EN

YEŞIM NAZLAR:	Welcome to the At-Large Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program Review Team call, taking place on Tuesday, 2nd of August, 2016, at 14:30 UTC.
	On the call today, we have Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Daniel Nanghaka, Judith Hellerstein, Glenn McKnight, and Seun Ojedeji.
	Currently, we don't have anyone noted for apology.
	From staff, we have Silvia Vivanco, Terri Agnew, and myself, Yeşim Nazlar.
	Finally, I'd like to remind everyone to start their names before speaking for the transcript purposes.
	And over to you, Dev. Thank you very much.
DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:	Okay, thank you very much, Yeşim. And good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. So on this Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program Review Team call, or the CROPP call, we want to just go overview of the CROPP FY17 process and update on the procedures. Okay. So I probably might… And I put the text for the proposal on the CROPP wiki page. And I will just post it there in the chat. And perhaps… And so the ICANN CROPP staff will also be joining us, to give us some background as to some of the latest changes to the CROPP program for

---

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.

FY17. Perhaps what I shall do, I'm going to share my screen so I can point to various things on the wiki for everyone to see. Okay, so let me figure out how to do just that. Okay.

So can everyone see my screen?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, we can.

YEŞIM NAZLAR: Yes, Dev, we can see your screen.

LEON SANCHEZ: I'm not on Adobe Connect. I'm only on the phone bridge.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thanks, Leon. Thanks for joining the call. We have just started.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: And the link is a cross-link. So he's showing the wiki page, so you can go there.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Judith. Okay. Just to give some of the key changes for the CROPP Review Team is that there's… I won't spend too much time on

EN

this. I suspect the ICANN CROPP staff will be joining the call. It identifies that they will be a little late on us.

So one of the key things is that the CROPP proposals can now be four days, three nights. There is a consolidated guidelines page on the CROPP FY17 wiki page. Perhaps I should… Let me just copy that link and just show you that link myself.

So this is on the CROPP FY17 page. It actually breaks down a lot of the information that's needed, in terms of the procedures, requirements, roles and responsibilities, and so forth. If we go back to the CROPP Review wiki, some of the key changes for any trip proposal – and let me just pick a blank page – under the trip proposal section, under "Proposed Goals and Outcomes," there's something called content guidelines.

So if you were to click on that, it then asks, when answering the question, "Please develop more specific goals or outcomes," and they cite several examples or categories. For example, presentations, including the role. Are you a speaker? Are you an organizer? Are there literature to be disseminated? Engagement outreach opportunities, recruitment opportunities, fulfilment of documented outreach strategic plans and/or the ICANN regional strategy for that region. And another category I didn't mention was knowledge sharing, including intentions to extend learnings, not just about ICANN stakeholder, but within and among ICANN stakeholder communities. Sorry.

And also, there is the section that was called the community confirmation section. This has now been renamed to the acknowledgment section, which I think is much more clever wording, as it wasn't too clear as to who was supposed to be doing this. And as mentioned in the notes, it's the CROPP Review Team member that's supposed to be updating this table.

So those are some of the key main changes for FY17. When the ICANN CROPP staff comes on the call, we can elaborate if there's any other key changes to the CROPP FY17.

ROB HOGGARTH: You've done a fantastic job. You've done a fantastic job summarizing and detailing all of those changes. I could not have done a better job myself.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thanks, Rob. And I see there was a hand raised. Olivier, please go ahead. Oh, I'm sorry, there was a queue here. I'm so sorry. I'm not seeing the – I think it was Tijani. I see there's Judith, Tijani, Olivier. So sorry.

So, Judith, please. Sorry.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Great job. I love all the new changes. My question is, our region, NARALO, we have already completed two CROPP trips, because we

EN

started very early, in July. And we used the old forms. And we have one scheduled for November that we used the old form. Do we have to tell the person to go back and put his information in the new form? Or how is that going to work? And then also, how is that going to work if we did our assessments based on the old trip report that we created, that was in the old format that we did before this new one came out? And that's my question.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Judith. First of all, we could confirm it. What's the proper approach?

ROB HOGGARTH: Thanks very much, Dev. Part, I think, of what was very helpful in your overview was providing that outline. But what you left out, something you should get credit for, is that we had tremendously positive and useful feedback from participants throughout FY16 that helped us identify ways to improve, evolve the processes for FY17. In many respects, a number of the, quote/unquote, "content guidelines and changes" were put in place to help all of you, as well as us as staff, evaluate these proposals, as we look back from a recordkeeping perspective. Particularly, soon you will see the assessment report for FY16. And there were gaps in some of the reports that we received from folks.

What I would like to suggest, Judith, for those of you who have been very proactive this year, and with whom we worked very carefully so

EN

that you all could hit FY17 running – and I'm delighted that you've all been able to make progress already – is let staff take a look at the documents that have already been submitted. Let us compare them against the content. And where we think that there may be gaps from a reporting or an assessment perspective, for historical reasons and for evaluation purposes going forward, let us then follow up with you. Because, let's face it. For those of you who've been involved with this review team for the communities of the At-Large RALOs, you've done a fantastic job documenting a lot of this stuff already. Many of the changes simply reflect some of the things that many of you had already put in place as best practices.

So let us take a look at those few forms that have already been submitted. And Janice, or Ken Bour, or Benedetta will get back to you on specific language. We might have some clarification questions that would help for future assessments. So let's do it that way.

For everything going forward, now that the new space is open, please advise your folks to utilize the new format. And so we'll just look at those two or three. Rather than just saying, "Go in and make the changes," let us take a look at them and then give you advice back. And we'll see if any changes need to be made, rather than creating extra work at this point. Thanks very much for the question, Judith.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Sorry, I was on mute. Thanks, Rob. And Tijani is next in the queue.

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Dev. I would like first to really thank Rob and his team, and Janice, about the changes made for FY17 for our program. It was in response to our request, because having a trip of one working day is absolutely meaningless. And in all cases I participated in this program, I added nights from my pocket, to be able to participate efficiently, and to make my trip really having meaning. So thank you very much for this change, even if it is not a lot. But it is at least something helpful. Two days of work, it is something that we can accept. But one working day is not, in my point of view, acceptable. Making the trip and having only one day for the work, it is, in my point of view, a waste of time and money.

Now, for the assessment, I agree with you, Rob and Dev, that the new procedure for the assessment is necessary. And I think it will help us to identify how efficient we are, how our travelers did their travel in the spirit of the CROPP program or did it in other spirit. So I think it is a good thing too.

Dev, you said that the acknowledgment section should be completed by the CROPP Review Team members. I want to correct that and say that this section is to be completed by the RALO PPCs, who are member of the CROPP Review Team, but they are the PPCs. And this is the procedure. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Tijani. I mean, the PPCs are the CROPP Review Team members that are supposed to be shepherding the proposal as it goes through the approvals by the CROPP Review Team, by the regional GSE, so forth. But point taken.

So, Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Dev. I have a question with regards to who should be filling what. I understand the great majority of the documents and so on can only be edited by the CROPP Review Team members themselves. But we have been faced with a problem where we had more than one traveler for a single event. And therefore, it looked as though they were all to edit the same page. And there was a bit of a confusion there.

Are the travelers supposed to edit the page themselves, or is there now a process that's well-publicized that says, "Send your reports to the CROPP Review Team representatives for your region," and they will be dealing with the editing? Because that, I think, was what I would favor, since the experts on the CROPP are the CROPP Review Team members and not the actual travelers.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks, Olivier. Well, Rob can also chime in on this, but my thinking is that what the CROPP Review Team member can do is, as I say, because they need to follow up directly. And the [inaudible] the procedure step-by-step. So perhaps we can get into it, especially when

EN

it comes to completing the trip assessment part of it, and we could just… But how I would approach it, as a CROPP Team member, would be that if there were multiple travelers, you would edit the wiki form, trip assessment form, with the names of the travelers, and then invite the travelers to just go on the – rather than going back and forth with e-mail, ask the traveler to directly edit what was their contribution, what was their experiences, how was the purpose and goals realized, and so forth. And each traveler then, as a heading, can do report, can fill out the appropriate section, so to speak. So that, to me, is the way to approach that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: But you say each traveler name can fill up their thing. You want them to go on the wiki and fill this up? The problem with that, it looks as though the people, when they're not regular travelers or regular beneficiaries of the CROPP program, have no idea how to edit someone else's text. Or sometimes they can't even edit it. They don't have the right account, etc. They're quite alien to it in some cases.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. If we go into the procedure – well, perhaps we'll go into the procedure, because one of the things I was talking about is that the travelers need to be prepared and understand fully their roles and responsibilities under this program. [Let's] step through the CROPP procedure. We can see then whether what you're seeing can be addressed.

So I still see quite a few hands here. Okay. All right. If I understand the order, I think Daniel had his hand raise, and then there's Judith, Alan, and then Rob, if have that order correct. So, Daniel?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: When it comes to the CROPP program, the issue that was mentioned by Olivier, comparing with the other regions, Olivier's issue I think is about one application being submitted by one person for various participants. So in relation to, I think the best thing is for the participants who are to go for the program should probably fill the proposal by themselves [inaudible] able, review by [our team], and submitted to be able to make responsible edit before it can go for discussion. Just my view. Thank you. Back to you, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks, Daniel. Okay, let's just go to the queue quickly, and then we can go into the procedure.

Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I actually – two questions. One is a follow-up to Rob. So, Rob, we have – I didn't get a clear understanding. So Tom, who has filled out – we have requested under the old format. He has a November trip. We have to have him, I guess, fill out the new? Is it going to be transferred? Or is Ken going to transfer? Is someone going to transfer the information to

EN

the new form, and then we would have him go back and edit that form? That was one of my questions.

And then, two, at Helsinki, some of the either CROPP or outreach meetings, CROPP meetings or whatever, it was discussed on outcome that we should be following up on the different leads that each of the CROPP attendees had gotten, so when they attend the conference, they have gotten a list of leads of different groups that might be interested in either become individual or ALS, and that our intent, I thought, for this year was to follow up with them and see which of these materialized or not. And so that is my question onto that, the outcome area.

And then my question to Dev on what Olivier raised is, maybe we have done this wrong, but what we've done and told our ALSes or individuals who are doing it, is that each person – doesn't matter if you could have two people going to the same event – each person fills out a different page. Because each person has different outcomes and different strategies going in, and they're looking at different things. And so we've had success with having each one doing a separate page. And then they are able to edit their own page, and not editing someone else's work. So they're just editing that they put on. And maybe that makes sense. That's how we've done it, and I'm not sure whether we've done it the correct way, but that's the way we think makes the most sense. So if that's any help to others.

EN

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Well, thanks, Judith. Thank you. Well, I guess I tend to prefer the more consolidated approach, because it just means one wiki page with the entire trip assessment. But perhaps Rob might have a comment on that. Because as far as I understand it, anybody with a wiki account can edit the page. Obviously, if the traveler is a totally new traveler, is not an At-Large member, for example, then perhaps what can happen is the information has to be captured via e-mail with the traveler, and then the CROPP RT member puts the response from this particular traveler.

So I'm just putting on the screen here what I suggested, how to do it. The trip assement for EURALO's proposal for FY16. You have the various responses by all the five travelers in EURALO's trip proposal piece. And then asks the travelers to edit it, or the CROPP RT member [chases] those persons directly to answer these questions and then fill it out on the wiki, all in one form.

So, all right then. I do want to get into the procedure, but let's see, who was in the queue? I still think it was Alan and then –

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Dev, my questions are still to Rob.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Go ahead, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Dev, my questions were still to Rob about what we do.

EN

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Rob?

ROB HOGGARTH: I was going to wait for my place in the queue to answer any and all questions that are on the table, if that's okay, just for efficiency of the queue.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: That's fine. Thanks, Rob.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just a very quick comment. Last year, there was a flow chart on the CROPP website that did not include the CROPP Review Team for the At-Large requests. And I haven't looked to see what it looks like this year. I just want to make sure that it does include it, because last time it implied that the requests go directly from the requestor to staff. And I want to make sure that we're not misleading people with the chart this time. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Alan. I'm not sure whether the flow chart itself was updated. But like I said, I want the staff to show the entire procedure for the RALOs to apply for funding.

All right. Well, that was a long queue. Your responses? Thanks?

ROB HOGGARTH: Thank you. You had asked me to chime in overall, so let me just set the overall stage here, because a number of you have been involved in every iteration of the pilot program, since we started it. And you'll recall that one of the reasons for this instinct to create the PPC role was to make sure that there was a person responsible, from the community perspective, for the proposals. And where we left it, very early in the process, was for each individual community to work out their own process or way for doing it.

So I think and believe that the processes still allow that flexibility, in many respects, for how you guys work that out. Clearly, there needs to be one final person responsible for the acknowledgements and making sure that everything is done.

You will also recall, Dev, that we had some excellent feedback, and you were one of them, as we moved from year 1 to year 2, say, "Gee, this way of collecting the input is quite challenging." And one of the reasons why we put it all on the wiki space was so that you guys could eliminate a lot of this back and forth with e-mails and everything else. Please look at this new process and give us feedback whether the pendulum has

EN

now swung back too far in the other direction, or whether we've achieved a good balance.

The bottom line is still that whoever the PPC is for the RALO does have that overall accountability and responsibility for making sure that everything is coordinated. That way, we don't have to go, from a staff perspective, through 12 different people or so to achieve answers or to clarify things. And I think, over time, you have evolved your Review Team processes to account for those responsibilities. So please keep that up. I think that's been a great innovation for the program, and it's helped things work very well.

In terms of individual documentation and things like that, if we can parking lot your question, Judith, I'll have Janice and Ken follow up with you guys on that specific trip proposal. My instinct would be to ask the proposer, particularly since the trip has not yet occurred, to go in and update the form to reflect that new information. Knowing how thorough the NARALO has been in developing its proposals, I would think that that would be very minor, because the guidelines are no proscriptive. The guidelines are there to help the individual who's filling out the proposal, just to order their own head to say, "Oh, am I thinking about this? Am I thinking about that?" Because each one of those guidelines isn't going to apply to every proposal, necessarily.

In terms of this concept of following up, you raise a really good point, Judith, that on some of these activities, one of the results has been lead generation, contacts with people. And what we've been doing for FY16 is actually going through, as we begin to assess the various aspects of

EN

the program, is we're noting where we haven't seen follow up. It's not required in the assessment form. And so we've been making individual calls to particular travelers or to PPCs to say, "Hey, how did that go? Did that lead generation result in new membership? Did it result in further follow-up?" Or things like that.

So I think that is the best approach that we have found so far. You guys might want to talk about additional follow-up with individual PPCs, may want to flag and then circle back around, consistent with your strategic plan, where you'll say, "Hey, Mary Smith, you attended this event. You got these five leads. What happened with that?" I would expect that that would be occurring just as a matter of course with your individual outreach committees in other groups, that that would be being done. To the extent that the CROPP format and the assessment system can help you do that better or keep people aware of their accountabilities, I'd be delighted. But I think that's something that you all should be doing anyway, as a matter of course, with your outreach groups and committees.

With respect to the flow chart, Alan, I will follow up with Ken, Benedetta, and Janice on that. I honestly know that we had the conversation about updating it but don't know whether that was actually updated. I didn't review that section of the wiki. So I will have that as a to-do to follow up with you. We'll confirm that that has been updated accordingly. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thanks, Rob. Thanks, Rob. And indeed, regarding the following-up of contacts received and so forth, just to say that, yes, I'm thinking that what happens is that the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee members can work in coordination with the CROPP RT. So we could have properly designated persons within the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee from the region doing the active follow-up with the contacts that the travelers obtained. It could be the CROPP RT person, but share the responsibilities, share the load. That's what the other members of the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee, I think, should be able to do.

I do see some hands raised. They are from Ali and Tijani. But can I suggest that perhaps you hold your questions so as we can go through the entire procedure? And then there are discussion points in the procedure, that perhaps you can raise your question then? Because I'm seeing half an hour. We're now halfway through the call already. We haven't even gone through the procedures yet. Is that okay from Ali and Tijani?

ALI ALMESHAL: No problem. I wanted just to comment on the submission, but I can save it for later. No problem. Go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thanks, Ali. And I see Tijani has put his hand down. Thank you very much, Tijani.

EN

Okay. So I'm just now sharing on the screen here. And again, everybody can go to the wiki page and go through the step-by-step procedure. I decided to number each of the steps separately so that hopefully it's more clearer. And I've increased the font size, so I hope everybody can read it.

So step 1, the RALO must have an Outreach Strategic Plan that's approved by the regional GSE. And the reason why is that before the RALO can submit any CROPP proposal, the RALO has to have an Outreach Strategic Plan, explaining its goals, strategies, expectations. And so the Outreach Plan should be developed by the ALAC Subcommittee on Outreach and Engagement, in close coordination with RALO leadership, and must be approved by the regional GSE VPs. Okay? CROPP RT members must ensure that the approved Outreach Strategic Plans are placed on the CROPP wiki. Okay.

And so I see two hands raised on this. Rob?

ROB HOGGARTH: I'm sorry. I'm very sorry. That's an old hand, and I was muted trying to tell you that. My apologies. I'll take it down.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Tijani?

You may be muted, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you hear me now?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, I can hear you now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you very much. Dev, what you prepared here is more or less the charter that I asked for to you and Alan. I think this is something very helpful. We need to do it. It is something that was made necessary because we faced problems with the working of the CROPP Review Team. So thank you for proposing this document.

First of all, we didn't go through the first sections, which define the mission of the CROPP Review Team. If you want, we can go on this later. But I don't agree with your proposal. For this section that you just read, you say that these Outreach Plans should be developed by the ALAC Subcommittee on Outreach and Engagement. That means that the RALOs will have their strategy plan prepared by the subcommittee, which is unacceptable. This is something proper to the RALO, and they are prepared by the RALO. The RALO knows what are their priorities, what they need. So this is something that should be changed to be this Outreach Plan should be developed by the RALO leaders and must be approved, etc. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Tijani. I think we are saying the same thing, because if you look at it, I'll read it again. These Outreach Plans should be developed by the

EN

Outreach and Engagement members, in close coordination with RALO leadership. So in other words, it's not something that's – how should I put it – is not done in conjunction with the RALO leadership. And the members involved in the – sorry, just to finish. The subcommittee members are from the RALOs. So it's not as if it's somebody completely outside the RALO making the choice for the RALOs here. It's by the At-Large community members in the region.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Excuse me, Dev. The members of the subcommittee are two persons from the RALO. The strategic plan is the strategic plan for the whole region, for the whole RALO. So this is something that should come from the RALO. The RALO is responsible for developing their strategic plans. This is my point of view, and I think it is very important to be like this. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Tijani. Any responses towards this?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Ali.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Ali, go ahead. Okay, hold on. Let me make sure – Ali, go ahead.

EN

ALI ALMESHAL: Thank you, Dev. I would agree with Tijani, because like here, what we do in APRALO, once we develop the strategic plan, we [inaudible] review with the [GSE] team to make sure that we are in line with the strategies and even the directions [inaudible] that they are having. But our strategy goes through the whole leadership team from the APRALO. So I can see that it might go maybe in some lines with the ALAC [inaudible], but I don't see a reason why we have to take it through the ALAC subcommittee. I totally agree with Tijani in that direction. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Silvia, go ahead.

You may be muted, Silvia.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Can you hear me now?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, we can.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Sorry, I was muted. I was saying that I listen of these concerns, and I think that the idea is to have those two representatives from the RALO to be proactive, and they need to reach out to the RALO leadership and bring the ideas, and socialize these ideas with the entire RALO. So Tijani is right that the RALO must have an input, and the strategy must come

from the RALO. It's a bottom-up strategy. But therefore, we have two members who are representatives, and the RALOs are aware that they are part of this Review Team. So I don't see a contradiction. It's just a matter of communication, I guess, between the two representatives and the RALO leadership. So that's my comment. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: So thanks, Silvia. I see Alan has raised a hand. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. Sorry, may I go ahead?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Let's just maintain the queue. There may be some sort of delay. Alan first, and then Ali can respond. Okay, Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I think it's clear – and if it doesn't happen, then there is something really broken – that the formal representatives on the CROPP Review Team, who are named by the RALO leadership, should be talking to the RALO leadership. So let's assume for the moment that that is happening, or there's something broken purely on the RALO side.

So the question between the two interpretations is, can the other people on the CROPP Review Team – and specifically, the eight people from the other RALOs – overrule the two who have done it in

consultation with the RALO? Or are they just there to give comments and suggestions? That's really the question. Who has the formal say on what gets submitted? Is it the CROPP Review Team, or is it the RALO, in consultation with the CROPP Review Team. Sorry, not the CROPP Review Team, the Outreach and Engagement group. And that really seems to be the difference. So let's not beat around the bush and say what we mean. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. All right, thanks, Alan. Ali, now you can go ahead.

ALI ALMESHAL: Sure. Just a comment what Silvia says, this would be not contradiction to that, but the statement here says this Outreach Plan should be developed by the ALAC Subcommittee on Outreach and Engagement. So when you said should be developed or coordinated or informed, totally different. When you said the Outreach Plan should be developed, then where is the plan that is done by the RALO leadership?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. Well, I would address it, to me in my mind, it's a… Like I said, to me it's a close coordination with the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee. If you look at what the Subcommittee on Outreach and Engagement role is, is to focus on how to do outreach, how to do engagement. And I guess perhaps the phasing can be – maybe I can relook at emphasizing the phrasing. But to me, it's a strange thing

EN

where there's emphasis on saying the RALO only should do it, and the Subcommittee on Outreach and Engagement has zero input into it, and vice versa. I don't think that that's…

I'm just saying, if I want to say something like, "The Outreach Plan should be developed by the ALAC Subcommittee and RALO leadership," then perhaps that's the way to word it. But it's meant to be a close coordination. Otherwise, if the RALO leadership was to do something, how would the Outreach and Engagement members have an opportunity [inaudible] to make that Outreach and Engagement Plan by the RALO if they're not involved? So it has to be something that's coordinated and it's a joint responsibility.

So I can see we're going to run out of time at this rate. All right. Tijani, I see Tijani and Alan.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you very much, Dev. We are doing things upside down. The responsibility, the remit of the RALO, is to develop its strategy. How the RALO can be informed and updated about the policies or the way ALAC should make its outreach and engagement through the subcommittee, the two members of the RALO in the subcommittee will bring this to the RALO. So the RALO has a responsibility. What we are doing now is to take the responsilbility, the remit, the authority of the RALO and give it to a subcommittee, a subcommittee which is not made of the whole RALO. And this is something which is not acceptable.

EN

So I think that the right wording is to make it done by the RALO. And we can add something to say in close coordination with the subcommittee. I accept that. But the other way, no. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks for that, Tijani. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I think the real issue is not if everything is working well, but what if there is strong disagreement? And you have to presume, at some point in time, that could happen. And I tend to feel that if the RALO feels strongly that the coordinated way forward for ALAC is something that doesn't fit their model, and they're willing to stand by it and have it potentially rejected by the staff who are accepting the plan, then so be it. I don't think we can say there is a one-size-fits all, and clearly the Outreach and Engagement group is there to try and find the common ground that makes sense.

So there has to be consultation and discussion. But ultimately, I don't think we can say that the other four RALOs will overrule, if there is indeed a strong difference of opinion. And I think we have to write our rules for the, hopefully, case that never happens, were there is such a strong disagreement. But there has to be an opportunity for the other RALOs to comment also, because that's how we try to find a middle ground that will meet all of our needs.

EN

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks, Alan. Okay. And just to say something on this point and then to move on to it, and perhaps we could work on redrafting that text. Keep in mind that, yes, the idea behind the sharing of all the RALO strategies is, again, for all the RALOs [to really] and Outreach and Engagement members to each other. So if something was tried in one region and, "Oh, that might be a good idea. Maybe we could do something like that in our RALO." So that's the idea behind it. It's not really meant for the other RALOs to override or anything of that sort. That's really not the intent. I should mention that.

However, the Outreach Plan has to be submitted to the regional Global Stakeholder Engagement VP. And he or she may make comments and suggestions, or may actually make a disagreement with what has been said and ask for further consultation. So there is a sort of review from that level, in terms of the Global Stakeholder Engagement agreeing with the text of the Strategic Plan and so forth.

And again, to me, my mind, it does not need to be so rigid. But perhaps to clear [inaudible], then perhaps, all right, let's work on language to relieve everyone's concerns. But I don't want to craft what the proper wording is right now. Let's step through the rest of the process and go through it.

So step 2, the RALO CROPP RT members draft a trip proposal. So once an Outreach Strategic Plan has been approve by the Global Stakeholder Engagement, the RALO CROPP RT members – and again, I used the words "in coordination with the RALO leadership," can draft proposals linked on the page. And the RALO CROPP RT members/RALO leadership

should develop proposals to ensure that for each proposal, it conforms with CROPP procedures and guidelines; that all the questions on the form are answered fully, in terms of event details, activity sponsors, etc.; that the purpose and goals are specific and are in line with the RALO's Outreach Strategic Plan; and this is the concern that Olivier was raising earlier, that the proposed travelers are fully aware of, understand, and agree to abide by the terms and conditions of CROPP as outlined on the CROPP wiki.

And one of the discussion points was, how do you do this? And my suggestion was that a conference call could be held with the possible travelers, especially if they are new to this CROPP process. And have that conference call with the travelers to ensure that the travelers fully understand their responsibilities. And it's not possibly going to an event to get contacts, and so forth. It is to get the contacts, do a presentation. It's not just about possibly attending an event. It's to do outreach.

So that's the part about drafting the proposal. So the RALO leadership should make sure all of that is done before the third step, which is when the proposal is complete, RALO leadership approves. Then we start the review process. So that's point 2.

Okay, I see a hand raised. Okay, Tijani, go ahead. I do – all right. Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yeah, thank you. Thank you, Dev. I don't think that the procedure is that the CROPP Review Team member fill in the application. It is the RALO

EN

that has to fill in the application. And then, because this is why we created the CROPP Review Team, is to review the application of the traveler. If the CROPP Review Team members fill in the application, what is the need of the CROPP Review Team in this case?

And second point, and I want to make it clear in this point to Alan's remark that he made at the beginning, I want to tell you that the CROPP program has a procedure, a clear procedure. And the procedure is for everyone. We, as At-Large, we decided to create the CROPP Review Team as an informal new body that will help our travelers to make good application to be accepted. This is why the CROPP Review Team was created. So the CROPP Review Team will not be included – I hope it will not be included – in the flow chart, exactly as the Finance and Budget Subcommittee is not included in the process of the additional budget request.

Anyone feeding in the additional budget request can send it directly to the comptroller, and exactly in the same case, but we don't want it to be like this. We want everything to go through the Subcommittee on Budget and Finance, and through the CROPP Review Team, to make the applications acceptable, to make good applications. It's not to make another layer of authority. It's not to make it more top down. We want it to be bottom up, so it is always the RALO filling the application. And then the PPCs, who are member of the CROPP Review Team, will review this application and will approve it or not before it is submitted to the CROPP Review Team. And the CROPP Review Team will make the last check, if you want, and say, "Oh, yes, it is good," or, "No, there is a

problem here." And then it come back to the traveler, and the traveler will correct the application. And then the application will continue.

This is how the procedure is now in ICANN. We added this layer only to help. It is not a layer to stop or to reject or to make authority. It is to help the applications to be good and to go through the process. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Tijani. Okay. I do see a queue in operation here. All right, Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Olivier, go ahead. I just want to say beforehand that perhaps we could just spend ten more minutes in addition to this. But I think it's clear that one action item coming up is we probably do need another call to go through this procedure. But go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much, Dev. And I can see that I'm disagreeing with both Tijani and with Judith on this. I think that asking a potential traveler to fill in the details directly on the wiki, and to get them to file something and then get it rejected or get it approved or get it amended, introduces another level of a barrier for the non-usual suspects to take part. What

EN

we're doing here, by saying, "Oh, yeah, travelers themselves have to fill all this by themselves," and then we will be looking at that and we'll be saying yes or no, to me is just another barrier to stop further participation in ICANN. And it also discriminates on people whose native language is not English, and it discriminates on people who haven't got a very good Internet connection or who are not very well versed in using the wikis, which, by the way, when you look at the CROPP pages, is very, very complicated.

It's got all sorts of things in there. Some of it is technical stuff for the CROPP Review Team. Some of it is aimed towards – in fact, I don't think any of it is aimed towards the traveler themselves. And I keep on remembering the success of Apple in the early days, to just make technology simple and easy for everyone to use. Before that, the only people who used to use computers were people who were supposed to be geeks and learn how the computer works. So I think we're on the wrong track if we're going this way. That's all. Thanks.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks, Olivier. Okay. Well, I do see we have a queue here. Might I suggest that before we take any more questions, can I just walk through the rest of the procedure in this short amount of time? Because we are going to take extra time. And then I think one key action item will be to – and I guess staff can record it now – is to ask on Doodle for another suitable day and time to have another call.

EN

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Dev, my –

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Is that okay with the persons on the queue?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Dev, my question is just a quick on [crosstalk].

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: [crosstalk] Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Mine is just a quick response to Olivier. Olivier, what we do in NARALO is first people suggest ideas with us, either at a meeting or offline. Then we discuss it [at] them. And then after their suggestion is okay with our Strategic Plan, which they have looked at, once that is, we've already approved it. And then we help them fill out the form. So once they get to the point of filling out the form, they've already been approved by a RALO. They just have to fill out the form and put their goals and objectives to match our plan. If they don't have goals and objectives and they don't have any of that information, then we don't approve it.

But the concept of their attending the event and what they said originally has already gotten our RALO approval. So they're just filling it out and putting information in the form. And maybe that helps you.

EN

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks, Judith.

ALI ALMESHAL: Should I go?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Go ahead, Olivier, as a quick response. Sorry, that was Ali, wasn't it? Very well. Let's clear the queue quickly and then I will outline next steps.

Ali, go ahead.

ALI ALMESHAL: Thanks, Dev. I would agree totally with Olivier, because this is what we are doing here in the APRALO. We get the request from the traveler, and we have to check and validate it within the strategy and the directions that we have. And once everything is clear from our end, we request all the information. And the PPC and CROPP Review Team will fill out all the applications on the wiki page. And that keeps us in control, knowing what has been done and when is the next assessment date that we need to follow up with the traveler themselves.

And that takes us again to the review or the [track] of the proposal when they send the assessment back. And we make sure that whatever they have stated in their strategy has been met or there has been a delay or anything not happen during, for whatever reason. So that puts

us, as the RALO, in control of who is doing what and when they are doing that. So this is all what we are doing here. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Ali. Tijani, and very short interaction, because [crosstalk].

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Very short. Yes, thank you. Olivier, what is very complicated? To put our names? Our dates of travel? Our objective of this mission? The website of the event, etc.? This is very complicated? No. People are not really ignorant, and they are not really stupid. People can fill in their application. And it is the role, if you read carefully the role, of the PPCs on the CROPP program guidelines, you will see that the PPCs are there to help the travelers to fill in their application. So the PPCs, who are members of the CROPP Review Team, have the duty to help the travelers to fill in their application if they have problems.

So we will not always add layers. And you tell me what you want, and I will do it for you. No. Everyone can do what they have to do. It is on the procedure, on the CROPP program procedure, the general procedure of the whole ICANN. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thanks, Tijani. So I think my first action item, again, is to now figure what date and time for the next CROPP Review Team call to really go into this in a little bit more detail. It's clear that persons have ideas, which is all good, for the wording of the procedures and so forth.

So I just want to add a suggestion for the group. Do you think the group can meet on, say, Friday? Or is that too soon? Today is Tuesday. Because I don't really want to delay until far next week, and I have, for myself, I will be attending the IGF next week as well. So my time will be very limited next week. So do you think it's possible to have it on Friday? Or shall I just let everybody fill out the Doodle, perhaps for Friday, for Monday next week? Is that okay?

Let me see what people are saying. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. Dev, I don't mind if it's Friday or any other day of the next week. But what I want to tell you is that if we will discuss all this procedure, not only the procedure, the whole text, which includes mission, procedure, working matters, etc., this should be – if we have to discuss it during the call, we will need four or five calls to finish it. So before coming to the next call, I propose that everyone read them and send through the mailing list their point of view, their comment on each point of this text. This will be very helpful so that we can advance very fast next time. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks. All right. Any other – I see persons [inaudible] the call. But let's have the Doodle out. So, staff. I know Friday is not usually a [key] day. All right, let's leave it for Monday. And I know that some calls already on Monday, so let's see if we can agree on a time to meet on Monday.

EN

Okay. And, indeed, please review the text for each of the steps. And perhaps have comments to post on the CROPP RT list or have it ready for the next conference call.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I'm just looking at the queue here. Oh, I'm sorry. Let me see. Sorry. The screen is shared. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'd just like a plea for people to recognize this is a multistakeholder process. Not everybody is going to get exactly what they want. Let's be reasonable, and let's be sure that we're not putting rules in for the sake of rules. I find it intriguing that we're saying RALOs must be able to set their strategy, but we're also saying there must be uniform rules of who fills in a wiki form. Let's be flexible and make sure we don't spend all of our time deciding how to do this, instead of actually doing the work. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks, Alan. And I see some persons are saying Monday is not a good day. So, staff, I know it's not usual to have a call on Friday, but I think this is urgent. So can some times be put up for Friday and Monday? And let's get the Doodle out later today, if possible, in time for

EN

everybody to fill out the Doodle by Wednesday or early Thursday, so that a time can be set.

Okay. All right. We're [inaudible] minutes past the hour, so any… I would like to just end the call now. And then, like I said, please review the text and your observations. So, okay, seeing no further comments or hands raised, I'd like to thank everyone for attending the call and look forward to continuing the discussion. This call is now adjourned, and have a great day, everyone. And for some of you, see you on the upcoming Outreach and Engagement call. Bye.

YEŞIM NAZLAR: This meeting is now adjourned. The audio will now be disconnected. Thank you very much for your participation, and have a lovely rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]