OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Julia. So good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. This is the Finance and Budget Subcommittee working group conference call on Wednesday the 11th of September, 2013. The time is 20:04 UTC. And today we have the pleasure of having the visit of Rob Hoggarth, who is senior director for policy development support; and Janice Douma Lange who is outreach engagement manager.

Both are going to be able to speak to us regarding our budget requests for fiscal year 14. And effectively we'll be able to ask questions and discuss the budget requests that we're, both the ones, I guess, that were granted and the ones that were not granted somehow.

We've got a full agenda that's for your perusal on the page, and without any further ado I think we can start with a roll call please.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Thank you Olivier. Julia here. Welcome on the Finance and Budget Subcommittee call on Wednesday, 11th September 2013 at 20 UTC. On the call today we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Darlene Thompson, Wolf Ludwig and Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

Our presenters today are Janice Lange and Rob Hoggarth. We have apologies from Roberto Gaetano. And from staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Carlos Reyes, and myself Julia Charvolen. May I please

---

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

remind all participants to please state your names before speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Julia. It's Olivier speaking now. We are now on agenda… At Large for the year 14 for financial year 14, which ever you want to call it, budget request. I'm not sure whether we have anything that needs to go on screen, but I'll hand the floor over to Rob Hoggarth and to Janice Douma Lange.

ROB HOGGARTH: Thank you Mister Chairman, Rob Hoggarth here. And thank you all very much for inviting us to participate. I'm hopeful that Janice will be able to join shortly because she is very good at clarifying these general statements I make.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Rob, this is Heidi, she's on.

ROB HOGGARTH: Okay. Great. Super. Thanks Janice, welcome. What I'd like to do is perhaps give you a general context over some evolution of staff operational support efforts, which will explain why Janice and I are on the call. And then give you the opportunity for us to dialogue about specific requests, or general areas where it looks like we're going in terms of the direction of the budget and resource support for the ICANN community.

More specifically, for you guy's purposes, the At Large, but also more generally if you would like. It's been a while since Fadhi came on board and brought some additional new ideas, concepts, and services including some additional new executives to the floor. And I think it's useful to note that whenever you've got new stuff, it's important to take the time and have the time to figure out how everything is going to work together operationally in the rest.

One of the areas where it's has been somewhat challenging, over time, sort of the melding, or determining where the lines are drawn with respect to the services provided by policy development support team, the more general operation of the global stakeholder engagement team, and under operational activities within ICANN.

I think that, Fadhi challenged us all to look operationally at how we can do better to constantly challenge us to improve. And one of the areas that became identified over time, which hasn't been actually converting an issue for the At Large community, but elsewhere and more generally in ICANN, is what's the right blending of sort of the liaison support that you have with the rest of the staff.

You guys have excellent support with Silvia, Heidi, Matt, and others. But doing that in a more programmatic way. And in particularly in areas like the budget, where we've got operational issues, have some very great [protection] issues, we know the details of that work but we may not be as skilled or as have as much time to actually do the communications and actually to work and collaborate with the community on not only communicating with Don, but learning and how to build better operational activity going forward.

So one of the concepts that Sally [?] and David Olive achieved a handshake on around the Durban timeframe was the recognition that, we are not the policy side… We need to devote some resources to more of this quote/unquote engagement role in terms of helping our subsequent matter experts in the operational side, share information, interact with all of you on a regular basis.

In terms of what's going on, can you give us more specifics? Can you provide us with [?] information and stuff from an operational standpoint that can make your job easier; either in terms of, just not having you spin your wheels when it comes time to prepare a document, when you're able to clarify a question or to get in touch with somebody a little bit faster than we've been able to do in the past.

And so one of the reasons why Janice and my positions have somewhat been evolved, and continue to evolve, in terms of this concept of outreach and engagement… One of the areas where we saw some immediate need, and we felt we could provide the most help immediately was in the budget are, particularly helping to communicate some of the decisions that have been made by the board, the board finance committee.

And do something that we really didn't do a good job with staff last year and the year before of just having a communication like this with those of you in the community who have the responsibility to just clarify where things stand, where things fit, what you can expect from an implementation standpoint, what has not been granted, potentially why. And then perhaps finding ways to build more into the future of how we can do this work better.

And maybe even be more successful in the request, or find ways that we can avoid the request all together and just get things into the regular budget process. So that's sort of all the background and context of why it's us talking to you. Hopefully, we can have a fruitful discussion in that Janice and I can answer most of your questions today. When we can't, and we're not the subject matter experts in everything, we'll be more than happy to setup and coordinate with Heidi, Silvia, Matt, and others what we need to do from a communications standpoint to make sure we get that back to you all as quickly as possible.

Let me stop there. Mister Chairman ask if you all, from a community standpoint, have any questions. I certainly want to give Janice the floor to clarify anything I might have said to make sure that I'm sharing information in a way that's understandable. So I'll pause for a moment for that.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Hey Rob and everybody. This is Janice. I'm happy with what you said. I think you're leading everybody down the correct path and I would rather leave the time to anybody on the line.

ROB HOGGARTH: Thanks. Thanks very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Rob and thanks very much Janice for this. Certainly, quite a few changes, I guess. I guess at this point in the call, does anyone on the call have any questions on all of these developments so

far? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. So I think that this is a clear signal that you may proceed forward.

ROB HOGGARTH: Great. Thanks very much Olivier. One clarification there, I would say yes, there has been development. It really is an evolution. This is something where I think we are committed, as staff, generally doing a better job at this work, and that's a constant mission.

We may have improvements and we may have obstacles or steps back, but we'll always look to all of your for more recommendations or thoughts about how the process can be improved, how it can work better, and I would hope now that there at least two others on the staff who have this area of accountability and interest, we have more focus – obviously it's not 100% of our job, but a substantial part and a growing part for us, is that maybe we have this dialogue on a more regular basis with you all.

That will be up to you all in terms of what you think you need out of a particular meeting, conversations, whether you just want Heidi to reach out to us to clarify things. Something to be built over time. So we're looking forward to that. It actually puts Janice and I into the position where – it's an area where we've got a lot of interest in, I think a commitment to you all in the community to make it work and improve it over time.

So we're kind of happy to be doing it, although I joke internally that I'm not sure whether I volunteered or I was volunteered for the assignment. Let me give you a couple of quick overview items just in terms of how

the process went this year, and potentially where it can go in the future, just some real high elevation points to share with you all.

The first I think is a general recognition that this community special request process was something that was born out of general community dissatisfaction with the overall budget process. It all come to a head back in the three or four meetings now at the Brussels meeting, the Brussels ICANN public meeting, in which basically the comment period for comments on the next fiscal year's budget was still going and didn't conclude until maybe a day before the Board meeting, at which the Board was going to make some decision on the next year's annual budget.

And a recognition that the process was not as effective as it should be. And Doug [Brenton] [?] at the time came up with this concept of this special community budget requests vehicle and channel if you will for addressing particular community interests or [?] address in the general budget.

I think that over time, as literally almost, I think, just this year was the first year we had somebody responsible for the project doing it a second year, where it was Xavier learning as he went last year, and had a little bit more traction going into this year. It's really been almost really invented or band-aided every year. And the challenge that we saw this year, of course, was that the ICANN public meeting at which the Board would normally make a decision about the annual budget, was actually going to take place in next year's fiscal year.

And so there was this odd contrivance of a fast track, and a regular track. I think there was some general concern about how that would work. I think it was less than perfectly, although the finance team, with assistance from other departments, was able to pull it off. So again, everybody thanks for your patience in terms of that approach.

But in terms of that general philosophy, I think in terms of where the staff would like to take this, is that the more we see, the more we respond, the more we're able to begin to put in place resources that you have all identified with the [?] with the resources that ICANN provides to the community. As that becomes more and more a part of ICANN's core budget work, becomes, for example, a part of the policy development support budget, or a part of the engagement or outreach budget of ICANN.

And that we don't put you all through having to make the same request every year, or different requests every year. What I would hope would happen over time is that the request can be really focused and say, "Okay, over the following, the past years, we have been successful in making ICANN appreciate that we need this resource or that resource," and so the request each year can be much shorter or less smaller in number.

This year, many of you will observe that [?] at 60 separate requests. And that presents a challenge and a number of fronts. So that's one general theme. The other, and second general theme I would like to mention to you is that the focus of the inquiries this year, I think, going forward from the staff and the Board Finance Committee perspective, was the focus on resources and not on dollars.

And let me clarify what that means. People would come in with various requests, there would be [?] what something would cost, or expectations. Staff and the Board I think wanted to look at on the consideration of these various proposals, and certainly on those that have been granted into the implemented as really resources. So that from a community standpoint, you weren't finding yourselves focusing on, "Gee, am I going to save $50 here? Can we get a better deal there?"

To really focus on what the intent of the activities are, to identify goals, metrics, and expectations, and then really move toward the actual work as opposed to getting a grant and then having to start all over, budgeting and figuring out how to do that. For us, from a staff perspective, the interest was having staff take on that burden. And for example, I'll use one thing, a little travel slot. Where it is the staff's responsibility to determine what is standard classification or a category of what a trip might cost, and then focus on delivering that and managing that process consistently with the overall travel guidelines.

And not be in a situation where someone's trip is going to cost $1500 and that was $100 over some artificial limit, and someone might find themselves going through great hoops and obstacles to make that work. That doesn't mean that staff going forward wouldn't work very hard to manage the cost, and to approach a program in a broad and specific way, but really to have you focus, and us focus on delivering resources to you and not so much tied up on the dollars.

So those are two major general themes, I think, coming out of the most recent staff experience. Janice did I capture that? Have I missed anything?

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Nope. You're doing great so far. I like being the silent type.

ROB HOGGARTH: Great. You do a very good job of that, thank you.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Thank you.

ROB HOGGARTH: So let me stop there, and Olivier again, I'll pause for questions or observations or comments from you and the committee so that we're all on the same page there and explaining things in an accessible way.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Rob. It's Olivier speaking. So I open the floor for questions. Just my own thoughts are this certainly shows a lot of changes, I think I for one see all of these changes of being something of a good thing. I see that in a very positive light, so ultimately I realize this year was a pivotal year where there were changes, and I know that we have shown some frustration in the not so far away past, or not so past, past, as one could say perhaps, with the fact that we were always rushed to do things.

And there never seemed to be enough time for the ALAC itself to ask its members and to us, our wider community for input. But certainly, this enhanced collaboration and certainly enhanced amount of

communication between the community and also within finance. I think I see there is certainly going to be some brief discussion within the staff structure as well.

That's something that I personally find very, very positive. I wonder if any of my colleagues have any thoughts as well to share with us. And seeing no one putting their hand up, you must have stunned them so much that, if they still are there with their gaping mouths. I guess I'll let you continue to awe us please.

ROB HOGGARTH: Well thank you. I don't know if I like that visual, but thank you. A couple of things….

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I hear Tijani, but I don't see Tijani… Okay.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I couldn't raise my hand, there is a problem with Adobe Connect, so I would like to say something.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. As for the process, I think that Xavier and his team has done a lot of [?] and we are working with them since,

more than one year now to improve the process. And I think that the improvement will be sent, and not this year because unfortunately we couldn't work the operation plan and the budget according to the strategic plan since the strategic plan would be ready after the operation plan and budget. We cannot wait for it, we have to start working.

So I think that starting from the next year, we will be very, very good place to make something very good and I would like to thank Xavier and his team for their effort, and I hope that starting from next year we will have really a better budget than we are doing now.

But now, already we have a lot of improvement, and as for as the special request, or the different request from the community, I think that the process we are using now is really transparent, and perhaps there are still some questions that are not well answered, but more or less it is very transparent.

And three years ago, we couldn't have any activity funded, if it is not already in the budget and [?] budget, and something additional, something that the community wants to do. So once again, I thank you Olivier and your team and I think that it would improve in the next year. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. I can certainly echo your points, absolutely. So we can go back to you Rob.

ROB HOGGARTH: Thank you very much. Tijani, Olivier, thank you for your comments there. We'll certainly pass that on to our finance colleagues. There really has been a lot of thought and reflection I think on the part of the senior management team to try to, as you point out Tijani, to sort of tune up the work on the annual plans with the broader strategic plans.

I think you saw some of that struggle this year with the SO special community budget request in that some of the community asked for, "Hey we want to move forward with a strategic outreach plan for our region or our community."   And some of those requests were not granted with sort of the advice that, yes, there is a broader outreach effort, and we really need…

This challenge that says we need to figure out more broadly what we're doing before we commit resources to a shorter term planning. And yet at the same time, we see the struggle with but, and this is your point Tijani, we can't wait to… What are we going to do? Wait for two months before we can do anything?

That does not make sense, so let's figure out a way to provide some other types of resources, some other programs, that may address some, granted not all of the interests and desires of the community. By potentially combining other resources and packages, or by just fielding more intense work with the core policy development team of engagement is already in place.

So I think you echoed some of the themes and some of the struggles that management has had that that has [?] through this staff perspective. I appreciate that acknowledgement [?] there is larger

forces at work. I'm challenged, Olivier, in terms of how you would like me to address that there are a couple of ways and I'm also conscious of time, we can – I can just elapse because the document has been out from the finance team, I'm reproducing now for when the budget being approved, that various requests were resolved in various ways.

If I went through each one we just might run out of time with me talking. It might be useful for those on the call if they have particular questions about a certain area that Janice or I can address. How would you like to approach it?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Right. I think we can perhaps just think on the ones that are on that FY 14 special budget request, and just basically look at the decision and if we can get some clarity as to where this is going for the ones that have been granted and the ones that have not been granted.

Because there is certainly an interest in that. One request from LACRALO, one from APRALO, one from NARALO, and I think that it might be worth spending just a small amount of time on those.

ROB HOGGARTH: Certainly because I'm also open to, and we've been doing this on the GNSO side of [?] sort of having a broader group discussion like this one, and then in individual organizations or for folks who have a specific request, want to talk about that in particular, I'm more than happy to have an individual conversation or discussion with the management

team of that particular organization. I could of sort of walk through the details.

I like the idea of having a group of you all together at once so that we can sort of outline the broader pre-steps of sort of where we're going. And maybe in discussing the first one or two on the list, you guys will begin to see a theme in terms of how things are approached or handled.

It might work best to go in reverse order. I reference to you all the issue of, that was unique to this year, a fast track versus regular track, if you will. And as I explained, what sort of drove that was the timing of the ICANN meeting, what we saw in terms of some of the requests, versus the challenge I think through the internal team, was that the fact wasn't very clear of what fast track meant versus regular track.

And with those two deadlines, a number of groups went ahead and submitted what otherwise would be considered a regular or an annual request in the fast track. And so we saw several requests that were quote/unquote [?] or decision postponed until the regular track was resolved. The fast track, to save us some time, was probably just set that to the side for just a moment.

The fast track decisions that I believe were made by the Board in the April timeframe, and so I think the challenge that exists there, this was prior to Janice and I adopting new personas, is that there is more than great communication on the fast track team. And so, grants were being made, [pearls] were being made, there were other decisions either yes's or no's.

And they weren't, although they were in the Board resolution or whatever, they weren't – and they were on the Wiki page, they weren't really communicated. So there maybe, I recognize, some hanging questions for some of those activities, and those I would be happy to address. Let's look at the regular track, so some of the newer things that really just came out of the August 22nd decision by the Board.

And let me recognize first that, and we should all acknowledge, the Board is making that decision on August 22nd, we're almost two months into the fiscal year. So that immediately begins to press challenges in terms of implementation. It certainly puts some pressure on staff, potentially puts some pressure on those of you will have implementation responsibilities in [?].

We recognize that, and we're hopeful that the collaboration of Heidi, Janice, me and others will smooth over those rest stops for those of you who are experiencing it. I'm literally referencing the document, I think, that Heidi has linked on the agenda page, as I come up through the regular track, the first item that I see is the NARALO FY 14 budget request.

Now, let's first discuss the decision recommendation column, generally and then specifically for NARALO. A past difficulty that Xavier's team acknowledged was, this is in particular last year, what's a yes/no? What's a no mean? In some cases, there was other language employed for the FY 13 plan, and so a decision was made with respect to FY 14 to be very clear about a yes or no. However, were there was a no, to say, where appropriate, but.

In FY 13 was, "Yes you've been granted something, but it's limited in the following ways." And I think the communications challenge there was many folks looked and saw yes, immediately assumed their entire request was granted, and that created some confusion. Now the risk that Xavier decided to take this time was to say no, and risk disappointing someone and then follow up and say, "But, we tried to address it in the following manner."

So it's a different orientation where no means no but there are clarifying factors or other things that come into play. So let's look at the NARALO request on FY 14 A07-02, request number 18. Where it says no and then it says see note in explanation column, see description for community outreach travel pilot program below. This is one of those items that I mentioned in response to Tijani's comment that, I think the Board and senior staff really are focused on trying to develop a broader strategy for outreach, and more broadly getting community confirmation through the direction that ICANN is going.

So the no piece of this I think was a couple of aspects. One, that there was a struggle to approve individual groups going off and potentially having different strategies that were not consistent with the overall strategy. And so I think there was some reluctance to approve or provide resources for that.

But also a recognition that, particularly in the NARALO request, there were a lot of activities that could conceivably be supported by existing staff resources. And I'm not speaking specifically about Heidi, Matt, and Silvia, although clearly they would provide some coordination, or support of some of the efforts, but essentially an expectation that there

would be some coordination on the staff level and with the community to really identify some of the low hanging fruit and areas where some of the planning could begin.

Some of the work could be done. Maybe even some of the planning could be done using a core in kind resources. The other theme that sort of fits into this node that runs through a number of other responses, not just for ALAC, but for other groups, was a third general theme in addition to the other two that I mentioned to you earlier. And that is, an organizational philosophy not to provide grants of money.

What does that mean? It means that wherever possible, that resources are provided either by core ICANN staff, and if there is a gap there then there needs to be an overall budget discussion about well, gee, ICANN, you don't have enough staff, how do we get you more for this resource? Or two, that if there is a resource made available, it would be coordinated and managed by staff and not directly by the community.

So those are some general themes and principles that were considered and utilized in terms of all of the requests that came in this year, that contribute, I think, to the decision about this NARALO request. The final piece, with respect to this particular request, and then I'll pause if you have any questions or just for anybody else in the general themes is… As part of this recognition that says, well, it doesn't make sense to completely foreclose anybody from…

And particularly a long standing part of the ICANN community like NARALO, or LACRALO, or APRALO, or any of the other groups in At Large or elsewhere, to find a way to provide some alternative means, or

something that is consistent with those general principles to help out. And so something referenced in the decision and in the explanation notes is that this outreach pilot program, which staff will be announcing in the next couple of weeks or so in much more detail, I can only give you the general parameters at this point and during this call.

But to sense that individual groups would be given allocated resources to conduct some regional travel to supplement the current resources that they have, so that they would have the capability of some short term targeted efforts, maybe building into a longer term effort. But essentially, providing some flexibility and some resources so that you all have some capability to begin to reach out and do more than you're doing now for an outreach perspective.

So in the ideal circumstance, we would have a conversation about implementation going forward that says, NARALO may come back to Silvia or Heidi and say, "Well we really want to do this. How should we approach this?" And then us collaborating with you to find the best way to contribute to the overall outreach effort, to identify maybe some activities or events where NARALO representatives would go to promote ICANN or the NARALO organization itself, maybe to stir up new recruits, improve the Q factor of the organization.

Otherwise promote what the organization is doing. So a lot of explanation there for just one of the items, Olivier, but that's the general theme. And I think most of the specifics for that program, I'm happy to entertain questions from Darlene or anybody else on that.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Hello. This is Silvia. Just a point of information, just a comment for perhaps moving forward, for future requests. I was thinking one thing that I heard from the RALOs was that, once a request is submitted, afterwards there is not much opportunity to provide additionally information, or an exchange in a two way conversation with persons reviewing the requests.

So maybe that would be one effort in which we could improve this process, where staff could be a channel between the community and the reviewers and the decision makers, and we can provide additional information, improve the request, and tailor request so that they are acceptable.

ROB HOGGARTH: That's an excellent point Silvia. This is Rob again. I don't think, and this is going to sound like an excuse, I don't think the finance team anticipated that they would get [?] requests. I think they perhaps underestimated the challenges of fast track versus a regular track, and managing that entire process while they were learning a number of new internal systems and how to integrate them through the famous at task system that some of you may have heard about that Fadhi has introduced through My ICANN.

And other internal organizational quote/unquote improvements. So I think it's… This year it ultimately became overwhelming, but I think it's very much worth exploring how we can incorporate that sort of feedback loop or something else, something else like that in future, FY 15, FY 16 budget preparation efforts.

What I would hope is, that now with sort of the, and I don't mean to overcommit you or GNSO on this, but the fact that we now we have this role, we're partnering up and developing working approaches with Heidi, and we do that with Silvia and Matt too, in terms of making sure that we're building those channels of communication, that ideally would be able to do that in helping you put the requests together.

Maybe having the conversation that has been requested being developed, and then finding ways of having that good sort of interaction once the requests are in…

SILVIA VIVANCO: …that's the point of maybe we can together work to make the proposal very, very tight. That every response is addressed and we are sure that it's like bullet proof, it's something that is very consistent with the criteria and the possibilities of being accepted are increased in that case.

ROB HOGGARTH: That's a very good point.   Let me mention another important consideration here, that we've supplied to them as more of… That we use for this process depends really, consistently that is the concept of criteria. That's something that Xavier I think identified last year, and for a number of different reasons, we've not fully produced or vetted prior to this year.

Tijani, you guys might have even got that as part of Xavier's separate budget and prove his efforts. The concept that it really helps you as

community members, as people who are considering or seeing that there is a whole in the operating plan that doesn't provide for a certain resource. And you go to ask for it, well you don't have criteria or an understanding of some general principles in terms of what's inbound and what's out of bounds, there is the potential for a lot of ways to time and effort.

If you go to a proposal that is not consistent with the general ICANN budget philosophy. But maybe just been developed three months ago that wasn't, it's only been in the Board finance committee. So I'm very hopeful that you'll have comment opportunities, that you will have an opportunity to share some draft principles with the staff has put together, and that we all can contribute to really have something very clear going into the FY 15 process.

So that there are criteria, there are guidelines, and that I think, will help fashion a request as well Silvia, so thanks for that observation.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Rob, and next we have a queue at the moment. So Darlene Thompson first.

DARLENE THOMPSON: Hi there. Darlene Thompson speaking. Rob I really appreciate what you said. That was actually very interesting, especially when you're talking about the outreach pilot project and such like that. So just so that I am clear, so that I can report back to my group, basically our request for

outreach is being denied. We're being told no too, but that it will be basically as the ICANN team.

As the ICANN team, we will be going after a lot of the same objectives anyway. So we should be able to get most of what we're trying to accomplish done anyway. In a nutshell, do I have that correct?

ROB HOGGARTH: I think that's a fair characterization Darlene. The key elements there is that with any language is that the devil is in the details. I think from a coordination standpoint, and I have – I don't see the list of who Janice communicates with from the overall outreach program perspective.

I don't know if you have NARALO representatives in those efforts, that would be certainly one avenue just so you guys can get plugged into the overall effort. In terms of some of these other things that will flesh out here in the next couple of weeks. So the original outreach pilot program, I think that given what I saw of the NARALO proposal, there can certainly be… Work towards that ultimate objective during this fiscal year.

And I would hope by participating in the broader efforts that can help you guys really focus on your efforts going forward.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: And Rob, this is Janice, and everybody. I just want to go back and reiterate it's a couple of things back from Silvia. I transitioned from the finance team so I'm not sure how much with their new team, in spring

this happened, but I note they were trying to post all of the requests onto the finance Wiki, on the community Wiki.

And encouraging community members to read them, and to comment within themselves. Because we firmly do believe that there is a large part of this that is about themselves, looking at the different requests and understanding more that way. So if that didn't quite work out, certainly put that back to the finance team because if any community At Large certainly is adept at using a community Wiki, and not afraid to be vocal on it, which I think is a great example. Also just from an overall outreach perspective, and as Rob and I are working to find the merge point between SO and AC engagement and outreach and engagement, and where this all kind of comes together.

From an outreach perspective from ICANN, we are really trying to encourage that all the communities at least provide representation at any calls or at the interactive sessions that we started at the ICANN meeting, in hopes that we build programs that everyone in ICANN can benefit from, while still understanding that the reason that we have separate groups in the ICANN multi-stakeholder model, is because there are different voices and different needs.

And the reason that we're doing regional strategies is that we have different voices and different needs in the different regions of ICANN. So from an overall perspective, even as we're saying, maybe we devote some staff resources to helping create firmer, tighter, more understandable requests, from a budget standpoint all still cannot be achieved through this method, but so much more could be achieved perhaps if we figured out exactly good strategies and good plans that

work for the community in general, and then what needs to be customized from an ICANN operational perspective for the individual groups and regions.

So again, I just want to reemphasize the fact that even with all the work, we will never have the budget to grant every single individual request, but by working together, from an ICANN multi-stakeholder community perspective, if we can build stronger, better programs that can be incorporated into the budget to carry forward, I think that's also a great way to look at things.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Janice. Next in line we have Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. I echo what the remark of Silvia, and I would like to say that we experience it last year. We had an interaction between the finance staff and the community about the additional request before the decision was made. It was for better comprehension perhaps, you express your need in the right way so people in the final don't exactly what you want, and perhaps they could say no while they can say yes.

So this interaction happened last year. This year it didn't happen because a lot of things. This year is a transition year as you know. We go from the traditional budget to an [?] task budget. So there is a conversion, if you want, and it's for another effort that the finance staff had to do. And also, this year we had two tracks, fast track and normal

track, so this is also time consuming and this is also a reason why perhaps this interaction didn't happen this year.

So I think this is another very good and very interesting reason that this interaction didn't happen. You know, we decided on a set of criteria for evaluation of those requests. We decided on them together. There was, if you want, an interaction between the staff and the community about them. And one of the main criteria for a project or a request to be approved is that it has to be related to the strategic plan for objectives such [?] priorities, to strategic plan priorities.

This year, we didn't have the strategy plan priorities, because the strategic plan was the strategic plan of the previous system. So we had a strategic plan, but we didn't follow it more or less. So one of the main criteria for decision cannot be there since we didn't have the priorities taken from the strategic plan.

I think that the improvement of the process will lead to such an interaction in the future. I have to recall you, or remind you of that the main objective of the improvement of the process is to have more interaction of the community, and sufficiently had from the budget decision so that things can be changed before the budget is sent to the Board for decision.

And I do think, and I do hope that for the next year we will have an interaction between the request is sent to the finance department and the decision on those requests, so that if there is a misunderstanding – also we can have feedback from the finance staff that explain that perhaps for this particular request it is not possible this year.

So I think that it is a very, very good point Silvia raised, and I think it would better for next year. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. I think we also have to move on as well. But if I may echo this, there have been some instances of, as you know, the format for filing a request being quite [?] of the explanation being misunderstood by the finance department, and then it would have probably had [?] in just a quick email being fired over and said, "Well, look, we don't follow this and what you're looking for here."

Rather than building it up and having some misunderstanding as to what the request really is. But I think the point has been made and is understood, and I certainly think with you Rob and Janice, there will be this extensive, more extensive bridge rather than just sending something, lumping it over the wall, and waiting a couple of months until finance lobs the package back with the answers to the budget request.

I'm a little mindful of the time. Could we perhaps move on to the next request please Rob?

ROB HOGGARTH: Sure. If you would like me to do that. Yeah, I'm very conscious of the time too. And I apologize. I told Heidi, "Yeah, 15 minutes should be fine. No problem." That hasn't been the case. The next one down my list here I think is the LACRALO request FY 14 B09-01 track request number 56. This also, consistent with my previous comments not no,

but. On said no, they said, "Resources to be made available in the core budget. So note explanation column."

So the concept here, as I understood it, was again to try to take aspects of the request, and the desire for resources by the community, and the feedback from the Board and senior management is, a lot of this looks like it can be accomplished by staff resources.

The challenge there becomes, now that we look at implementation it's Heidi, Matt, Silvia, Janice and I looking at each other and saying, "Huh? You want us to do another job here?" Or, are there ways for us to be able to fold in some of the LACRALO desires here in terms of outreach, in terms of support. If I recall this request appropriately, much of the extension that they were asked was related to actual travel.

And again, I think part of the staff response here was to focus on, "Okay, we can't offer – we can't grant this particular from all the other requests, but let's find a way to provide a program or a resource which gives this community that travel support, that outreach support, if you will, to allow them to do and conduct some outreach in their region."

I think the goal here was to assure an ALS from every country in the region. And so, again, I think the theme here was to find ways to utilize the different resources, let's collaborate and get as much discussion as consistent with the overall outreach program, and try to use that package or pull together those variety of different resources to use LACRALO in terms of this outreach activity, so that they can make some progress in this fiscal year.

There is one other piece here that was somewhat different from the NARALO request, and I just wanted to acknowledge it, and that was here because I guess LACRALO was farther along with respect to some of their ideas that, there was an interest in handouts or leave behinds. And so, a sense of some publication support and things like that. And that has, for the most part, been absorbed now into the core policy [?] budget.

So there are resources for that that exist. The reasons why, and this is true for some of the other issues, it says no is because funds and resources are not being targeted right to LACRALO to have it done, but instead they are being handled within the core ICANN budget resource bucket, if you will. I'll pause there for some comments and questions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Rob. I don't see any hands up at the moment, but it's well taken. And certainly having already discussed in other ways some of what's coming up with regards to outreach and support for outreach activities, I agree that there is certainly going to be some movement on that. The requests which were made will probably be partially fulfilled at least as far as some of the outreach is concerned, through this new system that will soon be rolled out.

So, shall we move on with the next request which is the APRALO request? And where, I must say, I'm a little confused on that one because I see that there is a request for the 4th and the 5th of September 2013, whilst we're dealing at the moment with a standard track, I

thought this was to be a fast track request. But I'm completely confused. So I'll let you explain what's going on Rob. Thank you.

ROB HOGGARTH: I'll let an ATL executive clarify my comments here in terms of that. As I recall, there was actually a fast track request focused on IGF Bali, but then a more regular track request looked at more regional IGF participation and activities maybe on a national or regional level. So again, I think that the perspective here from staff and Board perspective was to say, "Okay, we're looking and we've identified this outreach, this regional outreach pilot program idea."

It's called Community Outreach Travel Pilot Program in the document, but we didn't like that acronym so now we have a different one. Was to essentially say, okay, the fundamental core here that we see is a request for the capability to go out and meet the community, or meet the prospects where they are. To promote ICANN, or APRALO, or in the case of any organizations within At Large is that consistent being.

And so I think, that's what was being addressed, or supposed to be addressed in some limited way with this outreach pilot program effort. There is an additional piece of the explanation that's been thrown into this, that talks about the Speaker's Bureau. Because I think there are elements in the regular track, APRALO request that talks about delivering speakers to an event. And one of the other general principles that I sort of have applied over in several years, is this resistance or reluctance to provide travel support to non ICANN meetings.

Many of you have been with ICANN for long period of time and have seen the travel support function or resource in ICANN grow considerably. It's really grown in the last couple of years, and I think underlying the response to a lot of the requests that included travel was that the outreach, the IGF, or the ICANN public meetings was a reluctance to commit to permanent new travel resource obligations.

And so, along with this request, LACRALO request, I'll mention also the EUR RALO request, but [?] note that a general theme that says, wow, we're getting a lot of requests for travel. To use a familiar family term that we did, they were all requests – they were all in similar categories, they were all [?] but each one was different.

We had an apple request, an orange request, a banana request. But they were all requests of the same category, so the sense that we got feedback on [?], when you guys create a program that addresses the overall request for outreach support, and then package it in a way that we've got a consistent system, where there is some consistent principles and practices.

And we can really evaluate this over a longer period of time. So that next year we don't have requests for three trips from this group, nine trips from that group, eight trips from that group, going to different things or describing different activities or concepts, and let's come up with a program where individual community has flexibility within a certain allocation and within a certain general parameters to do whatever they think is best, what's unique to their particular community culture, regional culture, or regional priority.

And so that, and I apologize. I keep referring to this, oh, we're going to announce this program. But we at staff were essentially given the responsibility of beginning to put the parameters and framework to develop this pilot program that is going to be in existence in FY 14, and then depending upon your feedback and how other things, and observations about how successful the outreach event and things like that will be, we'll decide whether we'll do that for FY 15.

And ultimately, if that makes sense to be a permanent part of the ICANN budget. A broad, Olivier, explanation for not just the APRALO request, EUR RALO, and a couple of others.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: For all three of them, yes, and a few others. Okay. Fantastic. Any questions from the floor? I don't see anyone on the virtual floor raising their hands at the moment. I think that's pretty straightforward. Oh, Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Dev you have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Dev Anand Teelucksingh speaking. My question is regarding the various regional strategy working groups that have been created, and therefore these groups have different regional strategies, which includes regional engagement plans. How would the budgeting of such plans be handled?

ROB HOGGARTH: That's an excellent question, Dev. That's beyond my immediate knowledge capabilities. It's something that Janice and I will take back.

My understanding is that the regional plans or strategies are largely the purview and management responsibility of the regional vice president in the region of which those strategies have been, or will be, created.

And so they either have budgets to address the implementation of, or the development of the various regional strategies. And that is likely to be managed directly by them. Candidly one of the, that the staff brings towards in terms of this concept of creating an outreach program on a pilot basis to respond to many requests within At Large and other communities for outreach resources, was to find a way to marry those two concepts.

The regional strategies, and perhaps the strategy of an individual RALO that may or may not be in perfect synch with that ICANN strategy. Now a lot of… Janice and her colleague's job moving forward is to true up those as much as possible. We've already noted Tijani's comments that well, it doesn't happen immediately, it's under development.

And so the pilot effort, is a way to sort of bridge that gap. And the way that typically we're going to do that is to say, when someone comes forward with an application or a proposal, if you will, to travel to a specific event or outreach purposes, that at the very least one of the checkboxes will be coordination with and approval by the regional vice president.

So trying to forge some connection, some coordination, some information sharing between those two pieces of ICANN's overall strategy. And I'm hopeful, as I'm sure many of you are, that at some point those individual strategies will fold into the overall ICANN

strategic plan and from top to bottom, they'll understand how they all fit together.

I don't think we're there at the moment. Was that responsive Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. This is Dev. Yes, it is. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Dev, and thanks very much Rob for this answer. Any other questions or comments on the process or on the requests? There was a question which was asked by Wolf Ludwig a bit earlier in the chat, which asked that all together how many of the requests, I guess, looking at both the fast track and also the normal track requests, how many of the RALO special requests were finally approved?

Do you have this information at hand Rob?

ROB HOGGARTH: No I don't have need specifics on a notepad. I can, however, fairly quickly – as I look at the list that Xavier produced, if you – and this is not the appropriate way to do it, but if you were to just tabulate yes's and no's, the percentage will look pretty small.

But, the challenge there is it's no but, as opposed to yes but. So I think that it's fair to say that aspects of every request have been… Resources have been identified to satisfy aspects of every request that was submitted. I think I can say that with a completely straight face. How

you parse… Well, I only got 10% of what I wanted. I only got 20% of what I wanted. I think is in the eye of the beholder.

If you look at the overall request, I think again, the total is somewhere around 50 or 60, and I think we have now project ID's in our system for 22 or 23 of those. So more than a third, and close to 40% I think were granted in terms of the requests. I would submit, Wolf Ludwig and others, that it's not the fairest way to look at straight numbers because again, an effort was made to address every one of the requests in some way, except where, for example, they completely violated or were unable to be…

Violate an ICANN principle, or budget, or organizational management, or just not able to – we didn't have the resources to grant. For example, I think the BCS for bank account support, that Xavier doesn't have the infrastructure for it at the moment so that was a denied request, so that was a no, and that's almost a no, no. As opposed to, a request for some outreach support that is being granted through core activities or through one of these new programs where we're creating, we're implementing over the next month or so.

And I hope that was responsive.

UNIDENTIFIED: Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I press the button. I was not muted, and I just muted myself before speaking. Okay. Let me start again then. I noticed that the FY 14

special budget request Wiki, which are the pages that were updated and I guess maintained by the finance department, don't appear to have been updated recently. So when one looks at our agenda, we are pointing toward those, we have the results of the fast track budget requests with the summary, and the decision, etcetera.

There doesn't appear to be any similar publication of the regular track budget requests on that page. Will this be updated soon?

ROB HOGGARTH: That is an excellent observation. I will certainly pass on that feedback to finance team. I think it's a matter of how they want or should do that. And given their current staffing challenges, I would suggest that they would potentially just, they would post links…

Or somehow update the page and then post links to the PDF and Excel spreadsheets that they shared in the announcement that went out two weeks ago or whatever. So I think that would probably be how that update was implemented. So even if you interrupt my response, Olivier, to say, "Yes we'll make sure as best we can that the finance update that page," I don't see a thing much more than some links produced there.

But I agree that if it hasn't been updated, it should be because we need to have all that stuff kept up to date.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: This is Janice. I'll take that one up since it would be easy for me to just walk down the hall.

ROB HOGGARTH: Okay. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Janice. So we'll have an action item for you to walk down the hall. No walking astray in other places, you just have a straight line to the right office. Just one last one, this really – the reason for the [?] being needed is really because we all have to report to our communities and just reporting like this without an actual document in hand is pretty hard.

Especially since conference calls, as you will note, this is just the Finance and Budget Subcommittee, we've got one person from each region of the world. They're going to have to report back to their community and to their RALO, and it would certainly help to have all of the documents easily linked and being able to consult them so as to just point people to the documents rather than having to repeat the same thing 10, 15, 20 times. So that's the main reason.

Any other questions from anybody on this call?

ROB HOGGARTH: Thank you Olivier. This is Rob. I just would like to make the observation that again, and renew the offer, that if any of you want to have me sit in on one of your calls when you're doing the briefing, or updating folks, perhaps you already want to start thinking about FY 15 in light of this experience fresh in your mind, how you might approach that differently.

Please let me know or let me know through Heidi. My email is Robert dot Hoggarth at ICANN dot org, the standard format. So please reach out and I'm more than happy to collaborate with you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Well thanks very much Rob for joining us, and thank you Janice as well. It's great to see that there is a renewed link now, and certainly a lot more follow up. And I've noticed also, aside from the process which we're dealing with, being the SO and AC request, etcetera, the overall both finance but also strategic planning is definitely going through, I would say, positive change.

And the group that you're speaking here, the Finance and Budget Subcommittee, deals both with the finance part and with the strategic part. So I think that we're all looking forward to continue working with you, and certainly continue to improving the process. And if we can improve it on our side as well, that would be absolutely great.

So please keep us updated about the improvements on your side and perhaps how we could improve our part of the process. So as to get better and more input from the end users that we're supposed to serve.

I think that with this, we are 15 minutes beyond the end of this call, so I thank both of you. I thank staff of course for having arranged this. And I thank the members of the Finance and Budget Subcommittee for this call. And with this, this call is now adjourned.

[Various people say goodbye and thank you]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]