn Cade: Well from...

Xavier Calvez: And you're asking if that's okay to do?

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Xavier Calvez: Okay. Not knowing which - why the example you have in mind, I would say I completely agree. If it's less clear and more complicated to put several things under one form, use several forms. I think we are looking at the form as a - the tool to describe a request, not all the requests of one given organization.

So we're happy to receive or happy may be an exaggeration but we're happy to receive a hundred forms as long as each individually is clear as to what it tries to do.

Marilyn Cade: So can we maybe - if Chris could quickly describe a couple of the projects we had in mind. One is outreach and Chris maybe another is officer travel or the newsletter. Just in very summary form as an example of - because the other thing we'd like to understand is are there any threshold barriers against ICANN being willing to fund a particular activity because you think it's covered elsewhere, you don't (unintelligible).

So there's a completing activity that you think, you know. So we're really focused on doing - on proposing things that are reasonable.

Xavier Calvez: So we've debated that subject when providing the form and the guidelines that I have communicated. And a number of us were saying well we should define a threshold so that we don't get things that are completely outrageous and will

never fit into the envelope that we're talking about. And I think we decided and certainly I was of this opinion that we should not specify limits because this is the time to spell things out that are not yet done today. Right.

So we want to make sure that the requests of people are formulated and this is the channel to do it. So we have preferred not to specify individual thresholds or ceilings for the requests. We have preferred to provide to everyone an indication of an envelope so that people understand that if they provide three requests of one million each it will be extremely difficult to grant at least as per this process.

Now if you provide three or five requests of \$1000 each, you have more chances that it can be granted but you're probably also not necessarily formulating needs that you could potentially have.

So the bottom line is we have not wanted to specify amounts so as to avoid limitations at the source of the information. We don't want you guys to limit what you're thinking of on the basis of amounts. Of course if you tell me we have a five million action that we'd like to carry out even if it's over two years, this - I'd rather know and I'm fine that we know about it through this process.

It will probably have to be something that we'll have to take out of this process and address separately but at least it will have been communicated. Is that helpful?

Chris Chaplow: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: I think it's helpful if we probably also propose that we - and you have said this before, we consider this an ongoing dialog and we would all come back and

talk through why requests were not granted and what kinds of things could be because, you know, there's only a certain number of years that we will all keep asking.

Xavier Calvez: Right. No, no and understood. And I recognize, you know, we're doing something that's very difficult, right, because you have a situation where a number of organizations have a number of needs in the requests. There's a limited amount of funds.

So there is a compromise that everyone needs to do which by definition is frustrating because it is most likely that no one will get what they want. You only potentially can get a portion of what you want. So this is a process where everybody gets frustrated.

The ICANN staff would - should normally not get frustrated because we don't have a prejudice about the type of actions or about an organization versus another. I can imagine that we could get frustrated because we are trying to coordinate a process that puts us at the center of anger as you pointed out that has happened in the past. And we don't want that and that's not what we're trying to do.

But so I know we're doing something very difficult. And I know that by definition unless we would have unlimited funds, we will come to face a situation where we will have to say no to things that have been asked. I do expect that and I do expect that we're going to have to be as, you know, transparent and as clear as possible. And I recognize that transparency is only helpful if what you are transparently saying makes sense.

So it will have to also be the result of a process where we try to be as smart as possible with the understanding that again either - I would doubt that anyone

is going to be fully satisfied because I do expect that the requests will exceed from any constituency or any organization or any advisory committee will exceed what we can ultimately grant based on revenues.

Today just as - so that you guys know, we're looking at a revenue growth for ICANN that's relatively minimal. We are trying to assess the impact of triple-x to - from a revenue standpoint to understand what the impact could be in fiscal year '13. But otherwise it's in the 2 to 3% increase range.

So we are still working on those numbers. We're trying to formulate them. But the resources are not increasing drastically. Right. It's not like we are - have a 10 or 15% expansion rate and therefore a lot of flexibility I guess.

But having said that, that doesn't change anything to the notion of trying to have this process of additional requests. But I recognize Marilyn that we're going to have tough discussions not only staff with organizations but organizations among themselves because we're going to need to work together to prioritize and go through a process of elimination, which is going to be painful. I do expect that it's going to be painful.

Chris Chaplow: Thank you Xavier. Just we'll look forward, not backwards but just to understand where Marilyn was coming from. If you go back to - you read a lot of documentation but have a look at 18, 19 and 20, Pages 18, 19 and 20 of the FY12 budget. You can see the request versus what was allocated.

Xavier Calvez: Right.

Chris Chaplow: What happened in between we don't know. But there we are. But moving to forward to the question I want to ask. On your covering email Item 6, you said

that ICANN staff will be suggesting a process to collectively determine which additional requests.

Xavier Calvez: Yes.

Chris Chaplow: Is that something before the 20th or...

Xavier Calvez: I would have liked that it is before the 20th. I think we're going to have to probably take a few more days to be able to formulate something. And when I - what I wanted to be clear on is that what I would like we can do is we can come up together with a process for the definition of what makes - what is being granted in terms of requests.

What I mean by that is what I think we'll do is we'll provide a few suggestions of selection methods and we'll try together a group that represents all the organizations.

And through a little bit of discussion and hopefully a little bit of voting mechanisms try to come up with a method or a set of methods to look at the requests and try to have as a fair as possible process and transparent as possible and simple as possible process for election and elimination of requests to make it in the fiscal year 2013 budget.

It would have been clear that ideally we would have suggested and finalized that mechanism ahead of time and I recognize it would have been ideal. We just didn't have the time to - and the ability to do that within the timing. But ideally that's what - it would be much better that you guys know how it's going to be assessed when you formulate the requests than after you formulated the requests. I recognize the shortcomings of that and we just didn't have a choice.

Chris Chaplow: Okay. Thanks...

Marilyn Cade: Xavier, I have another question that's directly related to this though in terms of timing. So all of the requests are going to come in to you by the 20th.

Xavier Calvez: I'm expecting some to arrive by the 31st. But because some people have told us between the Chinese New Year and the vacation and South America and (Song), the 21st is impossible apparently. So that's why I sent an email before Christmas I think to say that there's - the deadline is not changed but there's a grace period. So I'm expecting things to arrive also until the end of January.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. So maybe we could go back to trying to understand what - I think it really would be helpful if we kind of shared some of the general categories that we're thinking about. And I don't mind for Chris to go first. I think - Chris, if you just want to check off the general categories that we are think - we're not asking approval. We're not asking ICANN to agree. We just...

Xavier Calvez: Right.

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Chris Chaplow: Yes.

Xavier Calvez: Okay. Understood.

Chris Chaplow: Okay. So I've got five general categories at the moment. One is for help with officer travel. Another one is for a BC newsletter. That's collateral that we've done in the past and want to take that further forward. Another one that we're interested is secretariat travel with our secretariat at the ICANN meetings.

And an outreach awareness program which is - which will be another meeting of sorts in some other location, possibly one in the U.S. and one somewhere else that we've never been able to have it at the BC.

And a leadership development program to be able to take business leaders from different parts of the third world and effective - quite use the word sponsor but help them come to an ICANN meeting, to a BC meeting, to an IGF meeting and generally sponsor them throughout the year to be active in the BC for it to be a two way process was to help them and for them to help the BC.

Xavier Calvez: Okay.

Chris Chaplow: So those are categories of (our terms) and the costs on each one vary from - well the lowest one there is about 8000 and the highest is 24,000. Those are just numbers that...

Xavier Calvez: Okay.

Chris Chaplow: ...we've got. Yeah.

Xavier Calvez: So all that sounds on the basis of what you just provided completely within the scope of what we're talking about. So it makes a lot of sense based on what we understand these requests could be.

Steve Metalitz: Xavier, this is Steve Metalitz. If I could just give you the quick list from the IPC on the same basis and it's...

Xavier Calvez: Sure.

Steve Metalitz: ...a lot of overlap. One is funding for an intercessional meeting to be held at an ICANN office. Second officer travel to ICANN meetings. Third would be support for secretariat services. Fourth would be funding for an outreach event in an underserved region.

And fifth would be related to the funding for - similar to what Chris just said; funding for participation in an ICANN meeting from IP groups in an underserved region where the meeting's taking place. This is one of my questions about Asia Pacific.

Man: Yes. Yes. Makes (unintelligible)...

Steve Metalitz: So those are the categories.

Man: ...categories we're talking about.

Tony Holmes: And just to answer that from the - well just to be quick. From the ISP side there's nothing that we have that doesn't fall within the categories roughly from the BC or the IPC.

Xavier Calvez: Okay. Understood. (Janis), any thoughts or comments on that?

(Janis Kolong): Xavier, good morning everybody. Yeah, I listened to these and Marilyn certainly you and I have had conversations and I know as does Juan exactly where you're coming from at least from our freshman year and last year with the (unintelligible) request.

And I really believe that a coming together of a working group from the stakeholder groups and the advisory committees and the supporting

organization is what we as ICANN staff are going to need to voice to in order to help this process become more transparent and more tangible for all of the groups.

I think we were very transparent last year in our freshman year of this request process in sharing with the community the request and the dollar value. I think the process is the issue. And I know Xavier really has the intent and even though the timing wasn't right to make this process complete with the community.

It's much like we're trying to do with the outreach program. Set up a straw man and then engage the community to really build something that works for the community. And I hear these requests from the three different groups and I think about what was said a little bit earlier on crossover and is it something that ICANN's already doing.

Yes. When I see this with outreach I know that we are trying to, and we will, put a sum into the budget regarding outreach in general. The more specific that the requests come in from the SOs and ACs and the stakeholder groups, the better that we can build that piece of the budget because I have no, you know, no input into dollar value, of course not.

But just knowing that this is something that the community has asked for in the past and it's something that we need to build together. So there will be times in the discussion after the 31st of January with the groups here on the phone and the other constituency groups and stakeholders about the crossover between - or the overlap between the requests and what ICANN itself can fund. Because then we have to take - if we are going to fund it at ICANN, we need to take your individual requests and concerns into consideration and to building that.

So I think the biggest year this year in our growth from our freshman year to this year is after the 31st of January and getting all the requests in is being, you know, outreaching (our self) each one of these groups and to help with a working group so that we can cover as many of the needs as possible and have (as brief) disappoint as possible.

But I think this call and what I just took the notes from, from these requests, you know, this is exactly, you know, where we're supposed to be and what we're supposed to be listening to and what the community is supposed to be working on.

So I'm really looking forward to it this year. I know it's going to be hard but I think the finance team has grown and matured. I think we've got great leadership developed from Juan last year and now Xavier this year. And I think, you know, we're really ready this year to engage more of the community.

So thank you for the chance to say that. But between the outreach and working with the finance team I really do feel much more confident about how we can go forward. And I look forward to building a working group with the SOs and ACs and stakeholders to make this happen this year.

Marilyn Cade: I need to get in the queue to ask a question about this. So tell me when you'd like me to ask that question.

Man: I'm going to have to drop off shortly but go, you know, go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Let me ask it now. I was on the (Curt Chris) framework discussion (Janis)...

(Janis Kolong): Right.

Marilyn Cade: ...as was Chris and the ALAC. It was a lot of discussion about a framework that ICANN is putting together. There's a proposal that is struggling and on the BC it's probably (unintelligible) struggling on this kind of very broad and confused idea of a working group that the GNSO would charter and supervise which we think there's a need to bring together the thinking.

In listening to (Curt)'s presentation, very, very high level, there was some hope that there would be bringing this together. But one of the requests we made was that the staff begin gathering examples of the outreach activities that are already underway and including whether or not those parties that got funding last year have actually completed their outreach activities or funding is being carried over.

A very high level survey, which I think really has got to be done. And we're talking about outreach and awareness and participation at the constituency and SG level while some of the other activities are perhaps focused on more general awareness about ICANN or philosophical activity.

There's even a idea of a ICANN academy that none of us have had any input into. So we've got to bring this together, not just on the budget side but we've also got to bring the leadership together to consider this before it ends up as a full blown proposal and the broader community is surprised by the amount of money and activities that are going forward driven by ICANN central versus this more organic approach that we're proposing; recognizing the two probably need to co-exist.

But there has to be some mechanism to bring them together. I thought that that might happen out of (Curt)'s framework proposal but then I understand that the rest of the constituency leaders did not participate in the second call.

So not to take up more time on this call but that's - we need to maybe - you and I maybe need to talk separately about how to actualize the next step of engagement because I kind of feel like we don't know what's happening on that right now. And it's - the timing's going to be critical.

If there's an ICANN outreach initiative that's going to have major amounts of funding in it such as what we just heard and we're proposing many outreach programs, it's difficult for us to know how to fit into the whole or to shape the whole.

(Janis Kolong): Right. No and I'll just quickly come back because I know we're over time here. I tried to stay away from mentioning any dollar because I don't have any control over dollars that go into the budget at all. And so the outreach is a - one of the FY13 priority that will be discussed with the community in the framework.

So it's from there that I know that, you know, the wakeup call is there and we need to organize the outreach and that's what (Curt) started to do. So it's a priority. And so that's where we know it's laid in.

We absolutely have just started with this. And the call so close to the holidays really weren't helpful, as we got involved with the House hearings and the Congressional hearings and everything kind of conglomerated together there before the holidays.

So I did put out the recording and then the transcript is due to me this week of that recording to make it even easier. So we do intend on following up with the community with further calls. There is absolutely the need to come back to the community.

We have only just started with the outreach. And the intent is not to go forward with a full-blown program until we do come back into the community. I have an 8:30 call this morning with the outreach team.

Rob Hoggarth from the policy team over the last couple weeks - the outreach activities that the policy team with the communities that they are liaising with have tried to incorporate in the past. And we are looking at how to incorporate metrics in the future. And I know that that's something that you have pushed and that you have even said last year you would be able to provide metrics on your outreach activities by following through.

So we're definitely kind of following your path and we will continue to. So please know that we are not going any further without keeping the community involved. And I'll make sure that (Curt) and I do get together with you separately to continue discussing this.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. I think it's really important because all of us have told you that we're putting outreach and participation in our - and yet we were the only ones besides the ALAC who thought it was a - who managed to make that call. So a lot of people are missing information.

So if you could - I'll send a separate email and Xavier I'll copy you. And if (Janis) and you and I and I'll see if Chris could join us, we each could just have a - I think it's really perhaps more important than - that we do that and not take up more time on this call.

(Janis Kolong): Right.

Marilyn Cade: But I...

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: I have to drop off here but just wanted to say thank you to Xavier and (Janis) and Juan for participating. It's been helpful - very helpful. Thank you.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you.

Man: Likewise, thanks. Thank you very...

Marilyn Cade: One quick thing before we all go. Rob...

Chris Chaplow: Go ahead Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: ...Hoggarth had no interaction with me as the Chair or Chris as the Vice Chair. So whatever interaction that Rob Hoggarth has had with the GNSO Policy Council has not at least for me and Tony can speak for his constituency - for me there's been no filtering down into the leadership of the constituency.

Man: I would agree with that.

(Janis Kolong): And Marilyn, we're talking the ICANN related activities right now. And I know that's what you're - you want to make sure that we are not inward but

we are coming, you know, not from a staff perspective only but out to the community.

I completely hear that and that's where the next level was to go with having the Webinars, which we have not been able to complete because of the Congressional hearings and the House hearings and the holidays coming up.

So again, Rob is gathering from and ICANN staff perspective and we know that we need to reach out to the community to get their perspective, absolutely. And so don't misunderstand. Rob is gathering activity that he knows from the policy team that have been working on. We need to get to that next step that we tried to get to before the holidays but we weren't able to complete all the Webinars and all the interactions.

So we're definitely only baby steps and our first steps and we will not proceed to a full-blown model and I know I can say this without (Curt) on the line. We will not be proceeding to that without the community interaction. We will not. But I - let's get a call together. I'd like to have (Curt) on that call too. But it's absolutely important and happy to do it.

Marilyn Cade: I'll give you dates for early next week for Chris and I. It's really a priority for us because if we get a motion coming out of the GNSO Council that we can't support and it creates confusion and anxiety within the constituency who then are putting in requests or don't put in requests because they think there's going to be some big mega committee that they can lobby, we're going to really have confusion. Okay (Janis)?

(Janis Kolong): Right. Right. And I've seen the GNSO working model so I know what you're talking about. Absolutely Marilyn. I look forward to it.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Fantastic.

Chris Chaplow: Well thank you. Thanks very much. I think we're going to have to wind the call up now. Thank you Xavier, Juan and (Janis).

Just to remind everybody that we do have a Wiki page for this group and it was in I think one of the emails I sent out. But if not, you can go to it through the community Wiki GNSO BC. And I put a number of deadlines on that try and keep us all on track including the toolkit deadlines.

Just one - I do notice that the framework plan is due out fairly soon. Xavier, is that still the - is that still on track?

Xavier Calvez: It's (date) but on track.

Chris Chaplow: Okay. So it is news that we're planning on our next meeting.

Xavier Calvez: Yeah, on the 17th. And while I have you and I should probably have started with that. I would like that we can organize a call after the publication and as soon as it makes sense for you guys but in order to go over the framework so that it is - we make it a little bit easier for you guys to get into it and to get a chance to ask questions upfront.

Not necessarily detailed questions for feedback from you but more making sure that you have the understanding that you need in order to start your work on the framework or any work that you would like to do on the framework.

So a call any time after the 17th in the few days following the 17th is what I'm suggesting to do. And what I - because probably Tony has dropped off and maybe Steve as well. I will probably just suggest an email - in an email to

have this call and everyone can then respond with in principle and in - if agreed on the timing that's preferable for this call.

It is for - to make us at your disposal for asking questions just to make sure you do understand the information that we're providing in there. And you can take that forward in your - on your work on the framework and we can circle back later. But at least you have the start meeting - kickoff meeting to help you guys think through the framework.

Chris Chaplow: (Okay).

Xavier Calvez: So that's...

Chris Chaplow: Yeah. That would be magnificent to get us going early on that rather than at the end of the comment period.

Xavier Calvez: Exactly. So we'll send an email so that we can get that date set for that.

Tony Holmes: It's Tony. I'd also appreciate that. Thank you.

Chris Chaplow: Great.

Xavier Calvez: Okay.

Chris Chaplow: Well I'll draw this call to an end. Thanks everybody and Ron Andruff by the way who joined us...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: Greetings to all.

Man: Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks very much and (Janis) I will send an email copy to Chris and we'll get the call together with (Curt) for - I think we have to be careful about the date for...

(Janis Kolong): Right.

Marilyn Cade: ...I know because of the launch but...

(Janis Kolong): The launch.

Marilyn Cade: ...but we'll...

(Janis Kolong): Okay.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. But we will figure it out and do it but we're going to have to do it before the Council meets. There's going to be huge confusion if we get a motion that some of the Councilors think they're going to create this big committee and just they - their leaders haven't participated in a Webinar and the transcript isn't out and most of them might have trouble finding time to read it anyway.

But, you know, we need to see if we can have some update information before people head off in a confusing direction.

Chris Chaplow: Right.

(Janis Kolong): Right.

Chris Chaplow: Thanks for your time everybody.

Man: Thank you.

(Janis Kolong): Thanks Chris. Thanks Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks guys.

Man: Thanks everyone.

Man: Bye everyone.

Man: Bye.

END