TERRI AGNEW:	Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the Finance and Budget Sub Committee Call on Monday, 22nd December 2014 at 20:00 UTC. On the call today, from Members, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Holly Raiche, Alan Greenberg, Glenn McKnight, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Judith Hellerstein, Ali AlMeshal, Humberto Carrasco and Leon Sanchez. On the participants' side we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Oksana Prykhodko, Fatimata Seye Sylla and Dave Kissoondoyal. There are no apologies.
	From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Rob Hogarth, Xavier Calvez and myself, Terri Agnew. I'd like to remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, Alan.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you very much. Do we have at least one person from each region, or are we missing anyone from a region?
TERRI AGNEW:	We have at least one person from every region.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you very much. I'll do the introduction pretty quickly. The FBSC has been reconstituted this year with officially two people from each region; one ALAC Member and one RALO person designated to speak on behalf of the RALO. We expect that person to also be the first level of

EN

triage, as it were, for reviewing requests from the RALO. My intent is to end up with a significantly better success rate than before. That means either we need to convince ICANN Finance or the Board that what we're asking for is really worthwhile… I guess it comes down to that.

I won't try to go into why previous budget requests have not been nearly as successful, but I think we need to make sure that what we're asking for are things that will really benefit ALAC and At-Large, and that we make the case sufficiently well that everyone agrees with us. We have a significant number of other people on the group who've expressed desire to either stay on the group or be on the group for the first time, and that's fine.

Should we ever come to a position where we have to take a formal vote, that will be done with the ten designated Members, and I'll issue a tie-breaking vote if necessary. Other than that I'll just be acting as Chair. Any general questions before we pass over to Xavier? Xavier will talk about the overall process and presumably go into the principles and things, as many of us haven't seen them before, given that many of us didn't receive the email.

XAVIER CALVEZ: You mentioned a better success rate. What is success for the FBSC?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that everything we ask for we get! Better than the success rate we had last year, which, when you discount the one thing we were granted but couldn't use, ended up being zero.

EN

XAVIER CALVEZ: Are you referring to the AC and SO Additional Budget Request Process?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Is that the only activity that is part of the FBSC?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, but that's the subject we're talking about today. I'm not saying we've been targeted or haven't been doing effective things. ICANN funded our Summit last year, which was just a few dollars. We've also been the benefit of significant travel expenses via the CROPP. All I was saying was that we'd like to focus on this particular part of the process and try to understand, when we're making requests, that we need to make a convincing argument that what we're asking for is something that will help us and ICANN, implicitly. There was no hidden message there.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Understood, and there was none in my question either, but the full Agenda of the call… I didn't know if that was the only subject of the call, or if it was the only purpose of this Committee either. Now I know it's not.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: It's not necessarily the only purpose of this Committee. It is the sole purpose of this particular call. This is our first call that we're having in this newly constituted Committee. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you Alan and thank you everyone.   [unclear 05:52] that we made a call with the whole Sub Committee regarding the planning process, and this is not the call that we'll speak about that. For this call, it will be only the Additional Budget Requests. Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Heidi, did you get a chance to forward everyone the email, right?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct.   They've just received it, so they're probably still looking through it. Perhaps the best thing is if you want to discuss the principles and the timeline, and then answer any questions. I'm aware you have about 20 minutes.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Let me start quickly explaining what we said in the email that Heidi forwarded. Just to reference what I was saying earlier, you'll see that the email is addressed to an email address called "community-finance@icann.org". This is an email address that includes the email addresses of everyone who's interested in any finance related matters at ICANN. It doesn't have to be only the budget process. It can be about any subject on which we provide communication. Certainly in the past,

the budget process has been the process of the communication that's gone through this address, but other communications can be sent through that address; such as in the past we've communicated about the quarterly financial statements we publish as well, and other matters.

So this is not an exclusively budget related email address, but an email address for any communication related to finance; which is why I was saying earlier that I think it would make a lot of sense if all the Members of the FBSC are part of it. So you know, on this email list we try and ensure we have all the Leadership of the ACs and SOs represented, and then anyone who has an interest in the subject is offered to be added to that list, to continue it to grow. I think it has approximately 45 or 50 Members as of now.

We sent the kick-off email for the SO and AC Initial Budget Request Process. For those of you who may not have participated in the past, this is a process created three or four years ago to enable the various organizations to formulate requests for specific funding needs, which would be outside or not included in the general support that ICANN provides. It has also been used to pilot, test, new types of facilities that would require support on an annual basis; for example the CROPP, that Alan was referring to earlier, is one that's been included in this process, to use this process for its capacity to include a new item, and one that could be tested and then to determine whether or not this can work.

The email you've received will show the process has not changed a lot since last year. We have an application form where principles are formulated for the requests in terms of the tools and purpose, and will have this list of principles in the email. There was a form in which the

EN

request is being formulated, and that form is submitted to ICANN. It's then evaluated by a Panel of representatives; that includes AC and SO engagement and also the Global Stakeholder Engagement Groups. They're involved in the activities that are usually the subjects of requests.

There is then a Steering Committee that reviews the recommendation of this Panel and the Steering Committee formulates a recommendation for approval of requests by the Board. That SC makes the recommendation to the Board, including the Policy Department Head, David Olive; the GSE Department Head, Sally Costerton; and the Finance Department Head, which is me. Even though more and more I have decided to remove myself from input on the requests, simply because I focus my review on the adequacy of the process rather than the substance of the request, which I'm really not sufficiently knowledgeable of or qualified to be able to assess.

Once a recommendation has been made for a number of requests, these recommendations are submitted to the BFC who reviews them, or a rationale is provided by staff as to why a recommendation is made to grant or not grant a request. Then the BFC provides [unclear 14:15] to staff. Then in the past there has been little iterations between the BFC and staff on those recommendations, and once the recommendations are formalized they're submitted for Board approval. The Board approval has, since last year, been advanced and disconnected from the rest of the budget process.

The Board approval related to SO and AC requests has been advanced to earlier in the year than the overall process. This is for the purpose of

allowing those requests are granted to organize, ahead of time, the activities that are the subject of requests. Notably those requests are happening in the early part of FY to which the request applies. As a reminder, our FY starts on July 1st and the approval of the Board of the requests, from memory it's up to the second half of April, so as to enable a certain amount of time to plan for the work of the requests.

The deadline for the submission of requests is February 28th, which is about two and a half months from now. It's [unclear 16:00] also in time, so that there is some iteration or discussion that can happen on possible or draft requests during the Singapore Meeting, that is the first half of February. We should take the opportunity to be in the same place and time zone there, to take advantage of being able to discuss, or address any questions or concerns about a request, prior to the finalization by the end of February 28th for submission. I'll stop there for any questions from anyone.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a question. Is this information anywhere on the ICANN website, so that… Yes, we're privy to this, but can anyone check what these requirements are?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Yes. What I sent on Friday is going to be published, if it's not already. There is a finance page on the community Wiki on which the documents

EN

will be published, and where also the requests are published, as well as older requests, and also the decisions once the decisions are made. I'll make sure the publication has happened or when it will happen. Thank you for that question.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Any other questions? Seeing nothing we'll go back to you.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. I don't necessarily intend to go into great detail of the document, but I'd suggest Alan, or Tijani, that there is at this stage, which is the beginning of the process, a set of questions or issues that you have encountered in the past in participating to the process of submissions. I think it would be a good time to make sure we have those clear in our minds and to potentially find mitigating solutions, so that these are not issues this year. Is there anything that you know would be challenging and that we could help with?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Xavier. I'm relatively new on this. I've been part of the Committee for a long time but I've not been very active for a bunch of years. Tijani certainly has been our lead and I'll ask Tijani if he has any particular issues he wants to raise. I'll note a couple of things. In my introduction I said we hadn't had any explicit requests funded. Part of the reason for that, last year in any case, was that some of the things we asked for were part of the base budged, and that shows there was a

problem in communication that RALOs were looking for things, where in fact all they had to do was say, "We want –" and it was already there.

What we're trying to fix right now is make sure we all understand what the ground rules are and that we have good enough communication paths so we don't fall into that hole again. I do see one question that Glenn asked: "Are there any limits to specific requests, in terms of the amount of submissions?"

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you for that question. We have always, as part of this process, purposefully not created limits to either the number of requests or the amount of those requests, simply to make sure that there is no self limitations of requests. This process had the merit in the past to help identify need of the community, and it's actually helped the communication of those needs, through a relatively formalized process, to staff. Sometimes these requests help formulate or better document or communicate needs that somehow are also similar across different organizations of the community.

In order to ensure that the value of that information is not limited we have not limited the amount or number of requests by organizations. All requests can be submitted. It simply needs to be documented. There are [parts 21:58] then of the [full] requests that are being evaluated for a decision.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani?

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. I think the most important thing is that we have to ensure that what we're applying for is not already in the core budget of ICANN. This is the first point. Last year most of our requests were about outreach. This point has been solved by the implementation of the CROPP. It's a genuine program, even if I have some remarks on it – but that's not the subject of this meeting. Now we have to apply for something that cannot be done through the normal financing of the ALAC and At-Large activities. If we have specific things we need to do, we have to apply for a budget for it, because it is not already included in the budget of ALAC and At-Large.

I think this year we need to think of the need of ALAC itself, because before it was only for the RALOs, for the ALSes, but not for ALAC. I feel the same, because there are some specific actions that we can apply for funding for, that cannot be done through the general budget. This is something we need to speak about beside the ALAC… But what we can do now is think about, for example, participation in the IGF. This is one of the activities that has been in the past financed by this Additional Budget Requests Program, and also, for example, I'm thinking about capacity building. This year we have [room 24:45] for capacity building, outside capacity building, not during the meetings. This is another subject of activities that can be funded by this additional request. Thank you.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Xavier only has a few more minutes here. Xavier, is it reasonable to say that you are not placing constraints on what we ask for, just that we need to be able to make a good case for it?

XAVIER CALVEZ: I think this is perfectly well representing the situation, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Fine. Let's not take up Xavier's time right now to talk about specific request or whether he considers them valid. He's already said they're valid, if we can make a good case. I have some other comments to make on the general form that we should use to be able to provide things. We have one hand up. Ali?

ALI ALMESHAL: Thanks Alan. Being new to this Committee I want to understand exactly what Tijani also just spoke about. What other Special Budget Requests are there? Today we have the CROPP for use for outreach. I just want to understand some examples of the things we can apply for. Alan asked for special meetings or budgets, or even Tijani said about IGF. I want to understand what the boundaries that we have in that budget approval, beyond that?

XAVIER CALVEZ: I'll take a stab at this, but I think Alan was just speaking to that subject. There is no boundaries of topics that are set. It is fairly obvious, and there's a list of principles or criteria that is attached to the document I

EN

sent. I think this will help you understand better, and I invite you to read those principles. It will help you understand better what would make more sense to apply for versus less sense to apply for. Of course, generally speaking it should be something that's of benefit to ICANN as a whole, and something to the benefit of the organization, which is by definition likely to be of the benefit of ICANN as a whole.

That's a very general principle, but there are no specific limitations on purpose, as to the types of activities this process can be used for. Again, it's a matter of what is the activity nature, what is the purpose of the activity, what is the value of the activity for ICANN as whole – and the principles try to give a little bit more substance in description of that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you sir. Any other questions? Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Just a question regarding inter-sessionals. There has been, this year, a number of requests from other ACs and SOs for inter-sessionals, and I wonder whether this is the right process by which we could ask for an inter-sessional, and I wonder if you are aware of which constituencies or communities have asked for inter-sessionals?

XAVIER CALVEZ: I was not aware, which doesn't mean others at ICANN haven't already done something about this. I think I would only encourage the request that's formulated on that purpose through this process, if there would be a meeting like an inter-sessional that you'd like to have, simply

EN

because it helps ensure that this need is recorded and documented and evaluated as a result, rather than counting on the fact that someone has a discussion on the side. For the sake of the safety that this would provide, I would suggest that if that is an activity that anyone in At-Large would like to have, that it is being requested so that then it's recorded as a request and can be evaluated. I will also separately check with Rob and the GSE Team to check if that's already in the type, but I'd prefer it's actually recorded as a requested activity.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll make one of my comments while you're still on the line, if I may. In my mind, requests tend to come in two flavors. There are one-off requests for things we'd like to see institutionalized on a regular basis or a semi-regular basis. I would think the onus is on us, when we ask for things that we expect to be repeated – whether they're pilot projects or things that will be repeated every once in a while – that we should really try to build into them some way or measuring the effectiveness of it, to give you a basis for future requests and not reading it just as an expenditure but an expenditure with known benefits.

I'm assuming that would help our case significantly when we went back a second time, or even the first time, to say we will be attempting to measure it.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Absolutely Alan. I cannot agree more. I think we collectively all want to do the best for ICANN, which simply means we want to use ICANN's dollar for the best value, the best purpose, and the view is coming out of

actions, events and activities is that they're the most efficient possible for their own purpose. If you can, in the request, develop and document the value that's expected out of it when it's being requested… We're going to make some effort this year in asking for after-the-fact reports on the value effectively delivered by the action or the meeting or the activity.

That will help of course; validating that it was a good value delivered, it was a good decision made to grant that request, and it also of course helps your case for subsequent request because it builds up experience in carrying that request that did deliver. I cannot agree more with everything you said, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We're really running out of time and we haven't gotten to the discussion we need to have on the types of things we want to put our focus on in our requests; not exclusively, but I think we need to have an organizing meeting of what we tell the RALOs in terms of their requests. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: We need measurements. The last day of the ICANN Meeting Dev started that conversation. When Ali and I went to report on the CROPP funding that we'd used in the South Pacific there was nowhere, anywhere on the ICANN website, that said how to report. So we were seen as not reporting. We had to correct that. But if on the form that we ask there are measurables, and if there's somewhere on the ICANN website where

it also mentioned measurables you would get a better report. I'm just saying there was very limited information. We need to develop it.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Understood. The reason why we don't provide metrics is because there is no standard request, and by the way, those requests are meant to be those that are specific to those that request them. So we did not provide metrics because we have not been able to spend all the time required to be able to develop a potential metric to a request that we don't know what they are. So as part of a request's justification, you as a submitter should develop the measurement that you think is adequate to the request.

If you know the purpose you should know how to measure the efficiency or the value that the request would have if it's carried out properly. That's part of the evaluation that's being made of the request as well; how to measure that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Totally agree, I'm just saying make that very clear and it will be done.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Understood. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Thank you very much for joining us.

EN

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you for the invitation and for the questions. I have a couple of follow-ups: how to make clear the need for measurement, and try to help in indicating how that can be done; also trying to communication better as to what is already in the core budget that's not being requested for. They're two things I'll try and follow up on. The third one was whether an inter-sessional is already in the plan or not. I will follow up on those three items and report through the At-Large ICANN staff.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you very much. Bye-bye.

ALAN GREENBERG: We now have nine minutes left to do the three-quarters of the meeting. There are a couple of things that I think are a given, that will be in this budget. They're hopefully moderately significant. I think we really want to put a lot of emphasis on things that will make the ALAC, the Regional Leadership and the RALOs more effective. One of the issues that we've been complaining about for years is we don't have enough time at ICANN Meetings. I'm going to suggest for this group's discussion that for the three Meetings in the coming FY that we consider adding an extra day to it; that is starting to work on the Saturday prior to the Meeting.

Heidi, am I correct? This coming FY is not in the new scheme of rotating meetings, but that starts afterwards?

EN

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: So we have three full Meetings in this FY that we need to look at. That's one thing. The cost of that is not outrageous. That is hotels and per diem for people already on site, but I believe we'll change the working methods and give opportunities to do things we've never had a chance to do before. I think that's part number one. I'm presuming that given that the Summit, by the time we start this, will have been well passed, that we'll start with some GAs for some regions, and that's probably a given. Then I think we need to look at other activities so that will allow us to work collegially, better than we do right now.

I think right now we work as a number of individuals with some very small cliques of people who work well together, but I don't think it shows that we're working well as a group overall, and I think we need to think about that. I'm not quite sure what that means, but I'm simply saying it's something we may want to talk about.   Inter-sessional meetings are certainly an option. A number of the gNSO groups have done that. Whether we need that or not is an interesting question. Glenn, in the chat, talks about inter-sessional meetings for the regions, which could be instead of or in addition to a GA, every two years.

Tijani mentioned an IGF budget request, and my inclination… Heidi, perhaps you can give me some feedback. My gut feeling is that if we do that it should probably be at the ALAC level and not at the regional level because I just get a sense, based on how hard I'm told it was to get the

EN

one approved last year, which the MAG ended up not accepting, that it might be a better or easier sell if we do it on the ALAC-wide one, rather than the…

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct. What I've heard in speaking with GSE staff, who helped plan that, is that perhaps something that the ALAC could request, for example [unclear 40:06] works [four of] Members might be invited or participated. So it's an expansion of that kind of request.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do we know what the timeline is for putting requests into the MAG?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm not aware of that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: For the timeline of submitting the requests? The requests will be open in January and will finish on the 28th of February. So we have more or less one month and a half.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The question was about the IGF applications, and there will probably be a call for that, until I guess probably as far as February/March. Fatima might have some dates on that. She's on the MAG.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, but she's not on this call, I believe.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, are you asking for the timeline for the Additional Budget Requests or for the IGF?

ALAN GREENBERG: I was asking for the IGF.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, the IGF is not yet open. The MAG hasn't yet decided on the topics so it's not yet done. We don't know.

ALAN GREENBERG: Understood. Those are the guidelines that I think are things that the ALAC as a whole will want to look at. Do we want to issue any guidelines to the RALOs for their requests? I can think of one or two, but I'd like to open up the floor. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Perhaps I didn't express myself well for the IGF issue. I am speaking about requests regarding workshops organized by RALOs or by ALAC, by any entity. If ALAC wants to organize a workshop they can put one forward. We may have several workshops for the same IGF from the At-Large and it may work, because it's more visibility for ICANN, it's something that will give really an added value for ICANN. Thank you.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Presuming we can get them all accepted by the MAG.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: For sure.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, one of the things that we also need to look at is of course the advantage of using this as a mechanism for RALO or ALS – conglomerates of ALSes - inputs into the Regional IGF. That could then be something that the ALAC put an über proposal into the MAG for the primary IGF to do, as you were saying, something along the lines of a more public interactive meeting, rather than one of the plethora of workshops that spring up at IGF time – engaging the wider ICANN story, but from the multi-regional perspective.

It's the regions who've had the opportunity of attending their regional IGFs, which, let's face it, are never cheap, and are in keeping with what's been requested from the RALOs to something at EURODIG, and I think that's something worthwhile exploring as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Back on the original question of do we want to provide any guidelines, restrictions or other things? One of the ones that's been mentioned is that given that outreach, CROPP explicitly funds outreach, that we perhaps shouldn't be making requests for outreach. CROPP has specific limitations that may or may not make them suitable for some

classes of things. I'm asking for thoughts on restrictions, or do we just tell the RALOs, "Whatever you'd like,"? Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. We may give the ALAC guidelines. [I fear 45:03] any request would better match the strategic priorities of ICANN and will not be accepted. This is one of the restrictions we'll have to put. Also, we'll have to make sure they understand that they do not need, and it's not useful, to apply for something that can be financed by the already planned budget for At-Large. Also, anything related to outreach will not be accepted because there is a specific program for outreach. Those are the kinds of guidelines we can give to the RALOs.

It's good that all the requests go through ALAC, because it's always been [unclear 45:58] ALAC level. We don't cancel the requests, but we try to find the elements that make the requests more successful, and in this way I think we [unclear 46:22] lot of the [unclear]. Generally we have more or less [that structure] with our [ALSes]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll say this as a matter of principle: I don't think this group should be afraid of rejecting a RALO request, if indeed the majority of this group feel that it's not something we should be asking for at this point. I'm not trying to identify a specific subject that would fall into that category, but I think it's within this group's purview to reject things or send it back for refinement, or whatever, if the people in this group think so. I think we, at the first level, need to be critical, if we're expecting to be viewed well by the people looking at the next phase. It's

EN

not something I'd say we have to do, but it's something we may choose to do.

One of the reasons I'm looking for restrictions is that we're asking the RALO representative on this group to be the first level of triage. It's not fair to ask that person to do that without giving them some level of guidelines for what we expect for the requests to come through in that process. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: A couple of things. First of all, certainly in more recent years, the last five or six years, and certainly in the last three the FBSC has indeed acted as a filter in the way you describe, Alan, and I have indeed rejected things or sent them back and said, "Try again with a different mechanism and show how it meets the strategic plan of ICANN," or, "It's not going to get a go here, because these are the things that are taking priority." So the group has acted, I think, responsibly and productively in the past, and I'd like to think it would continue to do so in the future.

But having the RALOs now made aware of even documentation we've looked at today, would be [sensible 48:51], because thanks to the work of Tijani and others, this fresh set of forms, of applications and of guiding principles, quite articulate, quite easily understood in my totally biased view, and will go a long way to helping the aspirants from the regions understand what will or will not have a good chance of getting through the filter of the FBSC. I think it's been made clear that the specific regional representatives from the Leadership of the RALOs was

EN

to act as both part-guide and part-facilitator for this process, and that's going to help a great deal.

Hopefully all of them have been briefed, at least in today's call. The other thing is that we really need to make sure that they come in early enough for the proper process, especially if it's something this Committee is going to send back and say, "Can you adjust – can you make this clearer – can you do some form of edit." Because what we may run up against, even with what looks like luxury of the 28th of February, it's a very short amount of time unless the regions are encouraged to get their potential Special Requests up, edited, adjusted, and facilitated by their Regional Lead, and then go through the full process. You still need to try and give yourself at least seven to ten days at the other end of it for that.

That's part of what I wanted to say. The other thing is that the Regional Leads are able now… I believe most of them would have had firsthand experience, either as a participant or CROPP Review Team, and so they should be able to re-direct good ideas to the most probable source of funding. At that point I'll shush up. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Cheryl. We have a number of things we have to do. We have to say, are there any explicit criteria that we want to set, over and above what's been provided by Finance? That's number one. Number two: we have to set a timeline for regional input. Number three... Let's leave it there at the moment. The question I have is that it's now the 22nd of December, are we going to be able to practically do

any work between now and the 2nd or 3rd of January? I'm asking for hands raised. Can we assume that this will be a semi-productive time, or should we write it off completely? I'm asking for ticks or crosses.

So far we have to crosses, many crosses. All right. There's a general feeling we're not going to get any productive work out before then. Therefore I would assume that we're going to need a draft timeline. You will get some work out of me. I'm going to ask staff, is it possible to come up with a suggested timeline before we break for Christmas?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. We can work together tomorrow, after the ALAC call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Let's do that and put it out to the list so people have something to respond to when they come back. I would also initiate a discussion on the list and remind people or ask someone to remind me to remind people to actually respond to that again, when we come back, if we haven't already. Within four or five days of coming back from the New Year's break, to be able to launch this program with RALOs. We're going to have to work quickly in the few days that follow the break, to tie this up. Are there other issues we need to discuss today?

There's one more issue that we will need to discuss. I need to leave very soon so it's not going to happen today. That is we need to reconstitute the CROPP Review Team. Right now I've said that the existing one, which may or may not make sense given the reorganization of the FBSC, will stay in place until it's replaced. But we do need to do that. So I ask

people to think about do we simply reconstitute it with new Members from FBSC, or do we change the overall structure altogether?

I have relatively little experience with this, so I'm not going to pretend to make a suggestion right now, but I will be welcoming input from any of you who do have experience, on how well it's worked, where it hasn't worked, and so forth. We'll want to do that early in the New Year as well. I notice there are comments in the chat. Is there anything that we need to bring out for everyone to hear before we adjourn today? Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think you've got a rare advantage, for one, when you're doing your timeline. This is probably the first time that Asia Pacific has been able to start one of these programs just before one of its meetings, so when you're looking at your timelines you'll appreciate the fact that you need to have at least one organizational meeting for each of the regions in that beginning phase – for one, because APRALO is having its meeting later today, we'll be able to comply with that. But of course, it won't be until early in the New Year that we're going to get any sort of feedback in terms of potential applications for special funding. That's just a fact of life, but at least we can get started. That's a good thing for this process.

Regarding the CROPP, as Olivier said, it would be best that's it's not too fiddled with. Can I suggest, rather than take time we don't have now, that you put up a Wiki or a discussion point so that those of us who do actually know what we're talking about, about CROPP, and do have some idea of the rules and regulations that are required, and can

perhaps give some advice, can put it for the community to review? I don't mean in the CROPP space. I think it's something that needs to be discussed beyond just the ten CROPP Review Team Members, but something that the current Membership might have a number of points to make.

But that's a conversation that might be actually good to have on the Wiki during this supposed downtime. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. Thank you very much Cheryl. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. I think that when you speak about this CROPP you have to speak about the Outreach Sub Committee, because the CROPP Review Team is formed by a part of the Outreach Sub Committee, and as part of this Committee. If you want to renew the CROPP, yes, you also have to look at the Outreach Sub Committee before. For example, Dev is the Chair of the OSC and he's also the Chair of the CROPP Review Team, and I'm really happy with him to stay, but if you propose to change something in the CROPP, I think you have to start with the OSC. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Tijani. I'll give you a very personal opinion. The OSC may well have some reorganization done to it, but I don't think it's going to be changing of the overall structure as much as we did in this one. I don't think that's nearly as crucial, and I see no reason Dev can't continue,

EN

should he choose to. That's a personal opinion, not really considered or following any consultation. Any other comments? Then I thank you for your attention. Let's continue this on the email list and on the Wiki, and hopefully by early in January we can be ready to really kick this off in earnest. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]