TERRI AGNEW:	Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Finance and Budget Sub Committee Working Group teleconference on Thursday, 2nd of October 2014 at 14:00 UTC. On the call today we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alan Greenberg, Allan Skuce, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Yuliya Morenents, Wolf Ludwig and Dev Anand Teelucksingh. We have apologies from Raf Fatani. From staff we have Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber and myself, Terri Agnew. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, Olivier.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you Terri. We are meeting here with the Finance and Budget Sub Committee with a single task. We have to fulfill it today. It's to follow up from the At-Large Implementation Team work, that has allocated some of the ATLAS II Declaration Recommendations over to the Finance and Budget Sub Committee because they involve the component part of our finance or strategy work. We have a table with a number of recommendations in there that we're going to look at. Our aim really is to look each of the recommendations, and either to work out a timeline by which we'd be able to carry out the recommendations, or to refine the recommendation to send it to the Board.
	I mention the Board because the Board component has a tight deadline. We are meeting with the Board over in LA, so it's important we manage to have something for the Board when we see them; whether it's a full recommendation or a clear recommendation, or whether it's a timeline to let them know when we will have a clear recommendation for them.

That's where we are. The table that we have has got some… Look at the section that's colored with a   yellow background.   These are the recommendations for the Board.   The other recommendations we'll probably deal with afterwards, once we've completed the first set.

That's where we are at the moment. For this, because I don't have a great connection right now, I'll hand the floor over to Tijani, the Vice Chair of the Finance and Budget Sub Committee. He'll take you through the table and I'll join you on the Adobe in a few minutes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. As Olivier said, the single Item on the Agenda today is the implementation of the ATLAS II Recommendations. As you know, we've been asked by the Board to give clear and implementable recommendations, and for this aim, the Task Force on the Implementation has assigned each recommendation to more than one Working Group in At-Large, so that those Working Groups will try to make the recommendations more clear and more implementable and doable.

Here we have four recommendations. (2), (40), (41) and (42). (2) is that ICANN should increase support, budget and staff to programs having brought valuable members to the community. This recommendation was assigned to three Working Groups – Outreach, Capacity Building and the Finance and Budget Sub Committee. From the side of Finance and Budget Sub Committee, what do we have to do is make the recommendation clear and practical; not too broad a recommendation

that you can't do anything with. I will give the floor to the Members of the Sub Committee. Are there any ideas? I don't see any hands.

I will start. I think that since we are talking about budget, about money, the Finance and Budget Sub Committee is involved. We have to look to this recommendation and see how, from the side of the Finance and Budget Sub Committee, the budget side, how we have to explain or mend this recommendation to make it clear for the Board and implementable for the Board. Already the Outreach Sub Committee has worked on this recommendation, as well as the Capacity Building Working Group, but they work on it from their side. I think that we have, from our side, to find the aspects that we have to highlight, to make this recommendation something that the Board can implement.

I think what the Sub Committee can do here is in the way of how to present the budget so that we can ask the Board to increase their financial support here, because that's our side. It's financial support for programs that brought important members to the community. Is there any comment now? Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: A couple of things – some of them helicopter, high-level points, and some of them particularly specific, and some you'll have heard me say before. One of the overall ones – and it does come out as one of the notes in relationship to Recommendation (2) from TG1, which talks about the specifics of increased support, budget and staff, to programs having brought valuable members to the community. In the notes there it says we need to think of ways to optimize budget.

I think what we should be establishing as the Finance and Budget Sub Committee here is that that's an overarching principle. We need to ensure that expenditure is optimized. This should go across all of these particularly identified as cost-center recommendations or cost-center effective recommendations. To that end, I think if you want to even duplicate that optimizing of budget into all of these sections, that would probably be a wise thing.

Having said that at a very high level, that does of course go a long way towards making sure some of these things that will be often utilized – in for example Recommendation (40), which looks particularly at the CROPP, whereby materials and resources are taken and utilized for those activities are usually those that are already ICANN-wide applicable. One doesn't just take an At-Large Structure, for example doesn't just take things that are only about At-Large, but they also promote ICANN in general.

I think it's making very clear to the Board in whatever we produce in an implementation plan that the intention is to bring value to the wider ICANN, as well as specific value and benefit to ALAC and the At-Large community. I'm going to stop the helicopter view there and come down to some of the very quick specifics. Then I'll probably come back in after others have also spoken.

In terms of Recommendation (2), as I said in a previous meeting, probably the Outreach meeting, at least in the Asia Pacific region we have an agreement between the APSTAR Organization that we will be cooperating on a survey, which actually identifies the value proposition from various forms of programs, sponsorships and fellowships across the

Board, inclusive of the ICANN Fellowship Program. We may in fact then be able to interact with that activity, which should be going on in Q2 2015. That will give us some quantitative stuff that Recommendation (2) can hook into. I think that will then allow Finance and Budget Sub Committee to in the future review, when looking at extraordinary requests for activities, we could perhaps use that work specifically to build Recommendation (2) into something highly implementable.

Recommendation (40), because it's about CROPP, we just need to make sure the CROPP actually succeeds, and again, that's got a lot to do with making sure we get value for money, but also the reporting that is required. One of the things I think is important for the Finance and Budget Sub Committee to recognize is that the pilot aspect of CROPP has only been committed to FY 2015 and it's really up to not just us, but the wider ICANN community, to prove that taking it from a pilot program to a actual and annual event is a very good thing. There will be a lot of work to help there.

In terms of (41) and (42), I wanted to point out that these are not verbatim but very reminiscent of implementables that were included either out of ATLAS I or from the ALAC review. I'll stop at that point. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm speaking as observer, I guess. It strikes me however that we're putting the cart before the horse. I understand why in Recommendation (2) Finance and Budget Sub Committee is referenced, but until we're given substance by the other groups, we're just in a position of essentially whining for more money. Before we are actively involved and should be spending a lot of time on it, we need some specificity about what it is that's being requested, and the material in which we can build what I'll [optimistically 00:12:52] call a "business [take]".

Yes, we're listed here, but I don't think we should be stepping in until we're given some solid information. I know we're working with an abbreviated copy of a recommendation here and not the full text, but I really think we need substance before we spend a lot of time focusing on what to do with it next, from our perspective. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. I agree with you, but I think that for this specific recommendation we need at least to know what the programs are that we're talking about, and to see what kind of money was spent for it – how much it cost ICANN. It's about this at the end. It's to increase this money, this budget, so we need to know at least what has been done so far, what the programs are, and waiting for the input from the Outreach and from the Capacity Building Working Group to try to evaluate and to give an implementation view from the side of the finance. Any other comments? Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the key word here is that, if you read the actual words in the recommendation or in the summary, it says we should increase support for programs that have brought valuable members to the community. I think part of it is identifying who those valuable members are and are they in fact valuable? Whose judgment is it and how do we demonstrate that this in fact has increased the overall value of At-Large to ICANN, or at least given At-Large the tools to do its business better? Simply saying, "You spent money on valuable stuff that's given us valuable return, give us more money," clearly we need a lot more detail.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, that's exactly why I brought up the survey/study that will be done by staff in APNIC, working across the APSTAR, because by including ICANN in that we may be able to identify some of those tangibles.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's one of the things that when it comes back to us may well give us the ability of helping to satisfy this recommendation.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly Alan. I agree with you. Any other comments or points of view? Heidi, are you willing to speak?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Tijani, I've just come on. I'm sorry I'm a little late.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No problem. If there are no other comments on this point I'll try to summarize what Alan, Cheryl and myself have said. First of all, we have to identify the programs and the valuable persons brought into the community. With that we'll try to evaluate the cost for ICANN and wait for input from the two other Working Groups, to give us their views or how they see we can make those programs more beneficial for ICANN and for the community. We also want them to assess whether those valuable persons are still the same or not.

I think for Recommendation (2) we cannot advance, other than identify what the programs are and how the persons or the members are that we qualify as valuable. This can be done also in collaboration with the two other Working Groups. Olivier, if you are hearing that… Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. I deeply agree with all the comments just now. I'm going to mention the fact that the Outreach Sub Committee and the Capacity Building Working Group are really the ones that are currently going to do the heavy lifting – well, it's not even heavy – but it's basically the groundwork. As you know Tijani, as Cheryl is in the Capacity Building Working Group, several of the Action Items has been to identify the programs and find out how effective they were. The same also for Outreach, for the CROPP, etcetera.

If they're able to perform such an analysis then the Finance and Budget Sub Committee can take those recommendations and put the [unclear 00:18:53] recommendation with [unclear] standard. It's definitely something we're not going to be able to do before LA. I think there's

just not enough time before them. [unclear] perhaps provide details to the Board as to what we are planning on doing for this; exactly what has been mentioned here during the call.

If we explain this to the Board, it will be our roadmap to achieving that recommendation – not achieving it; they are to [expect 00:19:30] from the ALAC whether or not to implement the recommendation. I think that's probably what we should be aiming at doing for them.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Since you are on the AC I think you can take on the chairing of the Chairmanship.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not yet on the AC. I'm on my mobile phone at the moment. I'll ask if [unclear 00:20:00] one more please? [unclear] and then maybe I can take over, when I'm on a proper screen.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. Any other comments?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: One quick comment – one thing we could also look at is the ATLAS itself, and what the ROI Working Group was doing. It's part of the evaluation and could also be part of this recommendation in terms of evaluating not just the CROPP and Fellowship Program, but also the At-Large Summit itself. That's it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I agree with you 100 per cent and I think that the most important programs that you're speaking about are Mexico and London. They're the two very big programs and they brought more people into our community, so those are the most important programs that we've done, and that are concerned here in Recommendation (2). That's right, we need the ROI for that. This will help a lot. Any other comments on that? Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Dev's comment I think is important, and to the extent possible I think we want to go back and find who among our active workers can honestly say that if they hadn't been brought to Mexico City to see what was going on, they probably would have never committed to the level of work they do. The same is obviously true, coming out of London. Clearly we don't track that actively, but we need to try to identify… We know after a Summit there's always a spurt of activity, but how many stick around and become active workers?

That kind of thing I think is a relevant statistic or piece of information that we need to be collecting and thinking about. Even if it's only sending out an email and asking, "Are you one of those?" That's the kind of thing that demonstrates that in fact there is value to bringing people together.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Absolutely Alan. I'm one of those who became more involved in ICANN after Mexico. Mexico wasn't my first ICANN Meeting, but it was the most important one and it made me decide to continue working with ICANN.

ALAN GREENBERG:	That's worth a half million dollars right there.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Exactly. You're right. We need to do this survey also. Any other comment on Recommendation (2)?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	I can certainly ensure that that part of our survey, that the ROI Working Group is putting out for the ATLAS II attendees is also hived off, and we can send it off to the wider community. Stretched slightly from what it's currently looking like, but to pick up on your qualitative input from this call; the fact that it was ATLAS I that was the pivotal for you, we could ask that question of many others. If you like we could perhaps give that as an AI for the ATLAS II ROI Working Group. It's a little beyond its ATLAS II remit, but I think it's well worthwhile doing.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you very much Cheryl. Yes please. Any other comment, or shall we go to the next recommendation? I don't see a specific Action Item for this recommendation, for the Finance and Budget Sub Committee. All we said was that it was applicable more for the Outreach Sub

Committee and the Capacity Building Working Group than the Finance and Budget Sub Committee – the identification of the persons and the programs. The evaluation of the cost might be our duty, but the programs and the persons is the work of the two other groups. For the Finance and Budget Sub Committee perhaps the Action Item can be to work with the Outreach Sub Committee and the Capacity Building Working Group to identify the programs and the persons concerned by this recommendation.

After that, we can try to evaluate the cost of those programs so that we can go further for the recommendation. Do you agree with that? Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. I certainly agree with this Action Item, and perhaps a way to keep track of all of this and therefore have a track record, [unclear 00:26:52] Finance and Budget Sub Committee detailing this specific Action Item to the Chair of the Outreach Sub Committee and the Capacity Building Working Group would be a good thing. I know that we're all on the call, but it's just in order to keep the paperwork in order, so we all stand on the same level. This can be sent to the various lists so everyone knows what's happening on the call. That's it. Thank you,

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: That's great. Can we go to the next recommendation? No other comments on this? We'll go to Recommendation (40), which is ICANN should offer a process similar to the CROPP but applicable to short lead-time budget requests not related to travel. This means that it's about

local work for the ALSes, for us, if we speak about the At-Large. There would be no travel, so it's more work for the ALSes in their region, in their home.

I think that we need others to work on this because of the substance. Our Committee can work on the finance part of it, but those similar programs that would be short lead-time, and that are not related to travel, we have to define them. I give you the floor for any comment. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I was going to perhaps try and make this clear, because it's a little bit cryptic and we should somehow think of examples of what those short lead-time budget requests could be that are not related to travel. I think that when one speaks about short lead-time budget requests, [unclear 00:29:25] that these are not activities that would fall under the additional RALO requests, where you can make a request up to a year in advance of the event taking place.

That would be an example. A local ALS that would be hosting an ICANN-related activity might require specifics services maybe, such as being able to have flyers and things. I don't think these are huge budget requests, but so far there is no such thing. The most that ICANN is able to do for an ALS is to send them some brochures, pre-printed brochures, for the ALSes to [unclear 00:30:21] run these activities. Of course, the ALS can ask for [unclear] with the ICANN [unclear]. There are a number of things.

There's a gap that's identified in there, with regards to support of the ALSes. I think also some of the work that we do in the regional IGFs, the local IGFs, but also some of the work that's done by the RALOs now in collaboration with the regional Internet registries. I think that is the idea behind this recommendation. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. You agree with me, that it's not clear and it's something that's perhaps subjective. We have to define more precisely what those actions that can be under this foundation. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just one note – this recommendation is getting perilously close to violating one of the requirements for an ALS, and that is that it be self-supporting and specifically not rely on ICANN for funding. I think we need to be careful, as go forward on this one, to emphasize that this is not for the ALS to do its normal work, but for exceptional or specific projects that it's working on. Even then it isn't clear that it doesn't violate the rules, but I think we have a much better case to make, if we can show that it's an exception and not something specifically required by an ALS. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Excuse me but I'll disagree with you. We are not speaking about the internal or normal work of the ALS. We are speaking about activities led by the ALS, in the region, in the country, to make

more outreach, to bring more people in, to be more visible, etcetera. Those are not breaching the rules in any way.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, I don't think you're disagreeing with me. All I'm saying is we need to make clear that it has the kind of characteristics you're talking about, and emphasize why it's not supporting the ALS, as such.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Alan, a question for you – do you think that if an ALS is to run a day on the new gTLD process, ICANN accountability and just on ICANN-related topics, that this has the danger of breaking the premise that ALSes should not seek funding from ICANN?

ALAN GREENBERG: No.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: How would we word this?

ALAN GREENBERG: Not in my mind it doesn't. All I'm saying is that the words are there and we have to make sure that if we're putting forward programs like this, it's not going to be construed by some Board Member who actually goes back and reads the words. We don't have to worry a lot about that. I

don't think many important members do that, but I think we need to be careful to make sure that we know that we're not doing something in violation of one of the very few principles that are laid out in the bylaws.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I absolutely agree with you Alan. I think the first thing we have to do is identify what the kinds of actions that can be under this program, and we can say, for example, to organize a day about the new gTLDs, or about the IPv6 migration, which is something that's done for ICANN, because it will raise awareness of the community there in that country and perhaps bring other people to ICANN, etcetera.

We can also think of other things – for example why not an active ALS for an active region could think about making a magazine, for example, because they have a very important event organized and they want to issue a magazine for it. This can be financed by this kind of program, etcetera. We have to think about what kind of activities can be included in this program. Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Just to follow up on what Olivier was saying, the idea here is that when we submit the RALO budget requests we always say that it has to be in-line with ICANN strategic plans. I think it's basically along the lines of once this is in accordance with ICANN's strategic plan – because this is what the Finance and Budget Sub Committee does; it looks at these requests and sees whether it's in line of ICANN's strategic plan and therefore approves or disapproves it. It's more along those lines.

The idea behind this program is, because the budget requests can only happen at a certain time at one point in the year, and then you have no opportunity to submit anything for that entire year, I think this is what the idea is behind this program. So for a short-term event that an ALS may be planning within three months, in the fourth quarter of the year, they can apply for funding, if the event is in-line with ICANN's strategic plan. Wording to that effect. We do it already, when we submit the RALO requests, and the Finance and Budget Sub Committee looks at it. So it's really a similar process to that, but on a short-term basis.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Dev for your remarks. As you said, no requests can be done if the action is not in accordance with the ICANN strategic plan. It's clear it will not be agreed on then, so this is something that's trivial for me. Now, I don't know which group put forth this recommendation, but it would be good if we had more information on what they had in their mind when they wrote it. As you see, we are three or four persons speaking now, and everyone has a kind of activity that can be included in it. It was better that they give examples or precisely say what this program would be about. Any other comments?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I was the moderator of TG5, which came up with this recommendation, therefore I'm aware of what the idea was behind it. Olivier was also on that TG, so he was also speaking to that effect.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. This recommendation wasn't done for some kind of activity that you're thinking about, but it was for general activities or general need for the regions or ALSes?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: It was the fact that the RALO had to anticipate well over a year in advance, in order to apply in that short time period in the first quarter of each year – to apply for funding for activities not related to travel. That's why we separated it. We already have the system for CROPP, which handles travel, so that's out of the equation. It's for things like brochures, and things for an event, that if they don't do it now then they can't do anything for the entire year.

   That's what the idea was – so that we have a method for a RALO ALS applying for funding, with similar guidelines to how Finance and Budget Sub Committee handles it, in accordance with the ICANN strategic plan, etcetera. That was the idea.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Dev. Olivier, I will give you the floor but I'd like to ask Dev why you didn't think that for the CROPP you had to make a recommendation? Because as you know, we have a lot of reservations and concerns about this program. It has been improved for this year, but we need other improvements.   I'd be happy to see a recommendation from the Summit, speaking about the CROPP and the evolution of this program. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. It's a very good point you just raised – as to why no recommendations have been made about CROPP. I think that might be something to do with the chronology of events. I'm not quite sure when the CROPP was evaluated, but I think that at the time it just wasn't in amybody's mind, since the CROPP was still ongoing and the first year of the CROPP was barely finishing. With regards to this recommendation, Dev mentioned the promotional material and I think this went further than just printed material.

One could look as far as even having promotional material like pens and pins and this sort of stuff, that would really be promoting the ICANN brand and promoting ICANN At-Large and these sorts of things, and maybe pins for the event and so on, that would have "ICANN" on them. Rather than ICANN going and sponsoring an event in a very official way, as it does actually with some events, but having the ability to have small funds allocated to this sort of thing. It would effectively help ALSes that are organizing such events on a very tight budget indeed. I think that was one of the ideas behind the recommendation.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Oliver. It's clear. As the Finance and Budget Sub Committee, how do you think we can approach this? I think that already we have to more or less define or explain the activities concerned by this program, and then I think the only Action Item we can make here is to detail or make more precise the kind of activities, as I said, and to try to make the recommendation more practical. That means saying that this program is about particular activities or particular actions, aiming to promote ICANN, to promote At-Large, to promote the ALS.

Also it's to bring people in, and in this case it's more or less outreach, but it can be one or the other together. I think that this is the way we can approach this recommendation. What are your points of view? Olivier agrees with that. Any other comments? Alan, I know you might have some ideas.

ALAN GREENBERG: I agree with what you said. I don't have anything specific to add at this point. While I'm speaking, I put my hand up for a moment but it's not really on this subject. I note as I'm sitting through all of the various committees talking about the ATLAS recommendations, we are continually saying, "We need to go back to the people who made them and understand what they said," or for clarification, and I think some things we need to file away for the next Summit, and presumably there will be one in the relatively near future.

Then we can make sure that when we talk about making recommendations out of the Summit, perhaps we need to emphasize ones that are well enough defined, perhaps at the extent of the number of them, to make sure that what comes out of the Summit is something that we can work with and can work with effectively. It's just a thought to file away for whoever organizes the next one. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. I don't know where we can put this Action Item for the next Summit.

ALAN GREENBERG: In our minds. Someone may remember it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, you are right, but I think it's a very important remark. We don't have to have so many recommendations, but have very clear and implementable recommendations that can bring something to the Board. It's useful to give them very nice text, very recommendation, but nothing can be confirmed. You're absolutely right.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're just spending a lot of time trying to decipher things here, and that's not a productive use of time.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Alan mentioned here having to go back to the Working Group itself. Perhaps we can just go back to the Working Group Chair and/or Rapporteur, since they were the ones that were part of that discussion. Of course, many of us are parts of the Working Group, and what I'm going to suggest as an Action Item here is that the Finance and Budget Sub Committee… Because this is probably a recommendation that the Finance and Budget Sub Committee is probably going to work on and expand; we can't allocate it to anyone.

EN

The Finance and Budget Sub Committee should work with the TG5 Chair or Rapporteur to define and explain "budget requests not related to travel" and in there provide a list of examples of promotional material and provide a list of examples of specifically targeted events. Is that how this is understood?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think so. Olivier, you said you were to reach out to the Rapporteurs or Chairs of the TGs. I can tell you that some recommendations weren't borne from them and they drafted it, but I don't think they can explain it better than the person who generated it. In general it works, but for some recommendations it's better to go to the person who brought this idea or recommendation. Any other comment for Recommendation (40)?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: It's comments to what Alan and Olivier said regarding the recommendation and how it was presented. I guess the challenging problem, because I think one of the goals for the Summit Declaration was to be concise and in simple bullet points, because if we made it too long then it was felt that it would not be read by the Board effectively and so forth, so there was concerns about that.

I guess we're going to have to do something like a mix, where there's a summary of bullet points and then an appendix afterwards, which explains it and gives more detail and examples behind the thinking. The challenge is of course how we can produce that in the short time during an ICANN Meeting, because there was a lot of time spent on Wednesday

and Thursday morning, trying to get that Summit Declaration ready for the final meeting of the ALSes on Thursday. It's a challenge. That's it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Dev. You asked how it can be done in a short time. I can tell you that if we did the Summit as it must be done, it wouldn't be a problem of time. For example for Mexico, we did several conference calls before the Summit. Each TG had conference calls, and we prepared everything. We prepared the reference documents and we also prepared the ideas we'd already discussed, so when we came to Mexico it was more compiling the ideas and more drafting than thinking about or generating ideas.

This should be done in the future, I think. I proposed it for London but unfortunately it wasn't done. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think Dev gave the answer to his own question and Tijani added something to it. Number one, the details don't need to be in the Declaration but they need to be retrievable and there. Number two, yes, there should be significant work done ahead of time. it's exceedingly attractive to have people sitting in the room, especially people who to one extent or another don't know a lot about ICANN or At-Large – because remember, we're using this to get people involved and they're not always the most experienced people.

It's very attractive for them to put ideas on the flipchart. That's not sufficient in my mind. They've got to be fleshed out. It may well mean

we also need to compliment what Tijani said. We may well need conference calls after the Summit, to flesh out these things. It's only the ones that get fleshed out and have substance to them that we actually pursue. Yes, there may be something in a Declaration, where when we put enough effort into it, doesn't fill its expectations. So be it. But it shouldn't just be these Committees that do the work.

It should also be involvement of the people who participate in the Summit. That's one of the ways of roping them in and getting them to be more active; making sure there are follow-on activities that we want them to participate in. I think there's a whole set of things that we need to do, and we need to think about them well in advance of the next Summit – not in the month leading up to it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Alan. I do agree with you, but I do also think that pre-Summit conference calls for each TG is very important, because we can prepare. We can come to the venue of the Summit already prepared for the recommendations, because we'd have already identified the documents, the main ideas, etcetera. Then at the venue, during the Summit, we will deepen them. We will write, we will draft, will compile. We'll not think.

We have to think before, I think, because if you come to the meeting and try to think collectively, together, I don't think that will be the right way to do it. Yes, a conference call after the Summit is also very important. I think both are very important, and the conference call after the Summit will serve what we're doing now, if you want, because I

agree with you that the TG should also work on this implementation program of the recommendations. Thank you. Any other remarks or questions regarding this Recommendation (40)? Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I've got text for the Action Item that I could suggest? I can paste it into the Action Item stream so that it makes it a little more targeted than what we have here. It's what I said just now. If you think that's not appropriate and we should just stick to the paragraph that says, "For Recommendation (40)," then let's just go for that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I beg your pardon, I didn't understand very well what you said. Are you happy with the Action Item on the screen now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If you look at the Action Item box, I've pasted a suggested Action Item to replace the Action Item that starts, "For Recommendation (40) the details are to be more researched. Maybe they can be put together, but it's just for us to have more clear idea of the Action Item rather than having something that's a little bit less targeted.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I agree with what you wrote there. I think we can use this Action Item. We have to work with the TGs, Chairs and Rapporteurs to understand better the kind of actions. I think it's a good Action Item. Anyone with ideas about this Action Item specifically?

ALAN GREENBERG: No comment, but I'm afraid I have to drop off now. I'm late for another commitment. Good luck with your work, if you continue meeting.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. I'm sorry that you have to leave. Okay, so is that you Olivier who is editing the Action Item for Recommendation (40)?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Bad person. I shouldn't touch it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Any other comments on Recommendation (40)? I don't see any hands so I'll go swiftly to Recommendation (41). Recommendation (41), the ALAC should work with the ICANN Board in seeking additional resources of funding for At-Large activities. This is a very broad, very wide recommendation. Nothing precise there. We have to ask for more funding, that's all. What do you think about how we can address that? Olivier, go ahead please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. This is not just about asking for more funding. This is primarily to do with sponsors. To give you an idea, whenever we have events that At-Large has run, there are some parts we've asked for sponsors for. We've had to go directly to seek sponsors ourselves. In some occasions we've received an answer from the sponsor telling us,

"We're already funding ICANN through sponsorship, we're sponsoring them for various activities, why don't you ask ICANN for a fragment of that money?"

As a follow up, they went over to ICANN and ICANN basically said, "No, we're not doing this to fund different activities in ICANN, what we're doing is funding whatever activities [unclear 00:58:35] to have. The sponsors themselves have no ability to tell ICANN, "We would like 20 per cent of our sponsorship to go to such-and-such a project, and 30 per cent to go to such-and-such an event." They don't have the ability to do that, and most of them are reticent in doing this. they just sponsor ICANN for a meeting, and it sounds like [ICANN 00:59:03] use their sponsorship in whichever way they want to.

I think here, rather… There are two aspects to this – one, being able to speak with ICANN, or with the ICANN Board, and finding out if we could have a percentage of that funding when a sponsor is sponsoring an ICANN Meeting. That's the first. The second thing is for ICANN to help us in being able to find additional sources of sponsors. There are some sponsors that ICANN has worked with in the past for small sponsorships such as a showcase event, where we're just talking about a handful of thousand dollars.

ICANN has not been able to introduce this, so there's nothing within ICANN's DNA to introduce us to any sponsors or anything like that. At the moment it's all done informally, and I think this would somehow try and formalize things a little bit.

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier for this clarification. I propose that we add "outside ICANN", to, "Seeking additional resources outside ICANN." This will help a lot in understanding the recommendation. As it's written now, "Seeking additional resources or funding," it can be from ICANN also. That's why I've said it's only about asking for more money, so "from outside ICANN" would clarify better the recommendation. In this case, I think this is something that I don't think is the job of the Sub Committee. It's more the job of ICANN, of ALAC, or of the ALT.

That's because it's more about contact with the Board regarding something that's not allowed now. When we ask for sponsorship from any sponsor, they generally tell us that they're sponsoring the ALAC event and they aren't allowed to sponsor any other thing besides this meeting. So we're penalized from both sides. We don't have enough money from ICANN and we cannot have money from sponsors. This is a good recommendation from my point of view, but we have to make it clearer. Go ahead Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. This is another idea to this recommendation. It was felt by several members of the TG that the At-Large community itself – please jump back in on this if I misconstrue it, Olivier – is not independent, because we're reliant on ICANN for funding to attend the event and so forth. I think it was also in that context of, "Well, the At-Large community should be self-sufficient in some way, to be able to participate in the ICANN activities and give input on the ICANN policy, but not necessarily be funded solely by ICANN."

That was the message. I remember this well, because the original thinking behind this was to say, "We should be independently funded." There was a lot of debate on this because if one was to take that harsh stance, ICANN could simple say, "Okay, we won't fund any At-Large activities because you all want to be independently funded. Go off into the wild and get your funding." Of course, we didn't… Well, [other members 01:03:15] of this group didn't want that, so this was the compromise; in saying this is a way to explore this idea of seeking alternate sources of funding. That was also the nuance there behind this recommendation. I hope I've made myself clear.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Dev. Yes, you explained it very well, and I do agree with you. I do agree with the recommendation and I find it very important and very interesting, but we have to make it clear first and then, as I said, this is more a political work, or it's not the work of the Committee, because the Sub Committee doesn't have a political work. It has generally a technical… It's not about discussing with the Board to have an agreement to find sponsors, etcetera. This is ALAC that can do that, but not the Finance and Budget Sub Committee. Olivier?

TERRI AGNEW: We may have lost Olivier. We'll try and get him back.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Any other comments on Recommendation (41)? Does the group think that first of all we have to make the recommendation and add that

we're speaking about additional resources from outside of ICANN? Secondly, personally I don't find a specific Action Item for this, because as I said, the Sub Committee cannot be the one that… Perhaps the Sub Committee can rephrase the recommendation and make it implementable. That's all.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Just thinking about it, I know that what some RALOs are doing is establishing MOUs. My understanding was that they're with the other relevant ISOC organizations, like the regional TLD organization or the RIR. That's one aspect, where potentially they can have an agreement between those organizations that help support At-Large activities and so forth. Maybe in that context, in terms of strengthening those… That's just one aspect of it that came to my mind when you were talking.

Along those lines I think we can look at encouraging the RALOs to really work more closely with the RIRs, the ISOCs, the ccTLDs organizations and so forth. That's it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Dev, can I ask you a question please? Why do you need to go to the Board and work with them to seek additional resources from the RIRs, since we are doing that directly with our MOU?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Again, there was a strong feeling expressed by several members of that TG that the ALAC and the At-Large cannot be fully impartial, because they are partly funded by ICANN. This is something I don't agree with

personally, but I'm saying that they felt that we are paid by ICANN to attend the event and so forth, so in a sense we would not be impartial to ICANN. This was the thinking of whether the At-Large community should be independently funded, so that we would not solely rely on ICANN for funding.

This is where the recommendation was coming from. I don't fully agree with this, personally, but this is what quite a few persons in the TG felt, so that's why this recommendation was included.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Dev. Waiting for Olivier, I'll give the floor to Cheryl, who has the Agenda.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Following up from what Dev was just saying, some of what can happen as a basis for the MOUs would be in-kind support. For example, as a result of APRALO's MOU with APTLD, it's possible for several, two or three, complementary conference seats to be given to APRALO Members, and that sort of thing. We probably need to pick up on that as an important point, but even in kind activities need to be accounted for. I think the Finance and Budget Sub Committee should be looking at that, because it needs to be recognized, respected and indeed rewarded, as the case may be, as to what could be considerable sponsorship.

In terms of the independent story, there are a number of ways to skin this particular cat. Again, Dev, I'm in absolute agreement with you that it's not something that bothers me, but I'm constantly, over the last

decade plus, working with people who think it's the life and death issue. There are ways around it, and again, we can develop principles and agreements that make it very clear that such a [unclear 01:10:29] or whatever does not inhibit or encumber At-Large's activities.

An example there can be taken from the Telco industry, where in a number of countries, including my own, the consumer advocacy is directly funded by a percentage of activities that all the Telco service providers, big, little and in-between, an amount of funds is collected off them and it funds the consumer advocacy, which is often absolutely diametrically opposed. There's a bunch of ways we can do that. I guess it's not really short-term stuff, but it's again going back to that helicopter view that we probably should own that within the Finance and Budget Sub Committee. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Cheryl. Is Olivier on the bridge now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, I'm back. Dev hit the nail on the head here and beat me to it. That's exactly the feeling of the group. As you know, this is not only just an At-Large issue. This is an issue that's being raised now with regards to the accountability process, and it's also an issue that's been raised within the NTIA transition of stewardship of the IANA function, where some are saying ICANN should not be able to do policy and implementation at the same time – or operations and policy. They want full separation and so on.

The Working Group spent a significant amount of time discussing this, and I think that the way the recommendation has been drafted is open enough to allow for this to be there, but not for this to be the primary component. As Cheryl very well said, this could be a long-term thing. I just don't see this happening in the short-term, and I'd certainly be very careful about telling the Board, "Stop funding At-Large. ICANN should stop funding At-Large and At-Large should have totally independent funding."

Because I'm sure that they'd be all too happy to say, "You don't want money at all? Fine. We won't give you any money at all." We have to be careful on this one, and when wording this if we need to expand this, we need to expand this in a very diplomatic way. Certainly the examples that Cheryl provided are ones that we could include in this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That is a very tight rope we have to walk on this, because if one – and by "one" I don't mean us, I mean "them", the "them" that we're always concerned about – were to go back to even the original documents and resolutions of the ICANN Board in the formation of the ALAC and RALOs, it was in fact intended to be self-sustaining and not in any way funded differently to any other part or constituency of ICANN. That would be a very scary outcome.

I can assure you, we don't want to get anyone back to suggesting that resolution should be re-looked at. The other thing of course was we also had the resolution about ATLAS I, where it also said, "Thou shalt not have lots of other additional funding," or we virtually wrote into it that

we had to become more self-sustaining. There are constantly pushes – and it's understandable – to have us not as the dependent part that we are.

The reality of it is though that our core business is not what we do for ICANN, in the main, and therefore it's perfectly reasonable for ICANN to give more facilitation and support, providing they're getting the ROI for is, to have the great jewel in its crown, which is the grass roots and end user engagement. We've got to be really careful how we pitch it, because time and time again it has been designed to have a very different outcome. Thanks.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Cheryl. Yes, Olivier will take the floor, but before that let me tell you that I'm uncomfortable with this conception of independence. Are we independent from ICANN? Do you want to be independent from ICANN? I don't think so. ICANN is us and is the others. We are ICANN and ICANN is what we are also, with the other constituencies. It's not about independence.

This recommendation is about seeking additional resources from outside ICANN and making the Board help us, because the rules now say that if a sponsor is sponsoring the meetings of ICANN, he or she cannot sponsor another activity for this meeting from any constituency of ICANN. Try to work with the Board to have the right arrangement so that we can be funded by the sponsors of ICANN also. Also perhaps ICANN can help us to find other sponsors to sponsor some of our activities. Still, we're a

main part of ICANN, and we are not wanting to be independent from ICANN. I'm not wanting to be independent from ICANN.

When I say ICANN, ICANN is not ICANN staff or the ICANN Board. ICANN is the whole. We are part of ICANN. I think that we need to have more resources, because we have other activities that ICANN cannot fund. That's why we're seeking additional resources. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. You've summarized it well. My personal recommendation would be to stick to the recommendation that is there on the screen, expanding it as we just mentioned, and not wake up a sleeping dragon.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Good. I see an agreement from Cheryl. Very good. If we are okay with that we can move to the last recommendation, Recommendation (42). It says, "ICANN should enable annual face-to-face RALO assemblies, either at the ICANN regional offices or in concert with regional events." This is something that we were all the time asking for, but we couldn't achieve it because of funding problems.

I think it's a very good recommendation, and I think that this recommendation should go also to the regional leadership, to work on it also. It's not only the Finance and Budget Sub Committee. We need to involve the RALOs in this recommendation. What do you think about that? Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not sure I agree with you Tijani that we'd need to go back to the RALOs for this. The Working Group was balanced geographically. It had people from all of the RALOs, including people who were involved in the putting together of the RALO GAs. It's been asked by a lot of people to be able to meet annually, at least regionally annually. The aim of this recommendation is as follows: at the moment the RALO GA, or the RALO assemblies, are funded through the additional requests.

We have to go through a process of going from one region to another, so the first year you would have maybe three RALOs or two RALOs. The second year you'd have two and the third year you'd have one RALO assembly. One of the problems with those RALO assemblies is that at the moment they do take place at an ICANN Meeting, which means that if a RALO is going to be allocated funding to meet in a certain year, it might actually have to meet in a region that's outside of the RALO itself.

It also has to share all of the facilities with the ICANN Meeting and so on. The RALOs had another thought, the wish that they'd like to be able to meet face-to-face more often. In order to keep costs low, the suggestion was maybe that these RALO assemblies could take place at an ICANN regional office. These regional offices have conference rooms and therefore are able to accommodate – when we have a RALO meeting, 30 people I think is the maximum we have at the moment – this size of assembly.

Therefore the costs would certainly be kept low. The travel costs would be kept lower than doing it at an ICANN Meeting, and thus the savings would be able to allow for each RALO to meet in their regional office. Plus the fact that it certainly brings more collaboration between the

regional office and the RALO, and that's something I think we should really support as well. We know that Global Stakeholder Engagement has really pushed for that local collaboration, and I think we have a chance in this, moving forward now.

Certainly one would have to look at the fact that the RALOs would then miss an ICANN Meeting, but at that point you could always say that with the At-Large Summit, that brings the RALOs to an ICANN Meeting, and if the At-Large Summit is to be repeated then we need to agree on a cycle by which an At-Large Summit would have to be convened again. On this occasion we've heard several suggestions. Some have said a Summit every year, to which I expect all of us would probably say, "Please don't".

Every two years seems to be way too short. Every three is I think, again, quite a tight schedule, bearing in mind it takes us one year to prepare the actual budget, one month to do the full preparations and so on, and then one year maybe to prepare the ALSes. We'd be looking at maybe a three- or four-year cycle, but that's something for us to discuss later. Certainly for the general assemblies and the RALO assemblies, having them every year would definitely help with the RALO involvement and with the RALOs being able to get more involved in policy development.

Again, we're not saying that the assemblies would take a full week, because remember, when you meet at an ICANN Meeting you are sending people for a full week. The RALO meetings could just be two days. Those two days would therefore cost a lot less than having the regional assemblies during an ICANN Meeting as well. I think I've

explained the point in a little bit of a disjointed way, so I apologize for that, but I hope you get the point from it. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier very much. Let me tell you that I think the financial impact of what you've explained now is not any better than having the general assemblies during the ICANN Meetings, because if we do it in the ICANN regional offices, for example for Africa, we have to go to Istanbul. All the African ALSes have to go to Istanbul. Whereas if we do it in Dakar, the ALSes of Senegal will not travel and the neighboring countries will come by car so they won't need a lot of airfare, etcetera, so it would be cheaper for this point.

Also, the meeting room, in my country, you can get the meeting room for free if you book beds and meals in the hotel. This is not a big advantage. You can have the meeting rooms for free in the hotel if you are accommodated in this hotel. I agree with you that we have to make it shorter. The GA has to be very short. I don't know if we can propose that even during the ICANN Meetings that the people come to the GA for only two days, but this would perhaps be difficult.

Also, for the airfare, if you come for two days it's more expensive than if you come for the whole week, because there are the Sunday rules for the air tickets. Thank you. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Tijani. I think that we could only find out, with regards to the flights, with ICANN Constituency Travel, if it's cheaper to have a whole

week in a place than to just have two days in a place. I would be a bit surprised that the hotel costs for the whole week not seriously offset the changing costs for the flights for the two days. Perhaps this is a discussion we need to proceed with.

This one might not just be a recommendation but it might be the start of a process to find out the differences in costs that would happen if a RALO assembly be held at a regional office, if it were held at a regional event, and for how long.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly. Very good. This is an Action Item I think. Our Sub Committee can do that I think. The Sub Committee has to check with Constituency Travel the cost effects of a general assembly in the regional offices and a general assembly in the country of the region. Also, airfare for a short time, for two days – is it more expensive or not than airfare for one week. We have to do those investigations before addressing this Action Item. What do you think about that? Olivier, it's okay? Any other comments? I don't see any other comments. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. I've also put together an Action Item that goes maybe a little bit further in reference to Recommendation (42): "ALAC Finance and Budget Sub Committee to work with Constituency Travel. The costs of RALO regional assemblies at 1) an ICANN Meeting, 2) a regional event, 3) regional ICANN offices. Bearing in mind for an ICANN Meeting, I think it's totally impossible to get a RALO to just meet for two days and send

them home before the end of an ICANN Meeting. I think that would annoy more people than make them happy.

Then with regards to the regional event at regional offices, at that point this is outside the framework of the five or six days that people spend there. Regional events are usually shorter. They might be two days' in length, and in regional ICANN offices we have full control over how many days they can be there.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Olivier, you know, the CROPP now only gives us two nights to make the trip, even if the event is for one week or more than one week. This is exactly what happened to me when I went to the Internet Summit of Africa. I was paid only for two nights but I stayed there for one week, and I paid the difference from my pocket. People can be funded for only two days, but they can stay if they want, but they have to pay for it.

Any other comment? I agree with this Action Item Olivier. Any other comments? You are to know that we are 40 minutes… It was for one hour this call. We've now spent one hour and 40 minutes. If there are no other comments about this recommendation, Olivier, I'll give you the floor back so you can adjourn the meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. I was dreading this, because I'm always Chairing meetings that run late, and this one is definitely longer than originally intended. I think we've done well. I thank everyone for having

EN

taken part in this call. Next steps are to act on those recommendations. Let's follow by email, but I think there are some of the Action Items that we can carry out right away. We definitely need something ready for the Board.

We'll work on the mailing list to see which ones we can actually give as fully cooked-up recommendations for the Board and which ones we have to provide a status of the recommendation for, or a progress report or roadmap or something like this. Is everyone okay with this?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks everyone for this. This call is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]