
TERRI AGNEW:

All right. We'll go ahead and begin at this time. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the Finance and Budget Subcommittee working group on Monday the 21st of December 2015 at 17:00 UTC.

On the call today for members we have Tijani Ben Jemaa, Wafa Dahmani, Ali AlMeshal, Maureen Hilyard, Alan Greenberg, Tim Denton, and Sébastien Bachollet.

On the participant side we have Daniel Nanghaka, Seun Ojedeji, Douglas Onyango, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Kali Kan, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Allan Skuce, and Glenn McKnight.

Hoping to join us a little later in the call will be Beran Gillen and Humberto Carrasco.

And we just had León Sanchez join us as well from the member's side.

Apologies we have listed from Wolf Ludwig and Humberto Carrasco.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Rob Hogart, I apologize, Rob is not on. Yesim Nazlar and myself Terri Agnew. Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and David.

And just for one clarification, the members I listed earlier today as members are members of the finance and budget subcommittee working group.

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 would like to remind all participants to please state your name, not only for transcription purposes but also for our interpreters. Thank you very much and back over to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I note for the record that we are missing from, we don't have any members on the call from EURALO, but Olivier has a flight delay and is planning to join, hopefully sometime in the near future. All other regions are represented by at least one person.

All right. The first item on the agenda is the welcome. So I will welcome you all. The finance and budget subcommittee is an interesting one for a number of reasons. Like several of our groups, it includes as formal members, one person from among the members of the ALAC from that region, and just for the record, I'm here not as the North American member but as the chair of the group.

And one member appointed by the RALO itself. Should there ever come to a vote in this group, then only the members participate in the vote. In addition to members, we have participants, and participants or anyone else who has an interest in what we're doing, and would like to take part in the process, to in general, since this group rarely does vote, participants are on an equal footing with everyone else.

This group is somewhat unique in that a large number of participants we have, especially from some regions. I'm not quite sure what the attraction is. Maybe there is a belief that we'll personally get money out of this if we participate in this group, it hasn't worked for me so far, but we'll see what happens.

But I'm glad to see so many people and I hope people will be active and, you know, take ownership in this. The process in the finance budget subcommittee is essentially to make decisions and orchestrate the process for getting money from ICANN. We have access to a significant amount of funds, some years we haven't done really well. Last year, for instance, we did quite well in making requests for special budgets and getting them.

So we're optimistic this will be a good year. How good it is, is going to depend to some extent on just how well we do our job and how convincing the cases are that we make. So the objective of this meeting, it's a kick-off meeting for the year, we are going to go over the process through which we request funding from ICANN for special projects.

There is also a special process we're starting this year that we're talking about, regarding General Assemblies and summits that is a little bit different, and we hope will both increase our success and make the process more predictable. But we'll be talking about that as we go forward.

I'd now like to go on to item number four, and start going over the detailed process of making the budget requests, looking at, so we understand what the process is, and then we'll go into five, which will look at the criteria that we'll be using this year to try to make sure that the budget requests are cohesive and fit together, so we make a good case.

And I'll turn it over to Heidi now to do item number, budget item, agenda item number four. Thank you. My mouth is not quite in gear with my brain yet.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you Alan. I don't think this will take 20 minutes, but we'll see. So the first link I have added under this item is the finance, the public finance Wiki. So Terri has already put that into the chat and this Wiki has all of the basic information that a finance department wants all the ACs and SOs and SGs to see.

So what I have added, and this includes, for example, the template, the new process description and timeline. The principles that govern ICANN's requests, and we're going to go through all of that on this. So I've taken most of that information and added to that to the At-Large fiscal year budget development site.

And as every year, for the last several years, we've basically had a very similar workspace that is adapted for At-Large, that lists, once submitted, the ALAC and the RALO fiscal year requests, the criteria, which we'll go over under the next item, the timeline. And this is where I want to start. And then also the important documents. That's the last item on the workspace.

And this includes a link to that finance Wiki, so if you want to go back and see the original information, it's there. I also have brought over to this At-Large workspace, the template, again, the principles, and the process. So really everything, this page is meant to be a one stop place

for all of the information. But I just wanted to stress that if you did want to go back to the public finance page, you can go to that link.

And once the other ACs and SOs and SGs start submitting, you'll be able to see them on that page as well. Okay, so going through then the timeline. And if you take a look at the At-Large timeline, that has added the FBFC schedule as well. So I wanted to just go over this. And Terri, if you possible, could you put that up, so the... Okay, you've done that. So that's perfect.

Actually Terri, if you could put up the At-Large fiscal year 17 workspace and bring it down to the overall timeline, that includes FBSC, that would allow people to go through that. So as she's doing that, I'm just going to start. And bear with me, because there are a lot of dates here. So the 15th of December was the kick off.

The key date to remember is that all requests need to be submitted by the 15th. Okay, so all other things being equal, that's really the deadline for that date. So then we bring that into the FBSC, so starting today, through the 23rd, FBFC representatives and/or staff or to send a notice to the RALOs of the opening of the fiscal year 17 special request process, to all of the RALOs and ALSs, etc.

Then beginning early next year, 4th of January until almost the end, 22nd, the RALOs are to review any ALS request or [complete] a template on behalf of the RALO and send it to staff. Now that time allows, I believe, most of the RALOs to discuss this on one of their monthly calls. And I think that there is enough flexibility to, if it is not, I think APRALO may not have their call until a little later, that there is still time to do that.

But again, feel free to do that on your mailing list. Then between the 25th and 29th of January, the request is that the FBFC invite Xavier Clavez, CFO, onto a call of the FBFC to discuss the preliminary requests. And that has proved to be very useful every year, so I would highly recommend that we go ahead with that.

Then between, on the 5th, by the 5th, all of the revised proposals to be sent to the FBFC for final review. Then sometime between 8th of February and the 12th, the FBFC is to review all of the RALO requests. And this year, what they are asking was that not only to review them, but also to prioritize them.

In the past, that has not always been the case. Finance has said that that would be helpful to do that. Then again, the key date is submission by staff to the ICANN controller of all requests that the FBFC has said that they want to submit. So again, please let staff do that. Then the 16th of March, the preliminary review of the requests of all of the ACs, SOs and SGs by ICANN staff.

Then during the Marrakesh meeting, the finance members, again, mostly Xavier, but I think mostly Rob Hoggart and Janice [inaudible], who are part of the process, will be coming upon request of the ACs and SOs and SGs to their meetings to review the requests, and perhaps if they have any questions, I think there is going to be, you know, questions for both the various constituencies and groups as well as finance to them.

And then the final assessments and recommendations by ICANN staff will take place between 15th of March and 31st of March. And then

during April, the Board will do their final review and approval. And so some time after April 1st, they will have the announcement and the details of the approved fiscal year 17 request.

So that's the timeline for that. I also wanted to go through the process...

ALAN GREENBERG: Two hands up Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, okay, Tijani.

Tijani, can you... If you're speaking, you're on mute.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you hear me now?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes Tijani. Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. You said that this year, our subcommittee will provide the requests. Is it the will of the finance department, or we will want to do it?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. This is Heidi. So again, it's a request by the finance committee. You're under absolutely no obligation, but it states under the process and principles that, let me just get the exact wording.

The finance, under the process it says, we ask that you give consideration to the number of requests, and to the priority of the requests prior to submitting them. So it's basically a request from the finance committee. Okay Alan

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Heidi. Last year, a number of the decisions that were made and approved by the Board, when we looked at them to be blunt, didn't make any sense. Can we encourage the people who are doing the assessment to interact with us and either tentatively pass their results back through us before the Board approves?

I understand the Board may make changes, that's fine. And also make sure that if there is any confusion or something, that they ask for clarification. But even without that, some level of feedback before it's all formalized, might allow us to avoid some of the situations that we had last year. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes Alan. Absolutely. The people, the staff that are responsible for that, and I and others from that various AC SO support staff, have learned from this, and will certainly... There is going to be more discussion internally on the details, but also I think on the call with Xavier with the

FBFC, that we definitely invite Janice and Rob as well, so they can hear the details. So yes, constant communication is a must.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just as a follow on, if we look at our success rate last year and how much money was allocated to us, it weigh overstates how much money we could actually spend, because a significant number of the allocations essentially went up in smoke because of technicalities. So let's make sure that doesn't happen again. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

So yes. In addition, if I may, from the staff side, if the RALOs or any of the requests coming from the RALOs, if the members of the FBFC can be closely associated with those requests, so they are aware of what is actually being asked, and what the objective of the requests are, that would be useful as well.

I know in the past there have been some cases where there was not clarity on the requests. And that may be, you know, the review and the final ultimate approval, and ultimately the implementation, rather challenging.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yup. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Tijani, thank you. Tijani, do you have your hand up again?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, yes. Do you hear me?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. I'd like to support the request of Alan, and inform you that this request was very old. We always asked from the beginning of the process that Xavier put in, or put there, we ask for interactions before the final decision. Now Alan is asking for an interaction with the Board final subcommittee.

I ask also for an interaction with the staff that are assessing the requests, before they decide to pass to the Board finance committee any advice. Try to interact with us, so that we explain perhaps the, they see that the request is not valid because they didn't understand what's behind it, perhaps because what we wrote isn't enough.

So interaction with the staff, interaction with the Board finance committee. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, just for the record. I didn't ask for interaction with the Board finance committee, may be an interesting thing. But perhaps we want to include a step in the process of reviewing all of our requests with our Board member. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you Alan, yes. I was actually just thinking the same. And I believe that Rinalia Abdul Rahim, who is the Board member selected by At-Large and the ALAC, will be speaking to the ALAC for a significant amount of time. So that might be the way to go rather than inviting the entire CFC. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. I guess, just for the last point, I guess it was always to done. I would like to add one thing. It's very important that we find what other process, what is the process to go to the [inaudible] in the light of what is discussed today within the CCWG, specifically with a question of budget. I think that this process, specific process, must be announced this year, even if it's not yet included in the bylaws.

We need to have those exchanges between At-Large, this committee, and the staff, and then with the Board, before they take a decision. It's really very important to show that we are not just waiting for the new bylaw, but we are just enacting on this new announce accountability system. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Thank you. Alan, did you want to respond to that?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I don't think there is any problem with that. I'll just note for those who haven't been involved for quite a long time, up until relatively recently, the process has really been one of RALOs coming up with requests, and those requests, to a large extent, have been passed through by the finance and budget committee.

So essentially, what the ALAC has requested is a merging of the RALO requests. There were not many ALAC requests as such, and there was no real triage or processing of the requests by the finance and budget subcommittee. That changed last year, to a large extent, and that will continue this year.

So very much so what we are going to put forward, hopefully, is something that this committee believes is going to be helping At-Large, and not just things which are on the wish list of the RALO. That doesn't mean that we take off things, we want to make sure that the requests are cohesive and hold together. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Thank you Alan. Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. This is Dev Anand. Can you hear me?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thank you. Dev Anand speaking. So my question is regarding the budget request timeline, I note the emphasis has always been in the past, that the RALOs have to make the proposal, and then the finance and budget subcommittee reviews the RALO's request. I've been involved with other working groups, and some of the works are considering that some budget proposal to aid in the work of the working group on behalf of the At-Large community.

So I'm just going to confirm that can working groups submit budget proposals to the finance and budget subcommittee?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: You have my answer in the window.

HEIDI ULLRICH: The green check. From staff... If I may, I think that's an excellent idea. And I think a lot of the At-Large working groups have areas where they could, you know, request would make sense. Now if we can move to the next points, there are no other questions, and I'll just continue on that. One area that we had to request in the past that we do not need to, this year, are the CROPP.

So the CROPP is going to continue without any additional requests. And also some technical issues for streaming, etc. that there have been some requests in the past that are also now have made it into the core budget, so no requests for that. Terri, if you could put the process up very quickly, and I just wanted to stress that this link is on the fiscal year 17 budget development workspace, so please do read this, when you have a chance.

I just want to highlight some points, again. The number one, as I mentioned earlier, was that the number of requests and the priority of the requests, are being requested by the finance staff under point six, templates which are available on the fiscal year 17 work space. This is sort of new as well, I believe, is that they're going to be reviewed in the order that they are received.

So that means that the earlier requests into the process, the more opportunity the finance staff, as well as the ACs SOs have for review. Having said that, I think that just be inviting Xavier, and Rob, and Janice, early into the process, so they're aware, I think that is also going to help.

Point seven on the process, it says, in the interest of accountability and transparency, all recipients of resources through this process will be required to comply with certain reporting and activity conditions, so that value resulting from the funded activity is established and can be reported to the ICANN community.

So what we have done, and I have discussed this with various people on the policy staff as well as Xavier, is that what we've been doing, which is rather unique among the ACs and SOs is that we have an

implementation page for fiscal year requests. Terri, if you could put that up when you have a chance, that implementation includes the details of acceptance, what is being requested, and then result and status.

So I've heard that is above what is being asked for. So we're doing very well in that regard. Okay. Overall operating [inaudible] the envelope for the fiscal year 17, for all requests is approximately \$600,000, US dollars. And again, the envelope may change for additional requests, depending on the conclusions that the selection process reaches.

Okay so those are the processes. Okay. And then the principles... There are some new principles. Again, this stated on the, I posted them onto the workspace.

I'm just...

Give me one moment while I'm taking a look, okay.

And Terri, I'm going to give you the link so that you can put that up into the chat. In fact, I'll just go ahead and put into the chat so that people can look at it. These are the principles.

Okay and Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, thank you Heidi. Two issues, two point. The first one is about priority. Instead that the finance staff will process the requests as they arrive. We will not make use of this possibility because we have submit all the requests in this subcommittee, and then we submit all of the

requests together. So we will not, perhaps other constituencies then At-Large will perhaps be the first to submit their request. We cannot be the first, we will be at the end because we have to do all together all of the requests.

Second question, a question about the envelope. Can you please repeat the amount of the envelope?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, okay. So on the first point, apologies if I've misrepresented that. So again, they're not going to be processed in terms of going to the Board finance committee. That's the ultimate step. Basically, as they come in, the process internally starts with finance, the staff that look at it, that would be Rob and Janice, and then the various support staff.

So it's just going to be the process of review. That's what is going to be prioritized and, as they start submitting the requests. However, we're going to invite Xavier, and Rob, and Janice, as the process begins. So they're going to be very much informed of what is being planned.

And then on the bucket, the number was \$600,000 US.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Repeat please, I didn't hear.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Six zero zero, \$600,000. I'll put that into the, okay.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay, thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Okay just moving along quickly. We have now the principle. So do take a look at those. I believe that they're going to be in the chat soon. Yeah, I put them in.

Sorry, I'm just taking a look.

Okay. So again, basically if they can please view the template. And the request must be consistent with the charter of the request and community groups. Also, no, yeah basically. Please use dialogue with staff will liaise with the community leaders, is a must.

Okay, I think those are the basic principles.

Okay, Alan, did you want to go over the criteria? I think I covered most of the issues under this item.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, you're not going to go over these principles in detail I gather, because there is an awful lot of them.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Exactly. I thought people could just read those.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Then we do suggest you read them. Yes, I will go over the principles. Can we pull it up? It's on the finance and budget subcommittee page.

Is that something we can get loaded?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry Alan, did you want to go over the principles in detail or the criteria now for the...?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, the criteria. You agreed... [CROSSTALK] Okay, we're finished with item number four now?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, just a final point. The template is the same as last year's. So those, I know that NARALO has already submitted the draft requests for their General Assembly, so that one can be used.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Is it possible to get the criteria up? It's listed on the finance and budget committee workspace. It's about halfway down.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, I'll go ahead and put them into the pod as well.

ALAN GREENBERG:

They're not very long.

Unfortunately they don't come out really well there. All right, I'll read them because I think each of them really does require a bit of focus. As with the last year, these are essentially the same as last year. So again, outreach is not a major focus.

Obviously, there are outreach components in a lot of what we do. Engagement and trying to make the existing structures and our processes more effective, are definitely something that we're looking at.

Requests for outreach and specifically travel requests, should probably be done through CROPP, we're not saying definitely because some things just do not fit the CROPP profile, although we'll note that the CROPP people have been very flexible in the last year or so, as to how the money is being used.

They've allowed the money to be used for things that are not traditionally eligible for, including ICANN meetings in one case. Which did not necessarily prove all that successful, but it's an interesting thing that they were willing to try it. They have also allowed the CROPP money to be pooled, even though in theory, it is for multiple trips. They have allowed the money to be pulled and used for a single event or a single process.

So they've been very flexible for anything related to outreach. The proposals should include ways in which the ALAC or At-Large community, which make them more effective and develop the community. So one of the examples we can use from last year is the

development session that we had at the end of the annual general meeting.

The requests, the RALO requests should not be the work of one person, and that are just submitted without anyone else. There should be discussion within the RALO, certainly within the RALO leadership, but also if possible, at the monthly meetings to say that there is general support for whatever the RALO is requesting.

General Assemblies, and ultimately a summit, or at this point still being requested through this process. So please, if you think that a General Assembly is opportune for the fiscal year 17, then you should submit it, but in parallel, we are also trying to integrate the General Assembly and summit process into the base budget of ICANN.

If we are success in that, the General Assembly requests may no longer be treated as special requests. They will still have to be outlined in detail to get budget estimates and things like that, but they may not be submitted specifically as a special request. But that's a work in process and we'll see whether we succeed in that or not.

Where are we? Yeah, the next one is requests must be submitted by the RALO representatives on the FBSC. So in other words, you're not, the RALO, formal RALO representatives are not here just as window dressing, they are actually should be able to speak to the requests and understand why they're important, and be able to say why they're important.

And the last one, staff is currently expecting the basic resource of the community will be supported through the core ICANN budget, but sorry.

Let me try to rephrase that. There are too many words there. In the past, we've tended to have a fair number of requests for things like printing brochures and various communication type things. We are optimistic that those will be submitted, those will be funded through a central budget, and not necessarily require special requests.

But for the moment, until we understand how these processes are going, fill in special requests. We may end up saying they're not going to be submitted as a request, because we are going to try to get them funded some other way, but for the moment, if you have things that will require money that you do not know for certain is a committed fund, then you should be submitting those requests.

How they get handled by us may vary depending on what we may understand of the central budgets and how they'll be used. That is about it. Any questions on this? Heidi, you have your hand up.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes. If I could Alan, just briefly to talk a little about that last point. The last two years, there has been a relatively significant bucket of funds that the communications department own, but again, they reach very much out to the ACs and SOs and their support staff. And that bucket covers items, such as for example, within At-Large, the RALO brochure review, updating, printing requests, the business card requests that a lot of the RALOs either have already or they're in the process of having developed, postcards for various projects.

Like this past year, we had postcards for the captioning project. Sometimes things for General Assemblies, some sort of communication

activity. So those are the sorts of activities that are covered by this bucket. So I wanted to point that out.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Heidi. There are some comments in the chat about outreach and engagement regional versus local. The budget is nonspecific. If you have a request that you believe is justifiable, and you can convince your peers within the RALOs that this is something that merits, this is the overall support of ICANN, then make the request.

And so there is no separate budget for different geographic localities as such. It really is based on the quality and whether this is likely to have a substantive effect, a beneficial effect, on At-Large.

All right. What is next?

[CROSSTALK] I see we have some hands. Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Thank you very much. It's Daniel Nanghaka for the record. I think when it comes to... I hope everyone can hear me.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes we can.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Yes. I think when it comes to engagement, there is needed usually for budget to be allocated for local engagement. Because if you look at the

corresponding, corresponding is only supporting regional travels of engagement, which is so much limited. Each RALO is allocated \$10,000, which I don't think is sufficient to cover [inaudible].

So if budgets can be [inaudible]... If some can go to principle engagement materials that can be [inaudible], there is a different then other activities that can [assist] for most engagement. That is my response.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Your voice was somewhat muffled, and I'm not quite sure I got the full gist of it. I'm not sure how you differentiate regional from local.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Daniel Nanghaka for the record. What I differentiate, basically CROPP has been supporting travels to other [territorial?] boundaries. That's what [inaudible] regional, like moving from one country to another. [CROSSTALK] ...local ALSs.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. The only overall CROPP rule, which people have been allowed to violate in one or two cases is travel must be within your region. It does not say it has to be outside of your country. So if someone has a particularly good project that they would like to apply for, and it doesn't require travel outside of your country, then that's quite valid.

We're not likely to allocate hotel rooms and pay for hotel rooms, if it's travel within the city. And you know, you're not likely to need a lot of travel funding for that, but there is no restriction that it has to be outside of a country. So if someone has said that, then either I don't understand or they don't understand.

In terms of things like printed materials and things like that, that, as we've said, we could probably fund through other sources. So that shouldn't be what CROPP funding is used for. Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. This is Dev Anand speaking. So one of the things I'm a little bit... Two things I was looking at when you were going through some of the criteria. You think that RALOs should consider the General Assemblies [inaudible] timeline, and it says here NARALO, AFRALO have scheduled for request for General Assemblies in FY 17.

I was just curious, what about LACRALO? Well I don't see anybody from LACRALO members on the FBSC here, but I'm certain this kind of discussion will be coming up in LACRALO. [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: León is on the call.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Very well. But does it mean that LACRALO is not, is preempted from making a budget request for an assembly in, say, Panama?

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi has her hand up, and I think... [CROSSTALK]

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, but I can answer that. Dev, keep in mind that Panama is actually fiscal year 16. Okay, so this is for fiscal year 17. So the text that I put there, is obviously any RALO can submit a General Assembly request. I only note that last year, under the fiscal year 16 requests, when the results were announced, AFRALO had received, did not receive their request.

And then out of the two, NARALO and EURALO that had submitted request for General Assemblies, the text said one may choose, and NARALO generously gave that General Assembly to EURALO, given the meeting in Dublin. So this year, it says that the other, the results announced that the other groups, i.e. AFRALO and NARALO would be given priority in their request for General Assemblies.

So I hope, Dev, that that answers your question. [CROSSTALK] Go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Sorry. I have a follow up question on another topic. So you can...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well I wanted to just point out quickly, to make sure that all requests take a look at the template. Under there, there is a section under

request suggestions and there are several points that they need. And the stronger that these can be, I would say that the stronger the chances of getting them approved. And number one is strategic alignment, which are of ICANN strategic plan does this request support?

Number two, demographics. What audience or audiences and which geographies does your request target? Number three, deliverables. What are the desired outcomes of your proposed activity? The stronger that they are, the more sustainable, I would think that that improves the chances. And then metrics, what measurements will you use to determine whether your activity achieved its desired outcome?

So I think, again, the stronger they are, the higher the chances. Thank you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev again. This on another issue. Now, in the principles PDF that was just shown briefly onscreen, there was 20 something principles, there was a principle regarding... Principle number 22, which I didn't fully understand. Let me just read what principle 22 says.

Because of the strategic implications and longer termed budget planning impact, beginning with the FY 17 budget process community request for additional ICANN public meeting travel support slot, will no longer be assessed as special requests through this process, but will be

made through the overall budget review process, managed through the ICANN public comment forums.

So I'm a little... I'm not sure if I fully understand that principle and what exactly is the budget reviewed process managed through the ICANN public comment forums. And the reason why I'm asking this question is because, some of the discussion in the working groups is consideration of submitting a budget request for working group, either working group chairs and/or members, to attend some of the ICANN face to face meetings.

So I don't know if you can shed any light on that Heidi or Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I can't because I haven't read it before, and now I have read it, and it is really, really interesting. Heidi, would you like to be put on the spot and comment on it?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, yes, so basically what that applies to are requests we have seen in the past, for example, the GAC, from the GNSO, for significant additions to their travel, particularly the AGM, etc. So that, I believe, is what that applies to. Dev, your points about the working groups, that's of interest. And let me take that back to Rob and Janice and ask about that, because I need to get clarity on that.

Okay. And I can [CROSSTALK]...

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: ...action item then? [CROSSTALK]

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, if you can perhaps, just offline, give me the details of the question, and were you thinking of just chairs, were you thinking of additional people. So if you can do that, then I can pass that on.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. I can work on something the next time I see you this week.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Heidi, on principle 22, I can think of two classes of examples of that. The first is the GNSO for the last several years, has had special requests approved, to allow them to bring the chairs of constituencies and stakeholder groups, and other similar people to meetings. That has been a request, the core ICANN travel, the core GNSO travel request is about 20 people, and this has added another 20 or so people to it.

So that one certainly seems to fit into that category. General Assemblies and summits, however, also are exactly the same sort of request. Different purpose, but are additional travel slots. Now, I don't know what it means to be managed through the public comment forums.

Public comment forums, I thought, only happened after the budget is already set. Isn't that a bit too late to be making a request?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. This is Heidi. So my, what I've heard, is that strictly travel, so again, General Assembly is not strictly travel. General Assembly includes meetings to improve the functioning, etc. of a RALO, which includes the travel as part of that.

So that would not be included in that. This is strictly, let's get these people there, okay? And what I believe I that those types of requests should be included in the regular public comment process for the fiscal year 17 normal ICANN budget. Okay, not...

ALAN GREENBERG: But doesn't the public comment...? Maybe I'm forgetting a public comment, but isn't the public comment done after they publish a preliminary budget?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Let me get back to you on that. And I think the public comment is, you know, there is a preliminary and then after the public comment, then those sorts of comments should be incorporated or considered.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, that sounds... Something sounds wrong to me. And just for the record, the description here is, additional travel support slots to go to ICANN public meetings. That sounds an awful like our General Assemblies and summit.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. This is again, on that General Assembly point, they're different. This is strictly for travel. Just getting those people there. The General Assemblies have a different objective. It includes getting people there, but it does not include that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I understand the objective may be different, but the expense is the same. There is still travel slots. So I will, I think we need to make sure that we don't have a gotcha there.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. I can double check [CROSSTALK]...

ALAN GREENBERG: ...and get some clarity on the timing of when this should be done, and exactly what do you mean by travel slots for ICANN public comments.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, I will do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Dev for noting that. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you Alan. I agree with you. We need to have that clearly explained. My understanding was the way to talk about the ICANN public, the ICANN public comment forum is to separate the budget with

the advance needs that is under discussion, where we are special requests. Why we have those special requests outside of the budget, is because for some of the activities, it needs to be [decided] a long time in advanced to be able to be started by July 1st for some of the activities.

It's why it's outside it because the budget itself may be decided end of June, at the end of the year, or the next year, or even... And it's why that there is this two processes with this special request. Then I think we need to have a better wording of this differences and why it is a request to have this, not the travel is taking into account in this first bucket of work. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Sébastien. Doing things ahead of time and doing it in the normal budget process it's too late makes complete sense, but that doesn't seem to be saying that. I think we need some clarity. There was another hand up that is no longer up.

We have an item on fiscal year 17 next steps, which I'm going to ask Heidi to go over, and I realize, Heidi, we left off a critical issue on the agenda, and that is selection of CROPP members. So we will add another item as a 6A, I guess, once Heidi does the next steps for fiscal year 17.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Okay. Alan, this was item number six. So this was actually next steps and member responsibilities of the FBSC members. So for next steps, I mean the idea would be that this week, either staff or the FBSC

members from the regions would send notice to the RALOs that the process has begun, as well as the details. So that would be the next steps. And then early in the next year, there would be a call...

I would hope that the RALO chairs would put the item on their monthly call agendas for January, and then in late January, we have that call with the FBSC and Xavier and Rob and Janice, to discuss some of the initial requests.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Could I suggest staff send a message to the FBSC members, outlining what they should be doing in the next few days, and perhaps giving them a draft of what they should be sending?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. I'll take that as an action item.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. All right. The next item, the one we've added, and we've... To be honest, Heidi and I both forgot about it, so I'm not quite sure how we should be taking this action, but I will make a suggestion. One of the responsibilities of the finance and budget subcommittee is to select a person, one per region, for the CROPP review team.

The intent is that the finance and budget subcommittee pick someone who they believe is well connected into the region and in the finance and budget subcommittee, so that the person who is auditing and reviewing CROPP requests, both understands the regional targets and

needs, and the overall constraints that we have in terms of our budget requests.

The bottom line is, if you look at, I won't say the success of CROPP requests, but if you look at the benefits that have resulted from CROPP requests, and I'm not talking about just the ALAC, I'm talking about ICANN wide, overall it has not been the most successful of projects.

And if we wanted to continue, then we have to make sure that the trips we're requesting have a high probability of something good coming out of them. And to do that, we need people on the finance and budget subcommittee who understand what the targets are. So we will need to have five members named by the finance and budget subcommittee, and I would ask each, the members of the group from each region, in consultation with the participants and the RALO leadership, identify a person for each region who we can name onto the CROPP review team.

It can be one of the finance and budget members, it can be one of the participants. In theory, it could be someone who is outside of this group, but that doesn't make a lot of sense to me, because that would be someone who is really unconnected with the finance issues all together. So I would ask and will follow-up with an email, but I would ask that over the next couple of weeks, that we identify people who can fill these roles, and we'll ratify them at the next finance and budget subcommittee meeting.

So if you could take an action item for me on that please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, just note Tijani in chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. I was on another window. And what did Tijani say? He has a comment that he has been dropped. Is someone calling him back?

TERRI AGNEW: Yes, we are.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then we'll patiently wait for Tijani. Heidi, do you have a suggestion on which the next meeting should be?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. I would think that we first need to have the message from the FBSC members go out to the RALOs, then urge the RALO chairs to add that item of request to their monthly calls. So I would think that probably in the third week or so of January.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Is that going to be too late for CROPP? Are we starting to get CROPP requests in that we really should have reviewed by a new CROPP group? Because we're still using the same CROPP group from a year plus ago.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Dev? Do you have a reply to that?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. This is Dev. I mean, currently the persons that were previously from the finance and budget subcommittee are still on the CROPP mailing list. The outreach and engagement subcommittee have needed selections as to who can serve on the, who is serving on the CROPP review team. And they have been requesting process [inaudible].

There is one currently under review by AFRALO at this time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I guess the question is, if we have the meeting in the third week in January instead of the first or second week, is that going to have a major impact? I suspect there aren't a lot of requests that will be coming in over the Christmas holidays.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, Cheryl here. It's not going to make any particular difference. We're still processing them as normal, and we'll continue to do so until we switch people out.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. That's fine. Then Heidi, I would agree the third week in January is probably a good target. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Alan. Tijani speaking. First of all, you are speaking about selecting members for the CROPP review team. The CROPP

review team is our, we created it, the At-Large created it. It doesn't exist under the original project of the CROPP. And we did it assuming that it will be constituted by, from each region. One member from the finance and budget subcommittee, and one member from the engagement and outreach.

So this, just to correct that the member of the review team, of the CROPP review team, should be member of the finance and budget subcommittee. Second point, I'd like to, when we will appoint people on the review team, to inform first the RALO, second the person who has been enlisted, because we experience a very bad experience with the engagement and outreach group.

[Inaudible] without informing neither the RALO leadership, nor the [inaudible] assuming that it will be constituted from each region. One member from the finance and budget subcommittee, and one member from the engagement and outreach. So this just to comment that the member of the CROPP review team should be member of finance and budget subcommittee.

Second point, I'd like to, when we will appoint people on the review team, to inform first the RALO, second the person who was [inaudible], because we experienced a very bad experience with the engagement and outreach group.

[Inaudible] without informing neither of the RALO leadership nor the [inaudible], assuming that it will be constituted by, from each region, one member from the finance and budget subcommittee, and one member from the engagement and outreach.

So [inaudible] that the members of the [inaudible] team, the CROPP review team should be member of the finance and budget subcommittee.

Second point, I'd like to, when we will appoint people on the review team, to inform first the RALO, second the person who [inaudible]. Because we experienced a very bad experience, with the engagement and outreach group. That [inaudible] without informing neither the RALO leadership, nor the [inaudible] assuming that it will be constituted by, from each region, one member from the finance and budget subcommittee and one member from the engagement and outreach.

And so at least just to [comment] that the member of the [inaudible] of the CROPP review team should be member of the finance and budget subcommittee.

Second point...

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I'd like to when we appoint people...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Terri, is there a loop going on over here?

ALAN GREENBERG: Terri, we've got a problem here.

TERRI AGNEW: We're checking into it. [Tijani Ben Jemaa's voice continues to be in a loop]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I must say, it is making the point very clear on Tijani's behalf.

ALAN GREENBERG: But it's the fourth second point. [Laughter]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I do feel suitably indoctrinated, I must say. As much as I actually disagree with one of his points, I have heard the message. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is Tijani on the call again or is he off at this point?

TERRI AGNEW: This is Terri. At this point we've disconnected him and we're dialing back out to him to see if we can correct that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, when you make contact with him, please tell him privately what was happening. Thank you. [Laughing] I don't even know how to handle this.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This Is Dev. I can probably respond to the multiple...

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm going to respond to both of those. But I prefer, if Tijani get on the line before we do that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No I am back, and what happened was not me, it was the system. I was dropped from the timing that my message was caught, and then it was in loop.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, Tijani we knew that you were not saying the exact same thing five times in a row.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I didn't know what was happening.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no. I understand. The timing was just perfect in the loop. It restarted exactly after you gave your second point, and it restarted

exactly at the point, and I have a second point. [CROSSTALK AND LAUGHTER]

It's not your fault. You should listen to the recording afterwards, it's quite humorous.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

To finish my message, it's only a matter of communication. Daniel was present, and we wanted him to be on the CROPP review team, but the problem was that Fatima was disappointed, and I don't want her to be disappointed. She is the [inaudible], thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

May I reply? In terms of who the persons are that they are appointed, the rule we adopted, the decision we made was, the person from both CROPP and finance and budget, are selected by the CROPP review team. Sorry.

By outreach and engagement and by the finance and budget. As I said, it makes absolutely no sense to me for that group to select someone who doesn't even participate in their own meetings. But technically we said the person is selected by that group, we didn't specify what their qualifications are. We made that the assumption that both the outreach and engagement, and the finance and budget would pick people with good qualifications, and that it's hard to imagine that person not being on the respective groups.

So that again, comes down to good judgment. On your second point, I think it's also good judgment, if you're going to remove someone from a

group, it's common decency to talk to them and explain why you're doing it, if it's a person that still has an interest in doing it, and if it's been done on behalf of the RALO, then the RALO should be informed also.

So I think you're correct. I'm not sure you can put a rule that comes in it to say that, but we shouldn't be taking volunteers and treating them in ways that they don't appreciate without at least going through a reasonable process.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, may I have a follow up question?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes go ahead, but only once.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: May I ask that for each group we have a charter, a type of charter so that we know exactly what we decided, [inaudible] says before, when we want to change something, we change it in the charter and then we continue. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I hope one day we'll get our bookkeeping that good, but yes we should. Are there any other items in this meeting? We are 11 minutes over the time, but I think it has been a productive meeting. Anything else anyone wants to raise?

Then I apologize for running over. Have a good rest of the day, and anyone on this committee, in this group, who hasn't spent their time reading CCWG comments and reports, that's how you should spend the rest of your day. That was said only as a half-joke. Thank you all for attending.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]