
TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the Finance and Budget Subcommittee call on Thursday, the 22nd of January, 2105 at 17:00 UTC.

On the call today, for members, we have Tijani Ben Jemaa, Alan Greenberg, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Leon Sanchez, Wolf Ludwig, Glenn McKnight, Humberto Carrasco, and Judith Hellerstein.

For participants, we have Allan Skuce.

We have apologies from Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Fatimata Seye Sylla.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullirch, Silvia Vivanco; and myself, Terri Agnew.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much, and back over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Terri. The purpose of this call is to review what the members, and of course anyone else on the call, what we're looking for in budget requests this year and to talk a little bit about the [features] and the timeline. The timeline is going to be tight, so there's not a lot of flexibility in terms of going back and forth between the committee and the RALOs. Hopefully we'll be able to message it out clearly as to what is expected and what people will need to do to make these requests.

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

Any quick questions on the overall target of this meeting? If not, then as Tijani suggested, we will go on to item #4 first, and then back to 3. Any comments, questions? Seeing none, hearing none – actually, let's change that a little bit. Heidi, could you go over the timetable first? Because I think that's relevant to both types of requests, and we perhaps should have that been presented before we talk about any of the individual requests, be it ALAC or RALO.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, I'm happy to. Terri, if possible, could you put the Wiki page up and put the timeline in the display of the AC please?

TERRI AGNEW: Yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you. So what we have is basically the Fiscal Year 16 AC/SO special request process is open, has been since December 1st. The deadline for RALOs, including the ALSes, to review any ALS request or complete a template on behalf of the RALO and send requests to At-Large staff is the 4th of February. So you have just a little bit of time.

At Singapore, there will be discussions of proposals with ICANN staff and community. On Sunday, there is a session with Xavier Calvez, the ICANN CFO, on the process and there's also going to be an informal meeting of the FBSC and we'll talk a little bit about that during next steps.

Then, following that, there will be a discussion of proposals – I’m sorry, the FBSC will review all the requests. The deadline is the 26th of February. The submission period for all RALO-approved requests will be the 28th of February. So about two weeks or so after the Singapore meeting.

Then, the final review, submitted request by ICANN staff. This is not At-Large staff. That will take place between the first of March and the 15th of March.

Then, the review will be reviewed by the Board Finance Committee between the 15th of March and the 31st of March. Then, the 15th of April, board meeting. The board will review it and approve those requests that will pass through the process.

Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I will note that one of the items that’s been talked about in accountability, in the Accountability CCWG is approval of the budget might conceivably in the future be contingent on approval of that budget by not only the board, but all the ACs and SOs. So something that might come onto the agenda for the Finance and Budget Subcommittee is reviewing the entire ICANN budget and recommending to the ALAC whether to approve or not. So something to think about in the future, but not in this year. Certainly not in this fiscal year coming up.

Heidi, is it possible to take the list of potential ALAC requests and put it up either in the note field or somewhere?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can post it into the chat, but my recollection is things run together and make it unreadable there.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So what I'm going to do, Terri, is I'm going to put this to you in Skype, and then if you could put it into a Word document and put it up, would that be okay, Terri?

TERRI AGNEW: Certainly. Is it the one on the homepage, the FY16 ALAC criteria for special requests?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Not criteria, the actual proposal. Let me just get that over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. While that's happening, we'll start talking about them. We're looking at this point – and this has been discussed by Tijani and I, but it needs agreement from this entire committee if we're going to go ahead with them. Certainly if there is any doubt that these are things that are

worthy of requests by the ALAC, then we need to have it raised pretty quickly. And if there's anything else that you believe the ALAC should be requesting that is not on this list, that [inaudible] has to come out in the next little while.

So the first item that we're looking at is addressing the continual problem we've had of the ALAC and regional leaders not really having enough time for substantive in-depth discussions. We lost the Friday meaning which cut into our time to some extent. The Accountability and IANA meetings are doing great damage to our scheduling and ability to have time to really talk.

The first thing we're proposing is that for the first two meetings of Fiscal Year 16 that we add a day up front. Specifically, we start on the Saturday instead of the Sunday. Whether that means some of the things that are on other days moves to Saturday or we simply take the whole day for discussions is not clear, but it will give us another full day to add to the agenda, and hopefully not just – or rather, hopefully to allow real substantive give-and-take discussions among the participants at that point.

Now, it's only the first two meetings, because the new meeting structure actually kicks in on the third meeting of Fiscal Year 16. So that one is obviously going to be something we're going to be talking about a lot in the coming meetings. In fact, that may well be one of the substantive discussion areas of how do we use the new meeting structure and how does the ALAC interact with that.

I think we're looking towards the bottom of this document. There we are. Okay, so it's right now in the middle of the scree under Proposed ALAC Statements. So that's the first item. I'll review all of them and then we'll open the floor for discussion.

The second one is something that's been done by the GNSO, and to some extent other groups over the last couple of years and that is at the end of the annual general meeting, take a half-a-day or a day and have a facilitated meeting for the new ALAC. That is the ALAC including any new members. That's partly an introduction, partly an exercise in people starting to work together. It's proven exceedingly effective to try to take this group of people, some of whom are brand new to the process and get them to feeling at home, in very colloquial terms.

Part of that is meeting skill exercises and just getting used to working with each other, but part of it is just the opportunity for people to talk to each other and get to know who the other members are. It's interesting that even among people who have been working together for a number of years, it tends to change the relationship and make it significantly better. So that's something we're also going to recommend.

That, of course, means we're adding two days to the annual general meeting, making it a really long meeting. I think one of the things we need to talk about today is that pushing people too much?

The last item is to propose a meeting at the IGF. Up until now, we've had workshops at the IGF which were proposed by RALOs. I have some feeling that those are going to be harder to fund in the future. It's

clearly harder to get a meeting to prove by the MAG than it has before. The only project we had like this last year was not approved by the MAG, and therefore it was canceled.

We're looking at doing something ALAC-wide. There's a number of options, either to do it during the meeting or perhaps before the meeting on day zero. Day zero ones don't have to be pre-approved by the MAG, but my understanding is any given group can only have one. If we would have one, then no one else in ICANN would have that opportunity.

Anyway, those are the three items that we've come up with for this coming year and I'd like to open the floor to comments. Specifically, do these sound like things that we want to do, anyone see downside in them, and so forth? Tijani? Go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

First of all, now, we have the list of the IGF sub-teams and [inaudible]. It just came. The [inaudible] is still [inaudible] the conditions and the criteria for accepting workshops. So now we are better prepared to at least see if we will submit a request for workshops. [inaudible] participation.

Since the ICANN Academy is doing [inaudible] training on the AGM meeting, perhaps we should do it at the first one of the next year. That means the first meeting of the new ICANN, since the new ICANN will first meet in February or March. In this case, we will not – how to say? Perhaps there will be a conflict. We use the same people to make this

[inaudible] training with [inaudible]. So I think that perhaps we can [ship] it to the next meeting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have a response on that, but let's go ahead with Olivier first, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan Greenberg. I am in full support of having a meeting at the IGF or doing some kind of event or something at the IGF. It's important. It can be really used for outreach.

One of the concerns, and you very rightly said, it's going to be harder and harder to get workshops in because there's just a flurry of workshops now, more and more. And ICANN has been a little bit not helpful and actually a bit abrupt in its way of [treating] the allocation of funding for travel to the IGF when it relates to the workshop.

There was another workshop organized by someone in the At-Large community, but that had not been filed for funding. Although we didn't get the two other workshops through the MAG, this one was accepted by the MAG but it was impossible to transfer the funding from one workshop to another. So, from a rejected workshop to one that was admitted. I'd say we have to be a bit careful these days. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. Anyone else before I come in? On Tijani's comment about postponing the facilitation workshop, from my perspective, I think the word facilitation in there was probably not quite accurate. I

was certainly looking at it more as an opportunity to get the ALAC working as a group than teaching facilitation skills. There could certainly be some component of that, depending on how many of the people actually had been at the facilitation workshop or were scheduled for it.

But I wasn't looking at it mainly as facilitations, but mainly as a group – what's the right word? Not group building, but to get the group acting as a cohesive group and get to know a little bit more about each other, because that really helps for the next end months you're relegated to only e-mail and Skype.

Any other thoughts? Or, Tijani, do you want to come back in and rebut? This is going to be a very [inaudible].

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I don't mind, but I think that it will be good to have the trainer who is a very good one and has a very good program. So to see him at least give some guidelines to help the newcomers to step in and to start working [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:

If we can get the same trainer we've had before, if he's not committed to a similar meeting with the GNSO or something like that. It's important to perhaps get our request in early. Yes, I agree. He does a lot of different things and includes the kinds of things that I'm making reference to. I would definitely want to try to have – his name is David [Coe], by the way, for those who haven't met him. And he's quite effective.

Any other thoughts on any of these? At this point, I'm hearing in general support for what we're talking about. I haven't heard anything negative. Any comments on lengthening of the week in terms of making it more difficult for people to attend? Certainly that's one of the worries we have.

I'll add something else before I open the floor. Parts of the GNSO have had inter-ICANN – not inter. Meetings scheduled between ICANN meetings, particularly the non-contracted party house or the non-commercial. I'm not sure which met in Washington a week or so ago, because the gap between meetings is so large.

I really think that we'd be putting, given that most of our people are doing this off-and-on vacation, that adding a fourth meeting to the year would be pushing people a bit too much. I'm not suggesting we do that at this point, but adding the days I think really would make the ICANN meetings more effective.

Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. What about an intersessional, either working group chairs or an intersessional ALT and leadership? So ALT and chairs of the regions, like a smaller ALAC and leadership, not the full 15 plus ten, but maybe a five plus five or something?

ALAN GREENBERG: I would personally have no objection to that. We have a lot of ALT members on the group. Anyone else have any thoughts about that? I'm

looking for your thoughts on whether your personal life could take another meeting away.

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes. Thank you, Alan. With the new structure of the ICANN meetings, we will have a meeting [inaudible]. So if we need to extend for one day, best is to do it during this meeting. I know it's not convenient. It's not convenient because it will be in the middle of the year and this is not what we are looking for. It is not the best meeting for such activities. But it is the only way to not have very long meetings for people. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

What Olivier was suggesting was a fourth meeting for just the ALT and perhaps working group chairs. Are you suggesting adding a day to one of the meetings in the new meeting plan instead of a fourth trip? I'm not quite sure what your reference was.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, yes, Alan. Knowing that adding a fourth meeting will be harder to see adopted and approved. I think one or two days for a meeting, an ICANN meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure they address the same problem. Inter-ICANN meetings in general have been to cover when there's a very large gap in the timing as there is occasionally. So I'm not quite sure that they're the same thing.

Heidi, please?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Alan. Along with what Tijani said, if you take a look at the new meeting structure, I put the link into the chat. Take a look at Meeting B. As Tijani noted, on day one, right now it says outreach. It might turn into outreach/engagement where that day could be used for training sessions for the ALT plus the RALO chairs, etc., for the other groups as well.

So I'm not sure that a request for an intersessional would be seen as crucial when this new meeting plan is going to be taking place. Those are just some thoughts and something I picked up from discussions I've had with other staff.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, thank you. You said you put the link in the chat?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: The link in the chat doesn't look like it's the right [chat]. That's a link to the budget workspace.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just a moment, sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me look at the timing for this first meeting, because the only one we're talking about in this budget cycle is the first meeting. That doesn't have it there.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So, again, for Fiscal Year 16, it will be first of July through 30th of June, 2016. So that would cover two meetings in the new plan. Let's see, 55, 56. Terri, could you please put that link up in the chat?

TERRI AGNEW: Yes, I'm working on it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Give me a moment please. I think the critical link we're looking at is this one.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So on that workspace that I just put in, if you scroll down a little bit, you'll see the new meetings – Meeting A, Meeting B, Meeting C. So in Fiscal Year 16, you will have a Meeting A and a Meeting B.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The link I just put in actually shows when they are, and it's the timing between the meetings that is perhaps the most interesting part of it.

Now we have a gap of March to June, which is three months, and June to October/November which is four months. So there's no really large gap in that particular one. So I would suggest that – well, given the lack of knowledge of what that first day is going to be in Meeting B, which as Heidi points out, is called outreach but we don't really know what that is. We can imagine ICANN as a whole doing outreach to the local community. It's not clear what the ALAC would do in that respect. That's been a question that's been raised with ICANN and the answer that came back did not have a lot of clarity.

We have hands and I don't know [inaudible]. Let's go to Tijani. Judith and Heidi, do you want to get in first?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'll let Tijani and Judith go first.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, fine. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I raised my hand to answer this question exactly because Heidi said it is an outreach/engagement. No, it is outreach and it is outreach to the local community. This day was especially designed to have contact and outreach in the region we are, the [inaudible] we are. This is for outreach for people who are not all [inaudible]. For example, we can go to universities. We have to create programs for this [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, Tijani. I'm well aware of that. That was the intent. But in the more recent discussions with the ICANN staff and the chairs, the question was asked of exactly what does that mean to the ACs and SOs as opposed to an ICANN program to familiarize the local people, and the answer that came back was no one had really thought about that at the staff level at this point. So it's not clear how that's going to evolve.

And bringing everyone in a day early, which as you know, ICANN treats as an onerous expense, and not having them actually scheduled to do something is somewhat problematic. That clearly is going to be the subject of significant discussion.

Judith? Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: In the Meeting Strategy Working Group, when we designed this day, we said that it could be outreach in the universities, it could be outreach in the civil society organizations, etc. This is for ALAC, for example, for GNSO, for the other [inaudible]. They have their, if you want, [inaudible]. But it must be outreach for the local community and not outreach for ALSes [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, as I said, I understand that, but translating that into reality, it's not clear how that's going to resolve. I understand the motivation, but at this point, I have not heard any concrete plans of how that will be implemented.

Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: My question is not necessarily on [this thing] right now, because I'm trying to understand the new meeting structure. I guess it was on the earlier topic of budget recommendations. Is it only for things that are going to be in the session with [inaudible] or is it things that are going to be in the main budget, like the indigenous program or what we're trying to do with captioning? Is that not covered under these finance budget or is that covered under a different budget?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll let Heidi address that, and the answer may be we don't know. Certainly in the past a number of budget requests that have been made the answer has been we're not accepting it as a special budget request

but there is provision in the standard budget to cover something like that.

We certainly can't judge 100% where it's going to be. If a RALO and the ALAC chooses to put something like that forward, we can certainly do that. If we know ahead of time it is definitely covered, then we'll bypass the budget request and try to incorporate it into the regular budget as business as usual.

Heidi, did I get that right or am I missing something?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Well, I've just been in touch with Rob Hoggarth who is working on this activity and is on the staff that looks at the review. Judith, in response to your question, I would now suggest that you do put that request in, and what will likely happen is that all the requests for printing, for communication type of activities, which I would suspect that captioning is in a way communication, be submitted. Then given the number that are submitted that a large bucket might be prepared for all the requests like this that can be drawn from.

Now, that's the backup. The first option would be that it's actually included in a general overall budget, but go ahead and submit these requests as a backup just to make sure that you are covered.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

So I guess the question for clarification is do we submit it as a RALO but only for NARALO, do we submit it for a request for different specific groups? What do you suggest, if you can [inaudible]?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Again, Alan, I would let you answer or Tijani.

ALAN GREENBERG: And if you don't like my answer, you can [inaudible].

HEIDI ULLRICH: Perfect.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, my answer to that is anything like that that we haven't done before is implicitly going to be asked for as a pilot program. It's clear that a pilot program is not going to be automatically extended for every ICANN event. If we're talking about captioning at just public meetings, it's not like—

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: We're talking about captioning mostly at the Adobe Connect meetings.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, I understood. I was getting there. I said if we're talking about at public meetings, it certainly wouldn't be at every public meeting. If we're talking about Adobe Connect, it wouldn't be every use of Adobe Connect.

So my recommendation would be you definitely want to call it a pilot program, and therefore include in it some sort of component of

measuring how effective it is, how much it's being used, what are the benefits of extending that? Because clearly it's not going to be something that's done completely across every use within ICANN of Adobe Connect, or if it was being done at public meetings for every public meeting.

So I would structure it with relatively limited usage, but enough to make sure that we're testing the market. If you do it too limited, you know it's going to be almost impossible to measure any benefit or to document the rationale for continuing to do it and spread wider. It's your call whether you say just NARALO or you suggest it for some other classification of At-Large meeting webinars or something like that.

I would do it wide enough to [inaudible] but we can judge to what extent it is useful, and at the same time, not so wide as the cost and logistics of managing it becomes something that's onerous. Does that make sense?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yeah, it does. Also, the question is also I guess while this would be before Chris's group works on the business case, and I guess his business case would be for ICANN-wide whenever he does that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Probably. And one of the rationales is get some experience while we're trying to justify it on a wider scale. It's hard to gauge some of these things. It's clearly for the good of mankind, but does it have any real impact? That's the kind of question that I think people will be asking

once they look at deploying something like that on a very wide-scale basis.

Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you, Alan. So my view would be that currently Chris Mondini has said that he's doing the business case for it. I'll be in touch with him and I will also be in touch with other staff, IT staff, to see if they would be covering it in their budget. So, Judith, I'll get back to you today I hope and then we'll go from there.

But I would think that if it is the suggestion from staff that ALAC do put a request in, I would suggest that it would be an ALAC request, because the Accessibility Working Group across At-Large. It's across the community. It's not just for NARALO. That would be my reasoning.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Heidi, I would modify that. Yes, I agree it should be an ALAC request. We might target NARALO meetings or something like that.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Oh, I see, as a pilot.

ALAN GREENBERG:

In that case, I don't think there are enough NARALO-specific meetings for that to make any sense because there are just so few of them. But

we could say NARALO and APRALO to test the model in areas where the scripts and languages might be more varied.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. That sounds good. Judith, I'll be in touch with you. I'm actually working with Chris really and I'll speak to Laura later today.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Right. And you know we have a meeting on Monday, another demo of the captioning on Monday on the Accessibility group.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So Monday's meeting is at 3:00pm Eastern and we're going to have a second demo of captioning, specifically requested by the Accessibility group.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you, Judith. Tijani, you have your hand up, and I would like to go on to what should be the substantive part of this meeting and we're starting to run out of time, and that is details about RALO requests, although we perhaps just [inaudible]. Tijani, go ahead, though.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay. Thank you, Alan. It could be a good link to what you want to speak about. I agree that working group activity should be done by ALAC since it is not related to the RALO, and this is exactly what's happened and what must happen for the Capacity Building Working Group who is intending to organize on side training with other activities, engagement activities.

I still see in the RALO compartment of the request why it must be in the ALAC. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I have absolutely no problem. If we can get support from multiple RALOs to put something into the ALAC capacity, into the ALAC category, I certainly have no trouble of putting it there.

We didn't add that when we came up with the ALAC specific list or the ALAC general list because we didn't. I can't even remember if we discussed it. But certainly if it comes up through working groups and RALOs, then if it's used to apply at the ALAC-wide level we can put that label on it. I have no problem with that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yeah. Because when we discussed it, it was for the whole region and we spoke about sub-regions of Africa. We spoke about the Caribbean. We spoke about a small island in the Pacific, etc. Do you remember, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I do understand that. Remember, those are also going to be rather extensive items compared to some things. To what extent we can get that pushed through in a general case is not at all clear. So we may want to, again, identify that as a pilot that we tested in one region. It's something that we're going to have to think about. Obviously it's something that we would want to do in conjunction with GSE, with Global Stakeholder Engagement. Whether that fits what they're planning this fiscal year is something we need to be talking about.

Again, I think we need some talk about it. My recommendation for any of these things, which ultimately may be very expensive, is to look at pilots. ICANN has been particularly favorable to things with call pilots, even if they're continued for three or four years. So, something to consider. But that doesn't mean it can't be supported by the ALAC, even if it's a pilot for a single region.

Okay. I'd like to go ahead with the guidelines for the RALO requests. Heidi, can I turn that over to you at this point? I'm going to have to leave partway through this process. Either Heidi or Tijani, as you wish.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Tijani, go ahead. But also, I note that you are one of the RALOs submitting a regional request, and Wolf who is on the call also has one. Did you want to have the two of you speak about these requests?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I thought Alan wanted to speak about the guidelines, not about [inaudible].

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought you said the RALO.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: But if you want, I can speak about that. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm easy. We can look over the specific ones we'd be talking about to date or we can talk about the guidelines for other RALO ones. I'm really easy which order we do it in. In both cases, I'm not likely the lead person. The list is on the [inaudible] right now. We're looking at capacity building in a number of different ways and we're looking at two regional assemblies for EURALO and AFRALO. Heidi, I believe you're also looking at the indigenous community mentoring program.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't remember if you think that's going to be able to go through for this year or not.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. I'll start putting that together. We have volunteers on that one, so I'll start moving ahead on that one and we can submit one for that. I see Wolf has his hand raised.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Wolf.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks. Not much to say then to confirm our intention what we have discussed, submitted to our monthly calls. The idea of perhaps a next face-to-face general assembly in line with ICANN 54 in autumn this year in Dublin. I think it's another chance opportunity for community building what is economic at EURALO because we have still a small bunch of people participating on a rather regular basis and we have around [inaudible] of the members who are silent most of the time.

To improve the situation, I think another face-to-face general assembly in Dublin makes a lot of sense. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would support that. I would suggest in your discussions about exactly how do you justify it. Really I think we need to ask ourselves the hard question of do the general assemblies really work or is it just a travel opportunity, and the two-thirds that you're talking about remain disengaged? I understand it's a difficult question, but I really think we need to face up with it.

Any other comments on the proposed RALO requests?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, I can speak about AFRALO request.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I can speak first about the capacity building. I can first speak about capacity building on-site training program that the Capacity Building group proposed [for all] At-Large. [inaudible] we will start with a pilot program. Perhaps we start in the Caribbean. Let's start it there. But it will be a whole program that we will implement step-by-step, and the first step can be a pilot program.

It will not be only capacity building, but also engagement with the ccTLD leaders or ccTLD managers or something like this so that the synergy between ccNSO and At-Large can be real, when they can be on the ground one day. Since we will go to those regions, we can also do this link between the two communities, [inaudible] capacity building.

So for AFRALO, since [inaudible] 2016 will have the meeting of Marrakech. We, as AFRALO, we submit a request for [inaudible] somebody there, and [inaudible] try to have facilitation training at the same time. So that [inaudible] more engaged or more participatory. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you very much, Tijani. I'll point out on the capacity building all indications are that this is going to be a – what's the right word? A challenging year from ICANN budgets. The forecast revenue from the

new gTLD launches is significantly below what originally had been predicated. As you know, the ICANN staff has grown significantly.

There are large expenses which are committed to for the next little while. It looks like it's going to be a really challenging year. You're probably hurting yourself if you make a request that is too expensive. Overall, budgets are not necessarily in our domain but I think it's a reality we have to factor in when we're making the requests.

Dev had his had up but is now gone.

DAVE KISSOONDOYAL: Can I just intervene please?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please, go ahead. Then we have Glenn and Heidi. Heidi, you can skip to the front after Dev if you think of something that needs to be said about what I just said. Go ahead, Dev.

DAVE KISSOONDOYAL: Yeah. I just wanted to point out that [inaudible] talk about capacity building, it is important that we get [inaudible] value [inaudible]. Basically, if capacity building is not [inaudible] paying for travel [inaudible] capacity building, when we talk about capacity building, we have to look at the model that we have [inaudible] Internet governance by an agency that conducts – we should go with the program, a well-defined program, [inaudible].

And then when the member attends the meeting, at the end of the meeting, if they [participate] after going through the full curriculum, [inaudible], I think it has to be a very well-defined program so that it is beneficial to both ICANN and to the [inaudible] as well. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Dave, and I can't disagree with that. Heidi, do you want to get in before Glenn or go with Glenn?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. Glenn, do you mind if I just – it's just in direct response to what Tijani was mentioning.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you. Tijai, I would very much suggest that any proposal, any request, that has to do with regional activities be considered in collaboration with GSE staff, not only in the preparation of the proposal, but also in the planning for the event itself, that it would be on the sidelines or connected somehow to an event that the GSE is planning.

This is directly related to the activities that they are doing in the region, but also, as Alan mentioned, the budget issue. By combining the two, you would have significant savings in budget. Just some thoughts on that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Glenn, go ahead.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Earlier on in the chat I mentioned one of the things that with our ATLAS II efforts we found that down the road we had to do quite a bit of effort to get people to do the second step in the recommendations, which I think we could've used an opportunity to bring some of the facilitators or leaders together as a follow up.

I don't think that was in the original ATLAS II budget, but just for future thinking, especially if we're doing regional sectorial get-togethers, and if the group gets together and starts thinking about their strategic plans and ideas, this may be three or six months later getting together. I'm not saying the entire group, but a small fraction of people are penholders to actually refine the documents.

I found that over the last few weeks Olivier tried desperately to get people to follow up and I think, just to give critical feedback, that may have been something that we didn't think about in terms of the evaluation process.

So I'm not sure if this is something that should be built into the model in terms of requesting for funding, but I think there should be a follow-through [inaudible], and if budgets are requested that there's a full assessment process. That's my general comment.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Glenn. I have a personal answer to that which will sound a little bit negative. It's really easy to get people to volunteer for things that involve travel. It's a lot harder to get them to commit real time to things after the fact. I believe that if you're going to be a pen holder or going to own a recommendation that you need to commit to working after.

One of the real problems we've had with the ATLAS recommendations is they were made and then everyone walked away from them and the pen holder for the specific group that made it was not necessarily the best person to talk about it. It is a real challenge, but I think that's the test of whether people are committed or not.

If I look at the amount of work that's been done on things like the cross-community working groups on accountability and IANA, yes there have been some face-to-face trips, but the work that follows them is a real measure of which people are the committed ones and which ones just show up for the trips. I really think we have to impress upon people the importance of work between meetings.

I would be reluctant to add that in at this stage. Just personal opinion. If everyone overrules me, that's fine.

Do we want to go onto the criteria? I think we really need to talk about that because that's what we need to send out to the RALOs virtually immediately. So, Heidi, if you could have that put up, I'd ask Tijani to go through it because I will have to leave in just a minute or two, and to start going through the criteria. And as long as people can stay on the

call, that's fine. I'm turning the meeting over to Tijani right now, and between Tijani and Heidi to present the actual [inaudible].

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you very much, Alan. Tijai, just before you start, Terri, could you please put that Wiki page up the At-Large Fiscal Year 16 Budget Development Workspace? The criteria are on that page. And Tijani, whenever you're ready, if you have them in front of you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, I have them. You are speaking about the criteria [inaudible] together?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Terri, I think you have the wrong page.

TERRI AGNEW: Sorry about that, Heidi. Yes, [inaudible].

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, just a moment, Tijai.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: There we go. Okay, there are the criteria right there. Thank you, Terri. Over to you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. So the criteria are we are proposing those criteria for the upcoming round of requests, which is open since first of December. We lost one month.

The first criteria was that outreach should not be laser focused because now we have a lot of ALSes but we have a lot of ALSes which are not active. So the focus now is for engagement [inaudible] outreach. So the first criteria was outreach [should not] be a major focus. Activity is [going through] engagement with existing members is encouraged. This is the first criteria.

The second one, I will read them and then [inaudible]. The second one is if any request is made on outreach it should go through the CROPP program and not the special request process. [inaudible] criteria. Proposals should include ways which will make the ALAC and all the At-Large communities more effective and develop the At-Large community. The thought criteria is that the RALO request must go through a bottom-up process. [inaudible] to being submitted for consideration by the subcommittee.

The next criteria will be they must be explicitly supported by the RALO representative on the subcommittee. And the last one, Heidi will expand on it. Proposals for communication printing. We likely be supported through the normal budget. Heidi will speak about that.

So those are the set of criteria that I discussed with Alan and Heidi and we are proposing to the subcommittee now to be discussed. Heidi, do you want to add something for the last point?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yeah. Thank you, Tijani. Again, what this is is that this past year, this past Fiscal Year 15, there were several requests from many of the ACs and SOs for communications, activities, or documents for outreach.

So while that was considered part of the normal support, and therefore those particular requests were not approved, there was a bucket of considerable funds for printing and communications, and that is being used – for example, now that At-Large and the RALOs were beginning to develop new outreach documents. So that bucket is being used to pay for that.

What I heard back from staff on this point was that it is hoped that these types of activities are included in the normal budget, but as a backup, just in case they're not, would be useful for those types of requests to be submitted through the AC/SO special request, and then all of those combined would be put into a bucket similarly as it was this past year.

So, in short, if that was too long – in short, if you do have requests for communications and printing, things like that, I would suggest go ahead and put in a request. Are there any questions on that one?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you have any remarks or questions? I don't see any hands. So now it is clear. I understand that it is adopted that we not focus on outreach, to have more ALSes to focus on engagement, [inaudible] ALSes active. This is the main point of the guidelines I think. Okay, Olivier, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. So if outreach is not a major focus, at that point the question comes as to whether any requests for IGF workshops or a meeting taking place at IGF would be given a green light because, at that point, the engagement is probably cheaper to happen during the ICANN meeting than not in other meetings or other venues outside ICANN.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. Activities in IGF is not only outreach. That's right that we do outreach during these meetings, but we are improving the image of ICANN. We are improving the visibility of ICANN. We are improving the visibility of the community of ICANN, and especially of At-Large community. This is something which is very good. It is not outreach in my point of view. Engagement, yes, you are right. But what we are proposing, what Alan proposed at the beginning of this meeting, this IGF meeting that we try to have one day before or during the IGF schedule will be a sort of engagement, but not an outreach activity.

I understand your worry, but we are not refusing outreach. Outreach is good. It's always good, but we don't have to focus on it. This is the problem. Because all we did so far is try to have more ALSes. Now the

idea is to perhaps to have more ALSes, but also to have ALSes first, and second to have our ALSes active and engaged. Thank you.

Any other remarks? So if there is not other remarks – yes, Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. Can you hear me? Hello?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I hear you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Heidi writes in the chat that ALAC activity at the IGF would be intended to gauge ALSes and other people at the IGF. If it comes down to workshops, then I would venture out to say that those ALSes that are creating workshops at the IGF and that will be over there are already the ones that are engaged, and the ones that are not engaged are nowhere close to being in a position to submit workshops for the IGF.

Now, if on the other hand, it's an engagement thing where we get ALSes that are not active at IGF, then that's a different story and I would fully support this because that then makes sense.

I'm a bit concerned about engaging ALSes in non-ICANN setting because this effectively admittedly, as far as I can see, would translate to free travel to something that's not ICANN related. That's a concern.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. Olivier, I want to make it crystal clear that what we put in our outline, in our proposals, that was read by Alan at the beginning of this meeting was a special event in IGF which is not a workshop. This is the first point.

Second point, as I said, outreach is not something that we [inaudible], that we refuse. But we don't have to focus all our efforts on outreach. We have to make the focus on the engagement as much as we can. But we don't have to be absent in all the [events]. We try to be visible as At-Large community and as ICANN. I understand what you say, but this is not to say that everything we do must not be related to outreach. Thank you.

So now we are out of time, but I would like to say that our subcommittee has to be clear to encourage the RALO submit their request as soon as possible because any request submitted after Singapore will not be – if there is a problem in this request, we will not have time to come back to the applicants and discuss it [inaudible] because we have to have everything ready on the [inaudible] February. As you know, we will leave Singapore on 14. We have [inaudible] time for that.

The best is to have the RALOs, the ALSes, send their request to the subcommittee as soon as possible. The best is to be before Singapore. Because if they send them before Singapore and Singapore will have a session to even meet what we have received and we will come back to

the applicants, there is a problem, so that they can correct their application.

If the request is sent after that, we will not review them day by day, so it would be difficult to come back to the applicant, have them respond and then submit them to the [inaudible]. So the best is to have all the requests by Singapore.

If someone is not able to send it by Singapore, no problem. We can send them after that. But I am not sure we can come back to the applicants for any improvement or any correction.

Another point, we have to emphasize that any applicant has to [read] all the documents related to the application, special requests, which are the SO and the AC special budget request principles. The second one is the [inaudible] special budget request process. They will help us and help the RALOs to make good applications so that there will not be any problems.

So our guidelines have to be respected when [inaudible]. Is there any other remarks, any other question? Yes, Heidi, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you, Tijani. Just two quick things. Coming back to the issue of outreach versus engagement, basically that was thought that in the past we've had some RALOs submit proposals for activities meant purely to get new ALSes and that involved travel to various countries to hold meetings again to encourage new organizations to apply for an ALS. That kind of activity is what is now not being encouraged, and instead

meetings where engagement or activities where engagement – basically, in-reach for existing ALSes. That is being stressed over the outreach of getting new ALSes.

Again, in Singapore there are going to be two meetings related to these requests. The first one will be with Xavier Calvez on the Sunday, and that's basically to review the process and ask questions to him. The second one is going to be an informal meeting of the FBSC very likely now to be Wednesday 9:30 to 10:30, and that again is going to be where the [FBSU] reviews those requests that have been submitted. Those are really the two key points. Thank you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Heidi. Any other questions, any other remark? So I there is not, Heidi perhaps we have to send very soon the [inaudible] to the RALOs and [present] the slides very soon. If there is not other remarks, I will adjourn this meeting. So thank you very much, and see you in Singapore. Please make your request and make the RALO request done as soon as possible. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you, everyone. Bye-bye.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks so much, everybody. bye-bye.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Bye.

TERRI AGNEW: Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]