
TERRI AGNEW: ...7th of May 2015 at 19:00 UTC. On the call today we have Tijani Ben Jemaa, Ali AlMeshal, Wolf Ludwig, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Alan Greenberg, Glenn McKnight, Judith Hellerstein, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Oksana Prykhodko and Allan Skuce. I show apologies from Aziz Hilali, Leon Sanchez and Holly Raiche. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Rob Hoggarth, Benedetta Rossi and myself, Terri Agnew. I would like to remind all participants to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I welcome you to this call. I don't think I have a lot to say, other than this year was a more interesting year in budgets than last year, and I understand, although he's not on AC, that Rob is on the call and will be taking the lead on the discussion, or at least on the first introduction. Rob, are you really there?

ROB HOGARTH: I'm really here Alan. Thank you very much. I'm delighted to act as a facilitator and information sharer for this discussion. What I'd like to be able to do is give you all a summary as to the results of the Board conversations with senior staff about the FY16 allocations that have been set aside for special community requests that were submitted. I'd like to go through the overview and then perhaps give you all the opportunity to ask questions about specific 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.

I don't know if it would be tremendously productive to go through each individual request, although I'm delighted to do so if that's the direction, Mr Chair, that you would like to take. I think the best way for a context background and introduction here is basically to share with you that the community special budget request process has now been in place for about five years, I'd like to say.

The major purpose for initiating this process was to give individual communities an opportunity to make more targeted requests for the ICANN budget in a particular fiscal year. For that limited purpose I think it's been generally successful in helping to identify potential areas of growth or expanded support to the ICANN community that the Board had never contemplated, staff had never considered, or that basically reflected changes in the needs of the community that were better and more effectively addressed by the individual communities themselves.

I've been very pleased over the years to see the growth that your community has made in terms of fashioning requests, developing ideas - and I think the FY16 period has just been another example of that, where you all have identified particular areas of potential growth, particular areas where there is community interests and demand for more services, that even if they weren't granted by the Board for this FY, have created constructive discussions that may lead to allocations in future years.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Rob. You asked, Mr Chair, should you go over each of the items one-by-one. Actually, I'd appreciate it. Everybody on this call is

very familiar with these items. The people on the call are all part of the group that made the decision to go ahead with them. If you could just do a one-sentence summary of what it is, and whether it was approved or disapproved, and as we go along we'll give people an opportunity to raise questions as to why or whatever. I don't think there will be a lot of such interruptions, but I think it will be an opportunity.

I know I have at least one or two of them myself, so if you wouldn't mind doing that... I don't know if you can see the AC, wherever you are. We know have the budget requests in the pod. I believe the ALAC ones start at the bottom of page ten, at item 51, which is the NARALO e-books request. If you could just do a one sentence description of it? In that case, that one was funded. Then pause for a second or so and we'll see if there are any questions.

ROB HOGARTH:

Sure. The first one is FY16-41, and with your advice I'll go through them serially. I might, when questions are asked, then interject further aspects, of strategy or overall philosophy where it's appropriate. I think one important concept overall is one that's been pushed on us by our Finance Team and by Xavier Calvez in particular. That is what he hopes we're able to do in various allocations - identify capabilities and not focus on specific funding amounts or dollars.

As I say that, there will be aspects to this, in terms of some of the explanations, where part of the explanation is going to be, "Well, the budget was just a little bit more slim this year, or a little bit more difficult to match." That may conflict with what I just said, but I think

the overall approach was to identify capabilities and not get people too focused on the actual dollar amounts, but for staff to manage the overall budget that they have been or will be accorded in the overall budget picture, once the formal budget process is approved.

Let's start: FY16-41. The answer to that request was yes, with an explanation that said that over time the Communications Team has been accorded a budget allocation in the overall ICANN budget, and that this is an area that makes great sense for the Comms Team as well as the community to explore - that is the concept of sharing content through the e-book capability, if you will, and that this activity or this type of initiative will be supported in FY16. The Communications Team is responsible for managing this type of delivery through its own budget mechanisms.

I think it's fair to say over the next six-eight weeks, certainly prior to the BA Meeting, staff is going to be having detailed discussions about how specifically they're going to set up processes for asking for a number of these content-like requests, and that as we look towards implementation of this e-book idea that you guys will be invited to participate in some discussions with the Comms Team to see how we may be able to give effect to some of these ideas.

There may be opportunities in a cross-community type way to deliver certain content or subject matter, and that's something to be worked out as we move to implement things. In particular, with this request, I note that the staff of the DPRD Team, the part of the ICANN staff that's responsible for education, development and research areas, wants to be involved in this request. They thought it was particularly intriguing, so

there will be a partnership likely between the Comms Team and the DRPD Team in terms of working with you guys to identify content, identify topics and bring that to life. That's number 41. Any questions or clarifications that you guys would like on that one?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I have one comment. It's interesting, in a world where everyone carries a Kindle or something else with them, that we haven't thought of this before. I'll leave that comment. No need to answer, but it's intriguing. If we can go onto 42.

ROB HOGARTH:

Great, thanks. 42 is a development session for ALAC on a pilot basis at ICANN 54. As the explanation notes, this is something that the GNSO Council took the lead on in terms of previous pilot efforts in their own community. I think it's something that you all observed and thought was a good idea. Senior staff and the Board agreed that this would be a good year to experiment and let you guys test it and see if it actually works for you.

The concept that the GNSO fostered was this idea of giving the leaders of the community an opportunity to do some team-building, some strategizing, for the year to come, and that the Annual General Meeting was an excellent opportunity to do that. From that perspective, with the conditions noted here about the number of travellers, and that the fact that the allocation is devoted to meeting space, obviously providing staff support for the activity and the rest, that this activity was approved for a pilot in FY16. Any questions or comments on this one?

ALAN GREENBERG: No comments.

ROB HOGARTH: Okay, great. The next one, number 43, is really one in combination with number 48, and probably we'll have some discussions surrounding it. That was the concept of... We also want to talk about it in the context of AFRALO request as well, which was number 46. Let me try to handle all three in one. I think the sense that came out of senior staff and the Board here was that the overall resources organizationally weren't going to be able to accommodate three General Assemblies in a single year.

I think one of the original expectations of hopes was that at the very least one could be done every year and that the combination of those would all contribute to an overall successful Summit experience, which took place every several years as well. There were some particular issues with respect to FY16 that made this a challenging area. One was the featuring of a high-level governmental meeting that, under the terms of the original ATRT Recommendations, is now handled every three years or so. That is slated for the Marrakech Meeting, which made it not possible to approve the request from AFRALO for the Marrakech Meeting, for a General Assembly there.

The Board and senior staff wanted to make sure though that there was an opportunity to show some progress towards a future Summit, and decided to almost put the decision back on your community to be able to select a single General Assembly for the FY16 period and allow you guys to consider and discuss whether that would be one provided for

NARALO or EURALO. So the upshot of the three requests is the grant of one General Assembly for this coming FY, and for you all to choose between North America or Europe regions to conduct that. I'll stop and see if there are any questions or comments on this one.

ALAN GREENBERG: I certainly have a couple of questions and comments. First of all, I consider this exceedingly unfortunate, given that we were supposed to have a GA when the meeting was originally to be held in Marrakech, and a fair amount of work went into planning that. To be told now at this point that we can't do that... I'd like to understand, is this a budget issue or a hotel room issue?

ROB HOGARTH: My understanding is it's a combination of both.

ALAN GREENBERG: In terms of budget, these don't cost you an awful lot of money.

ROB HOGARTH: They come out to about \$50,000, and when you look at the - and this is an overall comment on the requests this year - when we added up and figured out the various costs of all the requests, we had a total of 53 requests this year, and the total came out to \$1.5 million, approximately, give or take \$10,000 here or \$10,000 there. I think the challenge then became how to fit all those requests into a total bucket of more around \$500,000, which was the original target. So there was an element, Alan,

of the financial considerations in terms of what was capable of being granted this year.

The logistics, as I understand it, for Marrakech, not only in terms of dollars and hotel rooms, but just the staff capabilities to be able to serve two major meetings at one time. I think those were the real drivers in terms of making that decision for FY16.

ALAN GREENBERG:

A couple of things. First of all, the pushing into FY17 only works for Europe. At this point, there is no North American Meeting scheduled in FY17, so is there a subtle message here that you want North America, because you're saying the other one should be in FY17?

ROB HOGARTH:

I guess that's a fair question, but I do not believe that was considered when the choice was offered.

ALAN GREENBERG:

It's rather sad if you're strongly suggesting FY17, that we actually have a meeting in that year. There is one in the tail end of FY16, but I'm presuming that's not going to be acceptable. The related question I have is if we end up deciding - and to be honest I don't know how we're going to decide on which meeting to have - but let us presume for the moment that we decide to have the North American Meeting. There's a presumption here that the other one, the European one, could be in FY17.

We're also suggesting that FY17 can house an AFRALO GA, and later on, when we get to a LACRALO request, I think the number is 51, and maybe you want to talk about it right now - yes, let's talk about 51. I'm going to interrupt my comment and put the others who have their hands up on hold. Let's talk about 51, and then we'll get back to the regional ones.

ROB HOGARTH: Sure. 51, I think it's fair to say, was not considered to be a GA request. The way this was characterized was an engagement for Members of the LAC community, that would take place at a separate event, the Telecon event. I think first off, this wasn't considered to be a GA request.

ALAN GREENBERG: Rob, I wasn't claiming it was, I just wanted you to talk about it first and then I'll explain the connection.

ROB HOGARTH: Okay. Sure. Well, it's fairly straightforward in terms of this particular request. The request was approved with the understanding that staff had to be very careful from the perspective of actual trainers, and from a financial perspective focus on individuals who may have gone through the training in the past, who are in a good position to act as training the trainers type of approach. The expectation was that the Telecon event was taking place, and that participants in the training who are already going to be attending or participating, could participate or arrive either earlier or later to actually participate in the training.

The allocation I think focused on providing an extra hotel night for the people attending that event, as well as making arrangements for meeting space and the various logistics that go with that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, thank you very much. I'll go back to my talk and then we'll go back to the speakers' list. The connection here is you're presuming there will be 25 travellers from Latin America who can stay an extra night. That implies there's a Regional Assembly? Otherwise we wouldn't have 25 travellers who are eligible to stay the extra night, unless you have some other travellers in mind, other than At-Large Members.

ROB HOGARTH:

No, I don't think so. Part of it includes the trainers who have to travel as well. When it says travellers, it's not necessarily people who are being trained. There's that aspect to it. I think the impression also was simply that there was an expectation that there would be a large presence of LACRALO Members at this regional event, and senior staff wanted to make sure that there was the capability to serve as many people as possible who wanted to participate in that. So I don't think there was...

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think we'll have to talk more about that, because ICANN only funds five people, and I'm sure we're not saying 20 trainers stay an extra day to train those five people, and those aren't the five people that we're trying to upgrade the skills and knowledge of. So there's a mismatch

between the 25 extra nights and who will be funded by ICANN to do that kind of thing. That one makes very little sense, unless you were in fact planning to have three Regional Assemblies in FY17, which I think is probably overachieving.

ROB HOGARTH:

No, I don't think that was intended here. I think again, the perspective in terms of if you're looking at Xavier adding up the various amounts here, that an extra hotel night for 25 people doesn't add up to all the additional costs that would go along with the GA in terms of logistics, room support and staff support. I think it was viewed that this would be nowhere near approaching that \$45,000 or \$50,000 figure. It would be a much smaller-scale event.

I'd also note that - and I don't know whether this was intended in the language - when it says "up to 25 people" that could be 25 people, it could be 20 people, it could be 10. So there's aspect as well. But I take your point that suggests that by putting that number in it suggests a potentially broader event.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, yes. More than potentially! Anyway, June 2016 is still in FY... I'm confused. Yes, that is in this FY, but I think we're bouncing this one back to you saying it doesn't make any sense. You're offering to fund 25 extra travellers for a day. We don't have 25 extra travellers, and certainly not the ones we were targeting this event at. So something doesn't compute at this one. We'll go to the speakers' list. Olivier?

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Thank you. I'm also a little concerned with regards to the cycle of GAs. The aims with regards to the overall At-Large Summit was to have an At-Large Summit at least once every five years, and that was something that was also well understood and agreed by Fadi and various Members of the Board and of ICANN senior staff. So as far as our GAs are concerned in general, the year after an At-Large Summit is usually a blank year. The year before an At-Large Summit is also a blank year because we're just busy preparing for the At-Large Summit.

So we're left with two years and five RALOs, and therefore the idea and the way that it was done before was to have at least two... Sorry, we were left with three years and five RALOs. So one in one year, and then... No, we'd have two, two and one, which effectively means that we're going to need to have two GAs in FY17 and two in FY18. I hope that's well understood, because what we're effectively doing here is we're doing one, two, two, rather than two, two, one.

ROB HOGARTH: That's very helpful to reinforce, Olivier. There was some active discussion among Board Members about the general approach being taken through the special community budget request process, just generally. What is this process for? What does it accomplish? I think that there is a clear point of view that says that it would not be appropriate to tie the GA budget to what we're viewing as special requests from the community. I think your points go to that overall budget philosophy.

If, in fact, the organization intends to continue these Summits every five years and the cycle as you say it, that's a pretty consistent schedule for those. We, as an organization, should be looking at incorporating these activities into the core budget and not put them in the context of a special request. I think that's something for us all to consider, not only as we look at the considerations of the FY16 budget - and I know you're going to be having a conversation with Xavier tomorrow or some time later next week, where I think this is an important topic to consider.

Also, just looking at the whole concept of the Summit, where I think that has evolved to recognition that every five years, as part of the overall ICANN budget, the discussion about that particular item. The GAs might find themselves in that same category. Xavier has talked, and may explore with you tomorrow, the fact that the special requests bucket is such a small percentage of the ICANN bucket. An important safety vent, if you will, for special requests, for new requests for pilot effort - and I think a very good argument to be made that these GAs should not be considered special requests, but should be more core budget.

I think as we look towards FY17 AND FY18 may be the methodology to look at for clearing this up on a going forward basis. I don't know if that was completely responsive, but thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Thank you Alan. Rob, I was under the African community and we were a little bit disappointed that we will not be able to hold our GA in Marrakech. But now it is decided and I won't argue about it. Just to understand, you said that we will have the priority for FY17. Do you mean that in FY17 we will have a meeting in Africa? I don't have the schedule yet.

ROB HOGARTH: I cannot answer that question at the moment Tijani, because I don't have that schedule in front of me either.

ALAN GREENBERG: The formal meeting plan does not call for a meeting in Africa. That is always subject to rearranging. But the next meeting in Africa is... The schedule is all wrong anyway, because according to this... Tijani, yes, there is a meeting in Africa. Sorry. I was looking at the wrong year. Just barely, by two days, but it does make it into FY17. Rob, one other comment that I find a little bit troubling. If this pattern continues and you can't do an ALAC GA in the same year as you're doing a high-level meeting, we may have an interesting problem.

The ATRT did recommend a high-level meeting, and they recommend it preferably every two years. Does that mean we can only have Assemblies every two years? If you factor in the overall cycle as Olivier discussed, we're going to have a real problem and we're going to be competing with the GAC. It's not going to help our work patterns together.

ROB HOGARTH: I will take that as an opportunity for further comment, Alan. I don't know quite how that would work out in terms of whether we would have this perfect storm of conflict for the Marrakech Meeting early next year. I think that was just a very unfortunate circumstance with the high-level governmental meeting and the GA request happening to be for the exact meeting. I'd hope that if the Meetings Team achieves its objectives to get these event schedules out two years in advance, which is a priority that the Meetings Team currently has, and has assured the Board they're going to achieve, I think that would help us all in terms of some of this planning.

You're right. It may be difficult in some years. I would quickly also point out that the decisions made for this FY are related to this FY. A lot of the drivers I think for some of the budget issues going into FY16 we're trying to anticipate what was happening with respect to the transition and accountability processes, and the rest. Some of the pressures that senior staff and the Board were potentially seeing for FY16 may or may not exist in future FYs.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand that. The other comment I'll make is with the ABC Meetings, we're going to find that B Meetings are probably not particularly suitable for Summits. If we're bringing people in to expose them to the full richness of an ICANN Meeting, a B Meeting is not going to do it.

ROB HOGARTH: That's a very good point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Again, we're going to be really constrained at getting... Fadi said, and I gather was chastised for saying, that maybe we should have a Summit every year. Well, none of us are prepared to have a Summit every year. But if we're even trying to push it a little bit more frequently than every five years, we're going to have only a limited opportunity for GAs in-between. Maybe we have no more GAs and have a Summit every two years. Maybe that's what you're actually pushing us to do, but there's a budget implication to that that I'm not sure we're going to be able to settle immediately.

ROB HOGARTH: No. Just a quick response to that - I don't think that the decisions are one, as strategic as you're alluding to. I hope they will be as the process continues. Secondly, I'm treating your "you're pushing" as a more organizational perspective, not Rob Hogarth.

ALAN GREENBERG: Of course.

ROB HOGARTH: All right, just clarifying that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Part of what I'm saying is tongue-in-cheek, but nevertheless, there is an issue there. Olivier, one last comment and then we'll move on, because we've already used up over half the meeting.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Just to reinforce this, to me it sounds like the allocation of GAs this year is just a stop-gap measure, and I'd really hope that we can come down to an agreement with ICANN Finance and the Board for an ingrained solution where the GAs and the At-Large Summits would be part of the core budget, in which case we'll not be going through this time-wasting exercise every year to negotiate for GAs, et cetera. The timetable for travel is known in advance.

We can work out and design a table where then we can have an integrated table of GAs for At-Large, and also the activities in the other parts of ICANN - the GNSO, the GAC, et cetera - and therefore not end up with freak occurrences where all of the different ICANN component parts need to have a larger meeting at one of the smaller locations. That's just makes it very difficult. So hopefully we can come down to some understanding.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. Rob, back to you.

ROB HOGARTH: Thank you for those comments, Olivier. I think this is an example of we are now, as the organization matures, running into a situation where we're faced with potentially longer-term planning using what I think was

intended five years ago to be a more temporary process, and we're quickly seeing, as the organization continues to grow and evolve, that some of the old processes need to evolve or be modified to reflect that. Because yes, this should not be the process by which we do that. Plain and simple.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I think we're now on 44.

ROB HOGARTH:

Thank you Sir for keeping me on count. This is the Global Indigenous Members Persons Mentorship Program, which was I think a very disappointing not-approved for this FY, as indicated in the rationale and explanations, although I think the rationale doesn't express the angst about being able to serve and provide some resources for a pilot for this effort. As you may pick up in the rationale, I think there is a recognition by the Board and senior staff that this is an area that requires some attention.

The hope is that in this FY, although the allocation could not be made for this activity, there is an interest in being able to do this with more of a priority focused on the FY17 budget year. The hope is that during this FY there can be a partnership between staff and community to design a program - either an evolution of existing programs, or a separate program to ensure some sort of attention to or focus on indigenous populations and getting them involved in the work of ICANN from a support standpoint.

So it's disappointing in terms of my earlier theme about a tough decision; not being able to resource this year, but recognition of an important component going forward and a commitment to devote planning and expectations for being able to have a full-fledged program or some type of program in the next FY.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Rob. I found this one particularly disappointing because I thought we'd made it clear that A) the Fellowship would be a large part of this - and Janice had said we could absorb a small number of people without a problem. She actually said a much larger number of people than we asked for. I thought we'd made it clear that if you say, "We can only fund two or three this year," we would have been quite acceptable of it. We might have had a hard time narrowing it down to that many people, but that would have been our problem. The fact it wasn't funded as a pilot project with even less than a handful of people I found very disappointing.

ROB HOGARTH:

Janice, if she was sitting next to me, may kick me for making this comment, but I think as part of those conversations there may be throughout the course of the year, depending on how the program is being discussed and focused on, there may be opportunities to try some experiments. I think again, every FY is different. Xavier has ingrained on us there is a measure of storytelling in any budget, which creates a set of expectations that once you're into the year you begin to learn what you can do and what you cannot do.

I think from a special budget request process this was unable to be allocated, but if you had some good conversations that moved forward, there may be capabilities that come up within FY16 where there's an opportunity for some experimentation. That just couldn't be formally approved. The second piece to this I think is yes, I don't know what's going to happen with the Fellowship Program moving forward. I think there was some expectation there about being able to expand that program much more aggressively than the FY16 budget is giving staff the capability to do. So that's probably another piece of this. That's just my own personal speculation and not anything else.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Although this call is being recorded, and I'm not sure I want to say this for the record, I think what you're saying is if we're careful we may get part of this de facto approved, even though it wasn't approved. Don't answer that because we don't really want to confirm that, but I do caution Judith and Glenn, who are going to speak, to factor this in and not say other things. Thank you. Judith, you're next.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Since I'm factoring it in I'll let Glenn take it and then I do want to talk about my issue later on, so I'll use my one thing later.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Sure. I think Rob has identified that this is a bit of a square peg. It doesn't fit the Fellowship because of categories, but if you start to look at the demographics and not [unclear 00:38:53] it actually fits. This goes

back to a couple of years ago when Garth and I advocated for this with Chris Mondini, and he was really quite excited to see something like this. I'm actually very disappointed this one didn't get funded.

My understanding is - and I was working with [Toni and Loris] to make sure they got submissions in. I think we need to work with [Loris and Toni] to get it right. If there's any chance to work with the people like [Loris and Toni], with staff, to come up with the right net, I'm more than happy to volunteer.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Glenn. Judith, did you want to speak now or on some later topic?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

I will speak when we talk about the pilot for captioning.

ROB HOGARTH:

One final piece of this - please take seriously that last sentence of the rationale: "Staff available to explore potential program parameters with proposal authors, during FY16 the plan for subsequent new requests." Whether that's through Heidi or other folks on staff, please take advantage of that. I know there are a number of members of staff who really like the proposal, and so I think there will be opportunities for that dialogue and you should certainly take advantage of it, in amongst everything else you all have on your plates.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Rob, and perhaps even talk about it for this FY. Onto the next one.

ROB HOGARTH: The next one is number 47 - the ALAC high-level town hall meeting at IGF 2015. I don't have a lot of personal experience with this one. I think, as I understood the rationale and explanation from Members of the GSE Team of staff, it's that they were aware there's a number of potential discussions going on with respect to Day Zero events at IGF 2015, that they were willing to be supportive of this concept or idea. But they weren't in a position to be able to commit any resources or allocate any capabilities at this stage, because I don't know if it wasn't fully formed yet, I don't know what's changed with respect to IGF.

But they did make a commitment to note this as a potential activity that either then, or ICANN more specifically, would want to support by Members of the ICANN community who are planning on going to IGF. So there was that commitment to forward that proposal to the meeting organizers and staff responsible for organizing ICANN's IGF participation. I'm not sure where that sits today. I'll do some follow up for you all, but there wasn't the commitment to be able to fully engage and support a town hall meeting at that point in time. If things develop with the Day Zero event, that group might have a different answer. We should continue to keep this one alive in some way, through further discussions I guess, from those of you who are going to be going to IGF.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Since that was one of the proposals that I authored, I regret the answer. Anyone else on this one? You're back on Rob.

ROB HOGARTH: Thank you Sir. I want to be careful here. I don't want to give away too much, but I've been driving this whole time and flipping through papers. Granted it's very slow traffic.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please try to stay alive.

ROB HOGARTH: I don't know if I will capture all of these, but there was a common theme of requests made certainly by members of the At-Large community as well as other communities, in terms of a support for sessions at the IGF. In general, you'll have seen for most of them that the response was similar, with some exceptions that we'll get through in some of these requests. We just talked about one, with the high-level town hall meeting, in that as we have done in past years, there was a recognition that a number of these proposals were potentially good ones, but ICANN staff and certainly the Board didn't find themselves in a position to be the deciders of fact in terms of whether a particular proposal for a session was worthy or not.

So a number of the grants are conditional on the MAG approving certain sessions. I know that happened with the IGF this past year. Some were approved, some were not. That's the general tenor I think was taken with respect to these requests. If we look to number 49 - the AFRALO

Leadership Team Outreach [unclear 00:44:30] IGF Meeting in Brazil, I think there was a recognition that there were two components to that. The second component I think I just addressed in terms of the fact that if the session proposed is supported than two travellers will be allocated.

The earlier part I think focused more on the capability of providing an outreach event for a community from a region in which the event was not taking place. I think the sense there, at least in terms of what I recall from some of the initial feedback that we've gotten in circulating the requests and the rest, was that if this request had been for the IGF in Asia, there would have been a very close melding and a consistency there that would be easily approved.

The fact this was an APRALO event suggested for Latin America was something that scored against it, in terms of when it came down to having to make final choices between different groups, this part of the proposal simply didn't make the approval list. I think the rationale reflects that if this proposal was submitted in the future for an AP region event then it would be viewed much more favorably. It doesn't say "likely granted" here, but I think it would be much more likely to be granted in that context. I'm happy to answer any questions or provide clarification on this.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. We have Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Thank you Rob. AFRALO have requested a funding for an IGF Workshop, and our request was accepted by you. Nevertheless, I noted those days when I entered on the database of the IGF that our Workshop is not listed among the requested workshops. I submitted the Workshop proposal on time. It was the last day, but it was on time. So there is a problem, I don't know where. I have already contacted the Secretariat, but we don't yet have any response. I do hope this will be solved, because it's a pity that when ICANN accepted to fund our Workshop it's not on the list of the IGF Workshops. Thank you.

ROB HOGARTH: Thank you. Certainly there is a process that you still have to go through within the IGF, Tijani, for either an appeal or a reconsideration or something. As those things change and we get closer to the meeting, if circumstances change, please advise the IGF coordinators with ICANN, for a number of reasons, but yes, please let us know. The staff who are responsible for managing the IGF stuff are Mandy and Baher, so if you could keep them in the loop that would be great. Because that may impact other things they want to do at the meeting. So thanks for that update.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Will do. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Cheryl, to note, seeing as you're driving I don't really want you reading the chat as well as doing everything else. The APRALO one, which of course is specific to number 49, which you were just alluding to, is in exactly the same situation. It is not showing as listed, and it was well and truly in advance of the last day, so there's a bunch of stuff going on. But I think we need to look quite seriously and strategically about this interaction and nexus with the value - and there is value - in activities at IGF.

So I'd like to flag that we need to take a specific and somewhat separated strategic look at these specific and special activities at IGF for a short- and medium-term planning exercise. That's certainly something you can expect at least the AP Leadership to be following up with you on after Buenos Aires. Because we have fared for many years, when other regions get funded to do stuff in our region, we don't get funded to do stuff in our region and we don't get funded to do stuff in other people's. So we've got to work smarter on this. Thank you.

ROB HOGARTH: Thank you Cheryl. One other piece here that I think is important to share, which won't make me popular amongst my internal colleagues, but is something you are all probably in a unique position to do, is I think a number of people have advocated for a number of years in terms of an overall ICANN Strategy, in terms of the IGF Meeting. That's certainly something that from time-to-time has started to be explored and I don't think has been completed.

I think that would help all of you, in particular, whether it's a special request or just more strategically in the ICANN core budget, to what is the approach to that event, how can it be organized in such a way that you all feel you're getting the maximum benefit out of participating.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, working smarter, not harder. Not a bad thing.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll note that we're five minutes before the hour and we haven't finished going through the list yet, and we had some other things to discuss. That being said, in this era of ICANN transparency, I'd really like to see a budget reconciliation of what ICANN is spending on IGFs for staff and Board Members going, compared to what they're putting into the rest of the community attending and participating in these meetings. Nothing that you have control over, Rob, so you don't need to answer that.

ROB HOGARTH: But a potential message point for tomorrow, so...

ALAN GREENBERG: Indeed. All right, if you can perhaps at an accelerated rate finish the list, and then we'll break into some other discussions and you can go back to driving.

ROB HOGARTH:

Yes. I think there are only two others on the list that we haven't touched on in one way, shape or form. One is number 50 - real-time captioning at AC meetings. That's something that she'll be embarrassed for me to pat her on the back for, but that Heidi was a major advocate for internally - not just in stating the case but working with the IT Team on. I think that's something that while it doesn't have a huge budget impact, and actually in some respects [nods 00:52:10] to the benefit of the organization from a budget perspective, it represents a real opportunity for expanding the accountability of meetings - not just within your community but in others. So I'm glad there was recognition of support there.

Then number 53, which is the strategic working session for ALAC and RALO Leaders at ICANN public meetings 54 and 55, that was a request you all made to again follow in the footsteps of the GNSO, where they have pre-ICANN Meeting meetings amongst themselves, to set up the week, to decide what they're going to be talking about, to use it as an extra work capability. That has been indicated as being approved for support for the two meetings I indicated - not for Dublin, I don't think. I'm doing the numbers right here. Yes, for Dublin and for the Meeting A 55.

That's something I think fits in Alan with your overall theme of engagement in this current year. It's something I hope you guys will be able to take advantage of. It's something we'll want feedback on as to whether it works or not.

ALAN GREENBERG: For that one, that's something we've been asking, begging and whatever for about the last five years. So I'm grateful that was allocated. Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Rob, thanks so much, and thanks also Heidi for support. As you probably know, Glenn and I were the main advocates for this, and pushing with Gunela as well. I went and talked to a lot of the Board Members while there to get their interest, but my questions is on the structuring. How do they see it being structured? Are they going to leave the pilot to us to be determined on how to structure it? Or what do they have in mind for the type of pilot and what we're going to be doing? They're the basic questions on that. Do we work with someone from your office in helping structure the pilot? Do we work with the IT people? We've been working closely with Josh, but that's just my questions on this.

ROB HOGARTH: Thanks a lot Judith for those questions. I think you should view this as a collaboration with the IT Team. Josh was a very vocal and, I think, positive recipient of your conversations and conversations with Heidi. I'd anticipate that would be the level of conversation. There are certain parameters that are a part of this rationale, but I think you guys having some initial discussions, you've got between now and July 1st to have some conversations about how this might be rolled out. I think those could be quite productive.

You may even be able to continue some of the experiments that Josh described to all of you when we were together in Singapore, and whether that's some extra learning experience at the Buenos Aires

Meeting, or otherwise plans for maybe an experiment or two prior to the beginning of FY16, I think it's something the IT Team is looking very positively at, because it actually potentially has a positive budget impact in terms of how it's potentially set up, where we might even be able to utilize, in certain vendors, realize some improved efficiencies and maybe even some contract savings.

I think this was almost the perfect blending, Judith, of a really good idea, and that the interest in ICANN, the organization, trying to be more efficient and effective.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yes. Thanks so much Rob. Also my question is do we work also with IT in putting together a list of vendors for the captioning? It started where we had Josh and one vendor come on our Technology Taskforce call and Accountability call and display through AC how the pods worked. There are three vendors listed there, and we tried different pods. As Adobe is limited to the people who are working on their pods, do you suggest that we go with them? Or when you talk about different vendors are you talking about different vendors for face-to-face meetings? I was wondering if you could clarify that part.

ROB HOGARTH:

I wish I had more knowledge about this area, but I don't, so I cannot clarify specifically. I think that's something you should definitely raise with Josh. After the results of the Board Meeting were published I reached out to him to make him aware that this and a couple of other requests that impact the IT Team were approved, and so he's very

excited about talking about some of those. I suggest you and Heidi coordinate with him - or whoever Heidi designates; whether it's Ariel or Silvia - to have additional conversations about how this might get rolled out and managed.

I would expect that how you start the FY is going to be different from how you end it, just based on the pilot experience. I think we're talking at least three calls a month, and so once you're 15 or 20 calls into this I'm sure you'll have a much better idea about what the next steps are, whether it's scalable, and you'll have all sorts of information that you can then use for the pilot phase two in FY17.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'd suggest on this one, I don't even think choice of vendor is really the issue. We may want to try several vendors over the period of a year and see how the different technologies work in relation to being really effective. I think our challenge on the very short-term is to figure out which three meetings a month are we talking about where we can really get the best benefits or potential benefit out of doing this. I think that's where we should be putting our focus on the short-term.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yes. Alan, that's exactly right, and I will speak with Heidi about it. When I notified the people on the Technology Taskforce and on the Accountability that we had gotten the funding for the pilot, a bunch of people wrote to me that they want to help structure this pilot. My goal is after talking to Heidi and Josh is then to figure out how we create a structure for the pilot going forward - so how do we determine who gets

to have their meetings captioned, and come up with a system that will work, that could [radically 00:59:57] give a chance to all regions to get this tested.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suggest as a first option we start identified the possible meetings. Of course, that presumes we can get real-time captioning in various languages, which some regions require. We're really out of time on this one right now.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Right, but Alan, as you look on the thing, vendors can do Spanish and English very quickly. French is a little more difficult, but Spanish and French is very easy.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that's beyond the FBSC's domain. Thank you very much Rob. We appreciate your time. You can go back to driving right now. We're over the hour. Is everyone okay for staying a few more minutes? Hearing no no's, I think the only thing we must discuss at this point is what methodology we're going to use to decide which GA we're holding. Obviously, if one of the regions says, "We cede and we won't have one," that makes it easy. We could hold a wrestling match in the center of the ALAC table in Buenos Aires if we can find a volunteer for each region. Any other possible suggestions? That last one was a joke, for the record.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Damn, I was looking forward to that.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, it's not a joke, and on behalf of one of the regions we'll have an Asia Pacific representative wrestling.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: At least we get involved. That's a change - to see you're actually bringing in AP for once.

ALAN GREENBERG: As our surrogate wrestlers, of course.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm sure we can pick up someone appropriate from Japan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Touché. I was hoping you'd do it yourself.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Did you want this to be a survivable effort? Because I only play to win.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Does anyone have any viable suggestions for how we go forward on this one? It is a serious issue. Nobody does. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Is the question about how to choose between one of the two regions for the GA?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure the word is choose, but it looks like we're going to be funded for one only, and right now we have tow people who've put their hand up. Rob, thank you for being with us.

ROB HOGARTH: Thank you all very much. Please, I'm more than happy to follow up conversations. We will have separate conversations with the CROPP Review Team for the implications for some of these rationales for them, so more than happy to appreciate that this is not the end of the conversations, just the beginning. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Rob. Thank you for being with us. Anyone have any thought on the GA problem? Otherwise we'll defer to another meeting and the mailing list.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I didn't finish. I didn't say anything. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes? Judith has her hand up? I thought that was an old hand.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: No, it's a new hand. My thought was that we look at where the next meetings are of the large one - not the B Meeting, but the A and C, or the regular ones, and then we determine by that figuring out who holds the GA. That would be my thought - and maybe people would hate me for saying this - but maybe because it's going to be in Europe in October they do a GA so they can bring more European Members to the ICANN session. That's just one thought I had. Since there's another one in North America near the end, we do a similar type of thing. That's what my thought was.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not quite sure I follow you. You're saying for FY16 OR 17?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: If you look at the schedule for this year, there's an AGM at Dublin, which is in EURALO. The thought was maybe they have a GA before the EURALO Meeting so that more of the European ALSes can get involved, and stay for the whole ICANN Meeting. Then we could have ours similarly in 2016 before the ICANN Meeting there, for Meeting C.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's in FY17 for the next North American meeting. The proposal on the table was to hold the GA not at an ICANN meeting but at the ARIN meeting that's being held just prior to the Dublin meeting and Montreal.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I know that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. I think that even if we have a lot of objective reasons or objective criteria to choose Region A or B, the best way to do it is to bring both region leaders to sit together and try to discuss it together, and come to the ALT with a decision. If they cannot do it, the ALT sit with them and try to sort it with them, so we'll have a solution that will satisfy everyone. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you for a concrete solution Tijani. That's what I was hoping someone would say. Glenn?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: ...Montreal, as Alan has indicated. It was during the ARIN session, which we have an MOU with. I just posted in the chat - there are other ARIN sessions that are 2015 we can consider. It's not a question of conceding. I have no problem with EURALO doing the GA in this FY, but I'd just like to say that we'd still like to do it in accord with ARIN. Now, I know Judith had a different view, but I'm not against having the idea of EURALO doing it.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. If the other NARALO people agree with you then we don't have a problem. I will send out an email to the various people, and see if we can come to an agreement easily. If not, we'll either resort to the

suggestion Tijani mentioned of the ALT arbitrating, or the wrestling solution. All right, anything else we need to discuss today? Seeing none, I adjourn this meeting. Thank you all for participating. We'll all meet each other again real soon, I'm sure.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]