KATHY SCHNITT: Good afternoon and good evening. This is the At-Large Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program Review Team call on Wednesday, 20th August 2014 at 16:00 UTC. On the call today we have Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Oksana Prykhodko, Fatimata Seye Sylla, Allan Skuce, Ali AlMeshal, Cheryl Langdon-Orr. We have apologies from Juan Manual Rojas.

From staff we have Joe Catapano, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Gisella Gruber, Terri Agnew and myself, Kathy Schnitt. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Back over to you, Dev Anand.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you very much. On this call today we're going to be reviewing the CROPP FY 15 procedure, and the purpose of this call is because there are slight differences on how the CROPP works for FY 15, which is happening now, as opposed to the previous physical year 2014.

Also on the Agenda I want to bring up a discussion on how the CROPP Team Members can work closer with RALO representatives. I've noticed there seems to be some ambiguity regarding how the RALOs are supposed to coordinate their outreach efforts. I'll bring that as a discussion point.

First, an email was sent out to all existing CROPP Team Members, asking whether they wish to confirm they're willing to be in the CROPP Review Team for FY 15. I've not seen any emails contrary. It looks like all the

	Members replied that they're willing to stand on the CROPP Review Team. Can someone from staff confirm this?
SILVIA VIVANCO:	Could you repeat your question please?
DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:	My question is, a call for confirmation of the existing Members standing for FY 15, I want to confirm with staff whether any CROPP Review Team member indicated that they'll not be able to continue being on the Review Team?
SILVIA VIVANCO:	I haven't seen any email with this information. I believe that nobody has said that, but I'll check and get back to you on this.
DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:	Okay. Olivier?
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	I believe everyone's confirmed to remain on the CROPP.
DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:	Excellent. Once that's confirmed we can move ahead to the next Agenda Item. Otherwise we'll have to consider how we'd select CROPP Review Team Members, but since everyone's confirmed we can move to the next Agenda Item. That's the review of the FY 15 procedure. Now,

I've put two links on the Agenda page, and I wonder if… I'm trying to figure out the best way to do this. What I might want to do is share my screen, and then I'll walk you through various pages.

Once I do this I won't be able to see hands raised. Staff, please let me know if anyone raises their hand. Just to go over the procedure for the RALOs to apply for funding for outreach trips, perhaps I should also go through it. This is what I've written: "The RALO CROPP Review Team Members, in coordination with RALO Leaders and the Members on the ALAC Sub-Committee on Outreach, and ALAC Sub-Committee on Finance and Budget, complete the draft forms on the CROPP FY 15 Wiki, eight weeks before any such proposed travel takes place."

If you were to click on that link – and this is the change that's happened for FY 15. Previously for FY 14 you had to use a Google form, because there was no easy way to collect the information regarding a travel proposal for us to review. You had to create a Google form and so forth. For FY 15 the CROPP administrators noticed what we were doing and there's this space on the Wiki where we could have our drafts to submit the travel proposals for us to consider.

Let's say for example there's a trip proposed for EURALO. Our CROPP Review Team Members will then go to "EURALO trip proposal draft" and then fill out the trip proposal on the Wiki. It's the same information that was there previously. The key difference is that there's no alternate traveler as there was in FY 14, because it was felt that having that field in there didn't quite work.

EN

If something unforeseen happened and the main traveler was unable to attend, then the alternate traveler would have been called up very suddenly and it was not really feasible for that alternate traveler to be on standby to just drop everything and jump on a plane.

What happens now is that if there's something happening with the main traveler for an outreach trip that's been approved, and something happens, then Constituency Travel will get involved, as well as the CROPP, the Review Team Members, they'd then get involved to see what person could then go, and try and sort it out in that short time possible.

Ideally, the intent is that the alternate traveler would be from the same country as the primary traveler, so that there's no alterations to the plane ticket that's booked. That's the draft form. I've also noted here that the proposed travel must meet the terms and obligations for At-Large travel requests for the CROPP. For the most part these are unchanged.

The idea is that each RALO has up to five regional travel allocations, and the travel has to conclude before June 30th 2015, and must originate and conclude within the same region. Any outreach event can be attended by multiple persons, but then that traveler's counted as [utilizing 08:39] one of the RALO travel allocations.

I realize that this part here should be removed, because as I mentioned earlier there's no alternate traveler so I have to remove that line and I'll do that after this call. This part as well is unchanged. Going back to the procedure again, within two weeks, and given that the CROPP requires

six weeks' notice, we have to do the following: the CROPP Review Team would review the information in a draft form, answer any clarifying questions as to the purpose and goals of the proposed trip and all the details provided.

Then the CROPP Review Team Members would update the draft from the draft form, based on the feedback from the CROPP Review Team and their RALO, and answer any clarifying questions. Once approved by the CROPP Review Team the RALO CROPP Review Team Members would get confirmation and approval from ICANN's Stakeholder Engagement Vice President from the region regarding the purpose of the proposed trip.

Again, this is now simplified, because all the CROPP Review Team Member has to do now is they see the proposal at this link, for your approval.   Before we had to send an attachment and it was cumbersome, so it's now much more simplified in that regard. Once the confirmation and approval has been obtained from the Stakeholder Engagement VP the CROPP Review Team Members from the RALO would email ICANN CROPP Admins that the draft travel form has been approved.

Just to go into the outreach pilot processing flow diagram, what the staff admins will do is confirm that the criteria is satisfying and notify the Review Team Members if there are any issues that need to be sorted out. It's then processed. The Constituency Travel is contacted, etcetera, and then the trip is taken. One of the things that also has to happen – and I'll go back to the procedure here – is a trip assessment has to be completed after the outreach event.

EN

The intent here is for the CROPP Review Team Members to follow up with the travelers to complete those trip assessments. This bothers me. Originally, in FY 14, our Review Team Members had to take the information from the traveler and then upload the forms themselves. However, the travelers themselves would be able to edit the draft trip assessment on the Wiki. If I go back to EURALO again, you'd go to the trip assessments page and then the traveler can directly edit the trip assessment form, once logged in.

The idea behind this is we can now look at the trip assessment form and then the CROPP Review Team Members can ask clarifying questions, "Did this happen? Did this not happen?" Then once approved, the trip assessment form is then formally filed with ICANN's CROPP. I've walked through the steps for the CROPP Review Team. I just want to stop now and answer any questions. Does anyone have any comments or questions?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Looking at the procedures, [unclear 13:123] regarding timing. When the participant fills out his form and it's sent to the PPC, the Pilot Program Coordinators, at this stage I understand many changes can be done and the project can be tailored and modified to meet the criteria, if needed. How long does it take for this stage? Do we have any deadline for that stage?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I should say, just to clarify, I think this is one of the key aspects of how I think the CROPP Review Team needs to work and coordinate with the

EN

RALOs. In theory, anyone could edit the draft forms. My concern is that that should not really happen, and that's why I mentioned here, "In coordination with the RALO Leaders and their Members on the FBSC."

It really should not be an ALS, out of the blue, without the knowledge of the RALO Leaders, suddenly file this and then it's like, "Who's this person?" Coordination needs to happen before. That's why I suggest that the CROPP Review Team Members are the ones that will fill out the travel forms. Because the CROPP Review Team Members will be the ones that know what information is needed, the program criteria, the terms and conditions, you can work together with the proposed travelers and the RALO leaders to ensure that everything is complete.

Going back to the timeline, it has to be eight weeks before any such travel takes place, because ICANN's CROPP administrators need six weeks to do the processing on the staff admin side of things. It's eight weeks before they travel so that the CROPP Review Team can do its work within two weeks of the trip proposals posted on the Wiki.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you very much for that explanation. That's very important because we need to make sure that our Team Members are responsible for making these trips viable, and to make them stick to the criteria and supply any meeting information, etcetera.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Indeed. Ali?

ALI ALMESHAL: Again, my enquiry is almost the same as Silvia's, about the timing. Now, as the CROPP has been approved and the CROPP administrator program has moved it to the final approved side of the CROPP, is there any timing for the ICANN Travel to arrange with the traveler for that? Is that part of the other six weeks, or is there some different timing for that?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: That's why they have six weeks, once it's handed over to the CROPP admins, for processing by ICANN. If there's a need to contact the Speaker's Bureau, ensure materials are available to be given to the travelers, and also to arrange for the booking of the flight for the specified times. To confirm, the duration of the travel is the same. It's up to three days and two nights – the same as the FY 14. That part hasn't changed.

The funding is only available for up to three days and two nights. You get the hotel and a per diem for that. If a traveler is to stay beyond those days, they have to fund themselves or seek an alternative source of funding for that. Another key change… Sorry, go ahead.

ALI ALMESHAL: We have experienced that in six weeks, although the proposal has been approved by the ICANN Program Administrator, now for almost three weeks you'd wait just to get a response from ICANN Travel. I think six weeks for that, even if it gets approved by the Program Administrator, is too long.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I imagine the reason why the CROPP admins say this is to really cater for any issues that may come up in booking the travel and so forth, and how fast CT is able to come back with suggested flight plans and to communicate with the travelers. If you go to an ICANN Meeting, CT does several emails to the traveler. You have to fill out certain forms, bank information, information regarding your passport and so forth, those types of details, and confirm that. There's a back and forth there that has to happen.

I don't know if six weeks is too long. I think it acts to make sure that if there are any delays or communication difficulties that it could happen within the six-week period, before the trip takes place. I hope that answers the question.

ALI ALMESHAL: Thanks Dev. One more enquiry about the trip assessment update, you said it should be updated by the traveler, but if there is more than one traveler, what will happen?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I think ideally it should be a combined reporting of each one. I'll just go through the form. I believe how it works is that… Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I have my hand raised, but I want to respond to Ali's question. Each traveler has his statement docs to fill in, so each one has to give the statement that he or she thinks is how they will achieve the goal. Then, if you want someone to confirm yes or no, that's another thing. The

statement will be done by the traveler, and each traveler has his own statement space to fill in.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Tijani. That's correct. If you look at the trip assessment it describes whether the traveler has achieved the purpose, goals and outcomes that were specified in the travel proposal. If there were two travelers, "One traveler did this at the meeting, while the other traveler did this at the meeting," and whether they were successful or not, and that type of thing.

The idea is that this makes it a lot more easier, because the travelers themselves can edit this page and then let the CROPP Review Team Members know they've done it. The CROPP Review Team Members can then look at it and ask any clarifying questions. "When you said you met with somebody, do you have contact details?" and so on and so forth. Then there's a part here where the CROPP Review Team Members will confirm they've reviewed this and are submitting this formally.

Again, it's a lot easier now, on the workflow side of things. Any more comments or questions? Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Dev. My intervention will be about the RALO involvement. My understanding is that the application should be done by the RALO. This is my understanding, but the procedure is not like this, since the traveler can fill in the online form. We can add something in our procedure, as a Review Team, which would be the approval of the RALO.

EN

As we're seeking the approval of the VP, we can also seek the approval of the RALO. This is a way to ensure there are no problems. As we said, there was a problem before, and I hope it won't happen again, because we'll require the RALO Leadership approval. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Tijani. I think this is perhaps where some of the confusion's happening. That's why I have, in the other Agenda Item, how the outreach planning can be better coordinated. There seems to be a disparity where RALO Leaders, or an ALS within the RALO, is suddenly thinking, "I'll just apply," literally without talking to the RALO Leaders or the CROPP Review Team Members.

In theory, even though that's possible, I really think that the CROPP Review Team Members, this will be one designated authority from the RALOs that actually do this. I strongly suggest that it should be the CROPP Review Team Members. Again, it's not just the CROPP Review Team Members doing it in isolation. It has to be in coordination with the RALO Leaders and with the other At-Large Members within their RALO that are involved with outreach and the FBSCs.

For example, it seems odd to me that an outreach proposal is developed and planned without the Members on the Outreach Sub-Committee. It means it's not coordinated. My strong desire is for that coordination to happen. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Dev. I think Oksana was before me actually.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Oksana, can you please go ahead?

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Thank you Dev.   Thank you Olivier.   I have one comment, one proposition, and one question.   My comment is about our previous experience.   It was a successful project and with our successful experience from our side, I mean the cross-RALO [unclear 26:39], both from EURALO and APRALO for EURODIG.   I'd like to add CROPP Review Team Members to support the experience in future.

My comment is about alternative names.   For example, in our application you have only two alternatives for five candidates.   I could not comment on this application, but again, I ask all Members to check very well a lot of equal number of alternatives for a candidate, to avoid any [unclear 27:24] with empty places for applicants.

Then I have a question: what is the assessment status of the EURALO application for 2014?   Who has to confirm the assessment?   Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Oksana.   A lot of questions there.   In answer to the last question you asked, it's up to the CROPP Review Team Members from EURALO to follow up with the travelers to please provide a trip assessment, and in terms of answering questions in the trip assessment; whether the original purpose was achieved and so forth.   The thing is though, and I could be wrong, I think the CROPP FY 14 has been finished

and I believe the information has been… I don't think there can be any additions to the CROPP FY 14.

I was aware that the CROPP admins were asking various persons to complete their trip assessments, especially for those that came in the month of June, which was about two weeks before the meeting in London. Of course, after that meeting everybody was taking a break, but the CROPP admins were asking me and I was working with LACRALO and another RALO to complete their trip assessments.

It was up to the CROPP Review Team Members to follow up with the travelers to make sure they filled out the trip assessments. The FY 14 trip assessments have been completed and filed. If you go to the Wiki now for the CROPP FY 14, you'll see that it's in a view-only mode. You can't edit the pages anymore.   Regarding the concept of alternate travelers, again, there are no alternate travelers to be submitted for FY 15.

You just submit the key party travelers, without submitting any alternate travelers, because again, there was a lot of confusion within CROPP. A scenario may be that if the primary traveler became unavailable then Constituency Travel had to then potentially scramble at the last minute to try to find a flight and so forth for this alternate traveler, very suddenly and at the very last minute.

The original intent – and it wasn't really explained properly at the time – was that the alternate traveler would have a representative from that region, that ALS or whatever, from the same country.   Then there wouldn't be any significant changes to the plane ticket, they'd be the

same cost, rather than canceling a whole ticket, which would incur someone loss of fees and so forth.

Going back to the first question, this goes back to ensuring that it is a coordinated approach by the CROPP Review Team, working in conjunction with the RALO leaders, the Oureach Sub-Committee Members and the FBSC Members to ensure this is done in a coordinated manner. Thanks for that. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Dev. I was somehow irritated last year, and I guess also in the beginning of the process here, with the extent to which people were confused. The number of times that we had people that applied directly onto the web pages, through the web process, and filed their CROPP request directly, without going through the CROPP Working Group, without working through the RALO, and then having to spend some time – I gather you and staff – to stop this partway in its track and backtrack.

It somehow also brought in some bad taste into some people because they thought they had done something wrong, but really they hadn't. They'd done something wrong but it wasn't their fault, it was just badly explained. I just wonder whether you've got enough here to basically channel people to do the right thing and to make this as easy as possible for our ALSes to suggest a CROPP request. I wonder whether this group could think of ways to make it as easy as possible. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Olivier. Indeed, there is a lack of coordination where an out-of-the-blue travel request goes out in the Google form. That brings a lot of confusion as to, "Where did this come from? Is the RALO aware?" and all this sort of thing. That's why I'm strongly urging that it really should be the CROPP Review Team Members that are the ones that edit the form.

The CROPP Review Team Member would then make sure the RALO Leaders, the Outreach Members and the FBSC Members are aware this request is happening. It can be discussed internally as to whether this is feasible or not. I should mention also that the RALOs only have five travel slots. The RALO has from now until June 30th, so I would strongly suggest the RALOs now think carefully as to what outreach trips they want to go to.

If they use all their travelers on one event, for example, then that's it. The CROPP Review Team Members need to really look at the calendar of possible outreach events, which person can go to those events, and then get as maximum an effect by putting one traveler on five outreach trips, or if there's a very big event and it needs more than one person, then make that decision and say, "Okay, we'll send two travelers because that's a big event."

You can then start thinking, for example, if the event is something that's six days, you can then choose to have one traveler come at the beginning of the conference and then the second traveler come in during the third or fourth day of that conference. You can then use the CROPP for the most benefit. I really wanted to get some ideas as to how this coordination takes place, because my concern is that it's not

EN

happening effectively enough. Any more comments or questions? Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I'd like to comment on what Ali said about the six weeks. The statement was like this: the application should come through CROPP staff six weeks before the date of the departure. That means inside the six weeks there is the Constituency Travel work, and as you know, when it's approved, the Constituency Travel will be ordered by Janice and Rob to issue the ticket. We'll not ask them. Janice and Rob will do that.

If the traveler notices there is a delay from CT, they have to come back to Janice and Rob and ask them what happened, because sometimes CT are overloaded and perhaps they take time. I think the best way to do it is to go through Janice and Rob. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Tijani. I agree with you. Again, this is why you have a six-week buffer, in order to try to make sure all the details can be coordinated with the travelers and so forth. Sometimes there are visa issues. That poses an additional challenge here.

The RALO has to think carefully as to if the proposed traveler doesn't have a visa, they have to decide whether they can do it in time, and if not, choose another traveler that does not have a visa issue to go to that country with the outreach effort. It will be easier for that traveler to attend that event. Looking at the chat here, I've seen a suggestion from

Cheryl, supported by Olivier, to have flowchart. I suppose that could be done.

I'll consider that. Just know I am going to be very busy these next two weeks, but I'll certainly consider doing that. Any other comments on the procedure itself?   Let's move onto the next Agenda Item.   This is regarding how we ensure collaboration between the RALOs, the CROPP Review Team Members, Outreach, and the FBSC Members.

My thinking would be that if the CROPP Review Team Members – this is a suggestion, but I want to get alternate suggestions – certainly get appointed in the RALO calls. We'll have this as a standing item regarding outreach and so forth.   Any proposals that the RALO has could be discussed in their monthly calls. Then a CROPP Working Group within the RALO, comprising of the RALOs, Outreach Members, FBSC Members, and of course the RALO representatives, have a general list that's coordinated and discuss the proposal and so forth.

I realize the challenges if it's not formalized in any way. My question is, do you want it to be formalized in some way? That's why I suggest the CROPP Review Team Members have to be the ones to shepherd this process; talk to the RALO representatives, talk to the Outreach Members and the FBSC and work together. Any comments or suggestions on how this could be done? I see a tick from Cheryl. Okay. Any other ideas other than having it mentioned during the RALO monthly calls?

Let me ask another question then: do you think that there's an effective collaboration between the CROPP Review Team Members and Outreach

Sub-Committee Members and FBSC Members? I see Olivier raising his hand. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was gong to suggest that the CROPP Members would ask the RALOs during their monthly calls to have the CROPP Members speak to the RALOs for five/ten minutes, not just describing the CROPP but taking them through an application and through the process. The confusion is deeply, firmly in the RALOs. I know we've done some overall webinars for all the RALOs at the same time. Maybe it's good to [unclear 41:56]. Each one of us CROPP Members could do a little presentation in our own RALO during our monthly call?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I think that's a good idea. You probably don't need to repeat it every single call but just do it once, in a monthly RALO call, and walk through an application. I think that's a good idea. I will say yes. I'll try my best to see if I can be on those other RALO calls, but I can't guarantee anything within the next two weeks. I see Tijani has raised his hand. Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I would like to second the proposal of Olivier. Dev, I'd like you to please make a very simplified flowchart with the necessary information for the travelers only, so that the travelers know what the steps are and what the duties are, so that his or her application will come in on time and will be approved, if it's a good application. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: All right. Thanks Tijani. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON ORR: Thank you Dev. I think if the Leadership Team of a RALO and the At-Large Structures wants to have Dev at a show-and-tell at a meeting, that's fantastic, but I certainly wouldn't want to see it too regularly. Those RALOs do have standing Agenda Items and don't need to repeat the same stuff over and over again. What I would like to do though is perhaps make sure we work a little smarter rather than harder.

Perhaps we even have recorded one of your more detailed going-through the completion of a form, the idea form, and perhaps the use of a more animated development of a flowchart through that, with a number of, "Now you do this, now you do that." It would be less language dependent and more visual. That could be used as an online resource that RALOs can point the ALSes too, to have gone through.

I think it will be a more valuable use of Dev's time, doing that. The other thing is asking Members themselves within a RALO. They should more or less be able to work directly, and as needs be, be available for ALSes to contact early on in the process. Say the ALS goes, "Right, we have this opportunity, let's email the regional list" – or even directly, in our case, Ali and Cheryl, "Let's make sure we've got it right."

Then that can be taken to the next regional meeting. If for some reason that happens the day after the meeting occurs and you don't want to lose the full week, then that can be done inter-sessionally, using the

email list or with a smaller group activity with the regional leadership. I don't think that's a problem, I just think it needs to be standard operational procedures. Thanks.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Cheryl. Going back to the idea of a flowchart and so forth, I have seen that there are some CROPP FY 15 resources here, and I'll just take you through them. If you go to the CROPP FY 15 space there is an orientation of tutorials, and if you go to that page there's a YouTube video, which walks you through filling out the proposal.

I'm not going to play the video now, as it's eight minutes long. It walks you through exactly how the form is supposed to be filled out, and so forth. These are some of the materials available. There's also a link to things like handouts and outreach materials you can use; ICANN factsheets, IPv6 factsheets and so forth. That's one thing.

To answer your question Cheryl, it will probably just be one RALO monthly call that goes through the procedure in detail. I think you don't need to repeat that whole thing in detail every single RALO monthly call, but what happens now is that once the RALO [unclear 48:04] can say, "Okay, what outreach event opportunities exist within our region?" and start brainstorming and trying to figure that out. The RALO can then look at all of these events and decide what options there are. I think I saw somebody's hand raised. Olivier, go ahead.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Dev. I'm concerned. You just showed us a video and material that's on the CROPP website. I said I don't agree with pointing to this video and website because it's confusing. It's confusing because this is meant for the people who are going to be filing the CROPP requests, at the end of the day. It's not meant for the end user, who's going to go through its RALO to file something with our CROPP Review Team. What we're going to end up with is exactly the opposite of the message we want to give.

They're going to go directly to the CROPP website, completely bypass our own CROPP processes, and what we want is a diagram with our own CROPP processes – not the staff one that's one the website at the moment. We're setting ourselves up for even more confusion.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. Okay, I understand. I'm just saying this is more for the CROPP Review Team Members, so when the question comes out of, "Can we get outreach handouts?" and so forth, it's meant more for the CROPP Review Team Members to pull that information and say, "Okay, here are these resources."

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The CROPP Review Team Members are one thing, and they're all fine and we can do this internally. We don't need to tell the RALOs what the CROPP Review Team Members are learning through the videos and all that. Where the real confusion is is not at the CROPP Review Team Members, it's at the RALO level. Out there. That's where the real concern is.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I see your point, and I'm not seeing anybody objecting in terms of that we probably not do that. It would be too much information overload. I get you. I think the way forward is to develop a flowchart that would accompany the text regarding the procedure, and [unclear 51:00] the CROPP Review Team Members [unclear] doing the monthly RALO call to talk about the procedure itself, and show the flowchart, and explain how a RALO can make the most out of this.

Then start the discussion on that RALO monthly call to do it. You won't need to do that detailed presentation every single RALO monthly call, but it could probably be a standing item during the RALO monthly calls to talk about whether there are outreach efforts they should consider. They could discuss them at that broader level and decide which events could be prioritized for the CROPP in terms of its outreach efforts. Olivier, do you have a follow up? I see your hand has gone down.

Any other comments, questions or…? Any Other Business at this point? Any other comments or questions? Okay. Seeing no comments or questions I think we can end this call. Again, thanks everyone for attending. I'll try to draw a flowchart that could accompany the text for the procedure.

Let's look to have our CROPP Review Team Members suggest for the next monthly RALO calls to have this as an Agenda Item, so that this can be properly presented in detail for the first time, and then have it as a standing item to discuss outreach ideas for that region. All right. Thanks everyone. This call is now adjourned. Good evening and good night.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]