TERRI AGNEW:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program Review Team (CROPP RT), taking place on Friday, the 5th of August, 2016, at 19:00 UTC.
	On the call today, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Daniel Nanghaka, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Sarah Kiden, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Seun Ojedeji, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Glenn McKnight, and Pascal Bekono.
	Joining us a little later in the call will be Judith Hellerstein.
	We have listed apologies from Silvia Vivanco. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Terri Agnew.
	I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much, and back over to you, Dev.
DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:	Thank you, Terri. This is our second call to discuss further the procedures for how the CROPP RT operates. We didn't have enough time on the last call to even go throughout the entire procedure. I know that Tijani has posted something, and that has also received some comments as well.
	What I would like to do, if this is okay with everyone, is to stop midway through the existing draft procedure, and I just want to stop short because there are some discussion points I think that are necessary for

how the CROPP RT works and so forth. I think it would impact the final outcome of what our procedures are.

Is this okay with everyone? Okay, I'm seeing just green text. Okay. Well, great. Okay. Well, I think something I want to do is just share my screen so I could point out to the text so that everybody can follow. Anybody can go to the wiki page and – let us do that there and post that in the chat so we can now share the screen. Let me see if I could share it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here, Dev. Thank you for sharing your screen because, of course, being an Android user, you know, I can't follow that link, can I?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Apparently there's a new updated Adobe Connect plug-in. Are you all hearing me still?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. All right. Let me try sharing my screen again. "Share my screen." "This monitor" here. All right. Are people seeing my screen now? What I'll do is I'll make [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, perfectly. Thank you, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I'll make a text here. Okay. On the last point, we were looking to point #2, and that's when the proposal is being drafted. The proposal has to be developed so that it conforms with the CROPP procedures and guidelines – and I realize I see a typo there – and that all the questions on the form are answered fully, that the purposes and goals are specific and in line with the RALOs outreach plan, and that proposed travelers are fully aware of, understand, and agree to abide by the terms and conditions of CROPP as outlined on the CROPP Procedures and Guidelines page.

Now, a question has come up as to how to ensure this. For example, one of the suggestions I was making – and this is the discussion point – is that, especially if they are new travelers that are being proposed to go on this outreach trip, the RALO leadership CROPP representatives can have a briefing call with those travelers beforehand, and then share that so the travelers fully understand their responsibilities under the CROPP proposal. So that was my discussion point that I wanted to bring up there.

I see a hand raised. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Dev. I agreed with your approach that we will not follow the procedure you proposed at the beginning. We will discuss specific points that will help us to continue working on the procedure. So now

you are going back to the procedure, to point #2. I don't know if I understood it well or if I'm wrong. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Let's walk through this because I do have some discussion points of how we in At-Large handle such proposals. I just want to really get some feedback onto this, and then we'll look at your text, which is further down on the screen, as to what you've proposed, and have a discussion on that text as well.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay? All right. Okay. Thanks, Tijani. Any thoughts or comments on this approach of ensuring that travelers are fully aware of, understand, and agree to the CROPP conditions so that they can, when they go on the proposed trip, accomplish the purpose and goals fully? Any thoughts or comments on that?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Me, if you want.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you very much. I think it is in the remit and the duty of the CROPP Review Team to explain those things. I put that as one of the first [joint] mission points of the CROPP Review Team. The CROPP Review Team is there also to explain to our travelers, to the whole community, what the rules and procedures are, etc., so that when people start filling in their requests, they are aware of those rules and procedures.

I think that normally everyone in ALAC and At-Large should know that because inside the RALO we make this raising of awareness. We tell our people. We give them the link to the guidelines, and normally they know everything.

But I know they don't read, so we need the CROPP Review Team to make, at the beginning of each fiscal year, a briefing on the new rules and how they work, etc., etc.

Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks, Tijani. I guess my questions is it's good to probably have a refresher as to what the rules are on terms and conditions of the CROPP. I think that's clear. But if they are travelers, and especially if they are travelers that have not used the CROPP proposals at all, the question is, in my mind: how do we effectively ensure that they are fully aware? Because we have had complaints that the travelers were not made aware or did not fully understand what their responsibilities are, as evidenced by what has to happen in trip assessments, which is probably one key requirement; not just attempting to fulfill the goals of

the trip proposal, but it's coming up with the trip assessment and so forth. So there's a lot of prodding of the travelers afterwards, but there really should not be. So that was my suggestion on that aspect.

Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Dev. Hopefully you can hear me all right. My audio was dodgy earlier. Let me know if that's not the case. I'm perfectly happy with Tijani's annual or even-more-often-than-annual refresher course, but obviously it's something that we can't guarantee all the potential travelers will be attending or able to attend or will in fact, if they're not going to be reading and they're probably not going to go back to archives and listen to records.

To answer your particular question, I think, yes, that's a good idea that there is some sort of proactive interaction early between the travelers and the Review Team, but I'm very much in agreement with – and the reason I put up my hand – what Glenn has also now said in chat, and that is, "I really think that it's the Review Team members from our particular region whose interactive role it should be."

It may be as simple as a Skype call. It may be an [inaudible]. It may be that we discuss it at a more formal level and say, "We are reviewing this. Do you understand the following?" So it should be up front. We should rest assured that, before we promote such a thing, a particular trip, from a RALO, we're happy that there's a clear understanding,

recognizing it's not always in everything – get its little box ticked, and that's okay, too.

Now, that said, I would also suggest that, particularly with the online form, there should be a little box to be ticked that says, "I the traveler(s) listed above have read and understand the following" and make a little statement requirement. It's more of a reminder, but it's also a reminder for the ones that experienced, because we might find in some future point in time that there's a relaxation in some of the more regular travelers' performances, and I think it's good to [inaudible] on track as well.

Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks, Cheryl. In the actual acknowledgements but is now called the acknowledgement sections, there is a phrasing here that says that, if completed by the Pilot Program Coordinators, or the PPCs, the participants identified in this application agree to abide by the terms and conditions. So there is one type of notification.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm specifically saying that the traveler needs to make some form of [inaudible] as well.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. I get you. Okay. All right. Tijani? Oh, sorry. Go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you very much, Dev. I agree with Cheryl. I agree with Dev also, that it is the duty of the PPCs. If you read the guidelines, the PPCs have the duty to make the traveler aware of those guidelines. In the chapter that I proposed, I said that it is always with the help of the PPCs. It is the duties of the PPCs. They are there for that.

So to step in my procedure, first of all, the CROPP Review Team has to update the community about the new rules each year, at the beginning of each fiscal year, and then, when the traveler wants to fill in or to complete the request, they do it under the help and the guidance of the PPCs. PPCs are the members of the Review Team from the region. Don't forget it. So when I speak about PPCs, I am speaking about the Review Team, people from the same region.

Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks, Tijani. Glenn?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yeah. What comes to mind is that it's not just orientating these travelers and doing a follow-up. There has to be a communication back to your RALO and the membership on the productivity of that trip. But more importantly, I think – [inaudible] and Daniel are both on this call as well – is that we go back to our outreach and engagements and we do reports on our regions and what's been successful. What outreach

EN

have we done? CROPP is probably the most important aspect of outreach and engagement, so there should be a straight line from the strategic plans to the travelers and follow-up to the communication and the reporting back to the RALO and communication to outreach and engagement so we're getting value. They're getting performance.

If we're not getting performance out of these travelers that are documented engagements, whether it's speakers or Birds of a Feather or documentation that they got a list of people to follow up at new ALSes, we have to ask ourselves, "Are we getting value for this trip?" It's getting back to results-based management.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks, Glenn. It sounds like, going back to what the travelers need to do, it's to capture as much information as possible in terms of collecting any pictures, any recordings, and so forth. Then what they can do is also make those recordings and pictures, etc., available. It also makes for not just reporting to the CROPP RT but I think more for the RALO itself, actually.

Okay. Olivier? You have a hand raised?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks very much, Dev. I think we're all in agreement with all the reporting and all this. What I wanted to touch on – and I think we left it halfway off, and I still think we're pretty much unclear on this – is that the procedures you're currently providing us here are saying that the

CROPP RT members are the people that submit the form. That's what's there at the moment.

Tijani was saying that it should be the travelers submitting the form. Glenn came up with the ALSs submitting the form, which I believe would be the travelers at that point, but then recently, just a few minutes ago, changed his diagram to say "members." I'm not quite sure what that means.

Finally, the rules, I think, as they are, are that it's actually the RALOs that are supposed to submit the form because the RALOs request for travel.

So there's a big confusion here, and I'd like to share some clarity on this, please.

Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks, Olivier. In my mind, to me, it is straightforward. Maybe I'll try to restate. The RALOs are the ones that are submitting the CROPP proposals. However, it is the CROPP RT representatives that are the ones that actually signal when that process is finished and we start the review.

What happens is that the RALO have their discussions, their meetings, the discussions with the travelers on who should go to this particular event or whatever. You have as much internal conversations on that as possible. Once the RALO leadership has looked at the proposals and the CROPP RT representatives have looked at the proposals, they say,

EN

"Okay. It's good. It's ready. The travelers have looked at the proposal and everybody agrees that this is what it is," so that the traveler can't say, "Oh, I didn't know I was supposed to do this," or the RALO leadership isn't aware of it, or the CROP RT representatives aren't aware of it. Everybody has to be in sync – travelers, RALO leadership, and CROPP RT representatives.

Whatever process it takes, whatever Skype conversation or RALO monthly meeting or whatever, is up to the RALO. Once everybody is in sync with that, then the CROPP RT member – this is what Step 3 says – "Once a RALO's proposal is complete and the RALO leadership approves, the RALO CROPP RT members e-mail the mailing list." That triggers the actual review.

I think there was some confusion that, once a traveler started anything in the wiki, then the review started, and that's not the case. The Review Team doesn't not get involved until the CROPP RT member says, "Hey, our proposal is ready."

Does that answer the question, Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Dev. Yes, you've answered the procedure, but you just said that, "Once the traveler starts editing the wiki." So what you mean is that it's for the travelers who edit the wiki, and that's the thing that I just cannot understand. It's just one of these things.

EN

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:	Okay. I was just using what happened in the past: some travelers edited the wiki, thinking that they did not need to consult the RALO leadership or the CROPP RT members, and thought that that was all that was needed. I'm saying there has to be close collaboration with the CROPP RT members, the RALO leadership, and the travelers. They all have to be in sync.

I would say it doesn't really matter who makes the edits to the wiki, whether it's the traveler or the CROPP RT member, or the RALO leadership. What has to happen, though, is that everybody has to be in agreement to it. Then, once it is ready, the CROPP RT member has to then issue the go-ahead to the CROPP RT mailing list.

Does that answer the question in your mind, Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	You're basically saying that everyone is able to edit the wiki. I'm just concerned. Too many cooks spoil the broth. Telling the traveler, "Yes, you have to edit the wiki, but then you also have to coordinate with the CROPP RT members, and then you have to coordinate with the RALO, and you have to do all this stuff" – and these people might be doing it for the first time – will just confuse them, hence the reason why I've always favored the [inaudible]. CROPP RT members edit the wiki. The traveler can e-mail their proposal to the RALO. The RALO works with the CROPP RT members, and then we have a proper hierarchy of things working out.

Here, when you get everyone to coordinate with everyone, at the end of the day, nothing is coordinated. We end up with the problem that we've had so far, where everyone else thought that somebody else had told the traveler what to do and nobody has and the traveler ends up not submitting the report, etc., etc.

Anyway, I'm not going to die in a ditch over this, so that's the last I'll speak of this. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. I would say that it all comes down to the CROPP RT member making sure that RALO leadership is aware that travelers are working on it, which then triggers starting the review process.

Okay, there's a queue here. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Oh, sorry.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Actually, so sorry, Tijani. I think it was Glenn who was first. Sorry. Glenn first and then Tijani. Sorry.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. Tijani, I'm not going to be very long. I've been asking to put the graphic up because there was language changed that, after Dev has said – we keep using different terms, and I think it's a little confusing. So if you had the graphic on the screen, if people can see, I just want to make sure we're good with the steps. If anyone else – and it doesn't have to do be done now – wants me to make any other changes in the language or additional steps, the problem with it is I have to put in the graphic descriptor words, like "feedback," so I'm limited in terms of the features. I can do it. It's a very simple infographic. So if there's any other changes so people can understand the step-by-steps that I provided there, let me know. That's all I have to say, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks. I just refreshed my screen because I think it – yeah – updated the wiki one earlier. Tijani, go ahead. I'm putting it up on the screen. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Dev. I'd like to remind everyone that the CROPP program is made not only for At-Large, for RALOs, but also for the non-contracted stakeholders in the GNSO. The GNSO doesn't have a CROPP Review Team. When you have confusion, please goes back to the CROPP guidelines. The CROPP guidelines are very clear. The traveler drafts the application. The RALO leaders agree or don't agree. If the RALO leader don't agree, it is stopped there. Then the PPCs, who are supposed to

help the traveler in filling in the form, when the RALO agrees, seek the approval of the Vice President of the region. When the RALO leader and the Vice President agree, then the PPC, who already checked that the traveler is aware of the guidelines, will finish the acknowledgement section of the application. It is at this time that [inaudible] and [CROPP] consider the request.

So the CROPP Review Team is supposed to make things easier. I am feeling that this is complicating the procedure. That's why prefer that we always refer to the guidelines and try to make the CROPP Review Team make those guidelines and those procedures easier for the traveler, easier for the RALO, and easier for everyone.

Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks, Tijani. Just to say, broadly, yes. The Review Team members are the members that have to coordinate everything. "Do the travelers understand everything? Has the RALO leadership fully checked off on this? Okay. The RALOs agree with this. Okay, then I will start the process of review," and so forth.

Okay. Let me just quickly step to it because that's one of our discussion points. Okay, I see Olivier had – Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. Dev. Tijani, I'm really sorry to be persistent on this, but you just said that the traveler drafts the proposal. Dev, if you scroll up, I

these are the rules that we have. It says clearly in number 2 that the CROPP RT members draft the proposal. So RALOs/CROPP RT members draft trip proposals.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: May I answer your questions, Olivier? I'm speaking about the guidelines set by the staff. I am not speaking about our Review Team's proposed procedure. The guidelines set by the CROPP staff, by ICANN, is that the traveler drafts the request.

Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: He's probably going on and on about what he has to say. He has nothing important to say.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: All right. I guess afterwards we're going to wordsmith it to be a bit more – I won't try to wordsmith it now. I just want to step to the rest of the process because there are some other aspects/discussion points.

Just to make sure, it's only when the CROPP RT members start the review by e-mailing the CROPP RT list. Okay? That starts the review. It's not when the travelers first submit to the wiki and the RALOs discussing it. It's only when the CROPP RT members e-mail the list. That's what triggers the review times.

What I said under these review times is that you have to make sure that all the approved proposals by both the Review Team and the regional stakeholder VPs need a minimum of six weeks prior to the travel date. So what I said here was that, in order to allow that time for the VP and the CROPP Review Team and to review and to update the proposals based on comments received, the proposal should be submitted to the CROPP Review Team eight weeks prior to the proposed travel date.

Okay? Is that a new hand here? Olivier, is this a new hand, or is this an old hand? Okay, I guess it's a new hand. All right. Olivier, and then Tijani.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I don't have my hand up.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Oh. It's showing up on my screen. All right. Tijani then, then Cheryl.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you. I 100% agree with your paragraph. I put it in my proposal, but I added that those eight weeks are only to comply with the six-week requirement of the program administrator. We took two weeks for our review, but we may finish before two weeks. If we managed to review it in a few days, even if the request didn't come eight weeks before, we would not reject it. We would not say, "No. We cannot review it." We'd say, "Okay. Try to review it very fast, very

quick." Then we have the obligation to submit six weeks before the beginning of the trip.

Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANDGON-ORR: Thank you. Olivier's point in chat got my back up, to say the least, coming from the most language-diverse region. Yes, we do work in English. However, we do recognize and celebrate the diversity of all in our region. That includes our language diversity.

So I we happen to get an application in Farsi, that's okay. We'll deal with that at the next level. It's now an online form, so that would mean that, as English is the most likely to be the most acceptable checkmark box language, we can have it appropriately altered before it goes into the form as part of our assistance and working in collaboration, as Glenn said.

What Glenn outlined that happens in NARALO is absolutely consistent with the overall guidelines, and Tijani's point is just that: we cannot be setting up a system which can be demonstrably discriminatory and more difficult for our travelers than it is for travelers in other parts of ICANN that do not have a Review Team middle-management layer imposed upon them.

So collaborations [are clear] here, as Glenn has outlined, and it may be that different RALOs have to nuance this slightly in different ways. But if someone in APRALO can only work in local language or has an extraordinarily poor command of English, one of the questions we'd want to be discussing with them early on is, "What is the major language that will be used in the trip destination that they are proposing as well?"

Now, if it's all in-country, as well as in-region, and we are only going to be having interactions in a particular Indian subcontinent dialect, that's okay. But let's not get overly precious about this, but let's also recognize that collaboration is the key. Communication is the key.

Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Cheryl. Obviously, if the persons want to fill out the details in whatever language they are familiar with, fine. It is up to the RALO and the CROPP RT members of the RALO to really make sure they all understand it. But I do think it probably does need to be translated to English for processing, especially not [inaudible], but for easier review, and also for the GSEs to review whatever the proposal is, and therefore for the CROPP staff, the ICANN to then process the request for constituency travel, etc., etc., etc.

All right. I just want to step ahead now –

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. One word.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: All right. Very short, though.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you very much. It's about language. I agree. We in Africa have this problem. We have people that don't speak English at all. It happened one time, only one time, that the traveler drafted the request in French. The PPCs were Fatimata and myself, and you ought to know that the proposal you can update at any time before it is accepted. Fatimata and myself translated it and made it in English after the traveler drafted it. So it is possible.

I would like to emphasize on the fact that the PPCs are key in this procedure. They are key. They are the people who are responsible for the proposals until the approval.

Thank you.

EN

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:	Okay. Thank you. Yes. All right. Moving on quickly here, the CROPP actual review. The Review Team reviews the proposal, gets feedback, and based on the feedback, the proposal may be updated based on the questions or clarifying questions or suggestions and so forth.
	I said it's anticipated that the review process would take five to seven days, and typically currently what's done. Typically the approval is called by the Chair with a last call for comments on the mailing list. If nobody says anything within 24 hours, the proposal is approved by the CROPP Review Team.
	The question coming up was: should there be a more structured process for approval or disapproval? As an example, on the trip proposal wiki page, you could perhaps have a section to, say, require CROPP RT members to log in and edit the wiki, outlining their approval or disapproval of this.
	I see a hand raised on this. Quick. Olivier?
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	May hand is not raised.
DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:	Oh. It's still saying it's raised, according to my thing. My apologies. All right. Tijani?
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Is it showing it's raised to anyone else? If it's up, I [inaudible].

TERRI AGNEW: I see it showing as raised as well.

CHERYL LANGON-ORR: And mine only shows Tijani's hand.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's very strange. My hand is not raised. Sorry. Let me try to raise it [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I only see Tijani's hand raised. There's some lag somewhere in some system.

OLIIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'll raise it and then I'll clear it.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. It's cleared now. Okay. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you very much. For me, yes, I think we need a more structured way to do it. I propose that the CROPP Review Team create on its wiki a spreadsheet that has to be filled in by all the CROPP Review Team members to give their appreciation, their comments, on each application.

So, yes, sending an e-mail is always good, but to be documented, to be clear, we have to have everything documented together. On this spreadsheet, we will have the point of view of all the members of the CROPP Review Team, and this help even the traveler to know what the comments were. So I think it is a good thing to make it as a spreadsheet on the wiki.

Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. I think, yeah, a spreadsheet does add on a layer of complexity, but I think everybody is agreeing with the concept that it should be a more structured process for approval for people to make their comments then, rather than just in an ad hoc manner that we're doing right now with – well, e-mails are going to the mailing list. The CROPP RT members are then giving feedback and following up with the RALO leadership and travelers and feeding it back to the CROPP RT list.

Okay. Let me see if there's a hand raised again. Glenn?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yeah. I disagree, Dev, that you think it's another layer. Listen to what Tijani is saying. He's simply saying, "Make it a simple process that steps are not ignored or signed off." I don't think this has to be overly complicated. It's a very seamless process that every step is there so that at any time you can see what's missing.

So I think that Tijani's idea is a good one.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Oh, no, I agree with it. I just think having a spreadsheet as a separate attachment to a wiki proposal – that's what I meant by the additional layer. That was more of the implementation aspect.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Oh, okay.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: But I think the core concept is correct.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. Thanks.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Some sort of system where we acknowledge – yeah. That's all.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yeah. You just gave me the impression, when you said "layer," that you didn't think it was a good idea. Okay. Thanks.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thank you. Okay.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. I'd like to emphasize the fact that the, for the form, the proposal request, we don't add anything on this form, which is an official form. This form doesn't have to have the CROPP Review Team point of view. We don't have to complicate it. We don't have to change it. We have to use a separate thing to document the point of view of the CROPP Review Team members. That's why I proposed a spreadsheet.

If we don't like the spreadsheet, we can make any other kind of form of document. But don't use the official form to add the point of view of the Review Team.

Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks, Tijani. I do have an idea that I want to share with you all as a [inaudible] approach. One thing is that this sounds good when you have one proposal, but when you have different travel proposals coming in at different times at different stages of approval, it becomes hard to track what the CROPP Review Team deadlines are in order to respond to things. So I do have a tool, and I will show it just as soon as I finish off the GSE review, right after.

Oh, there's another comment. Glenn, go ahead. Or is that an old hand, Glenn? Okay, Glenn, I'm not hearing you, so I'm going to assume that's the hand until you interrupt me because you may be muted.

Okay. The next step here – this is also another discussion point – is that, once the CROPP RT approves, they would then start the e-mailing. On the team [lead's] CROPP RT approval, they would then e-mail the regional GSE VPs for their review and comment. My discussion point was that: should we just have the regional GSE VPs added to the CROPP RT mailing list so that the review by the Board, the CROPP RT, and the regional VPs can happen concurrently? So that was my question or comment.

Any thoughts? Glenn, I see your hand raised. If you want to say something… Okay, it's not. Okay. Somebody else has raised their hand – oh, Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you. I think that the Vice President shouldn't be involved before the CROPP Review Team finishes its review because, if at the end the application is not acceptable, and the traveler understands that and we threw it, there's no need to go to the Vice President.

So, first of all, finish our work, and then it should be within one day with our communication tools that the Vice President could give their point of view.

Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks, Tijani. I just note that, because I'm aware of what happens in the other RALOs, some GSE VPs do make a thread for comments. I noted that there was a disconnect with what the GSE VPs may say changes and so forth to the proposal before they give their approval.

In a sense, that is happening outside the CROPP Review Team, so if it is that GSE does not like a particular proposal or they have concerns about it, it might be good to have that shared understanding of, if they have a disagreement, why they disagree or what the questions are they're asking that perhaps we didn't ask ourselves in reviewing the proposal.

So that was why I was suggesting it, but you're thinking we should have it separately, that this [will still] still be separate. Okay.

Any other thoughts or comments on that aspect?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here. I've fallen out of the AC room.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I'll log back in as soon as I can. I think, again, that this is almost an arbitrary line, and it will vary in whatever way the regional people feel most comfortable interacting with their regions.

EN

For example, you'll find from APEC that things will come already discussed with, and quite probably adjusted and approved from the regional office very early on. That's because our regional people attend our monthly meetings. Our regional people work in partnership with us. Our regional people are very likely to be asking in their own right as facilitators, assistants, and advisors to the outreach activities that CROPP travelers are known for.

So just be a little cautious about getting too prescriptive as to when these things happen. I see both sides, but it is going to, I think, be more variable, certainly if you compare the way we would naturally do things in APEC versus some other regions. Thanks.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks, Cheryl. Again, it's just to ensure that the proposals do not exceed the six-week minimum deadline for when approvals can be processed. So, again, I was just trying to figure out a way to make all of this happen so that everybody is on the same page as quickly as possible.

Yes, the RALOs can be proactive and talk to the GSEs well before the proposal is even synthesized or made into this direct proposal so that it should not be any – and, again, like I said, I'm just speaking from experience, noting that some GSEs actually made extensive comments on it, and in fact, in some cases, even rejected the proposal, actually, even after it got approved by the CROPP Review Team. So I was, again, trying to make sure that everybody understands each other and the reasons why, for future reference.

Okay. Seeing no further comments, all right. There are two things. Throughout each stage, the CROPP RT members update the acknowledgement sections, noting approvals or if there is a disapproval. Only when that section is completed would ICANN staff/CROPP staff process the proposal, and that is done six weeks before the proposed travel date.

Again, just making sure who is updating the acknowledgement section. It is the CROPP RT members making sure that those approvals are in place. Once all those approvals are in place, then the CROPP staff processes the proposal.

Okay. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Dev. As per the guidelines, the PPCs are the only ones permitted to finish this acknowledgement, to fill in this acknowledgement section. By the way, they have their log-in permit to fill in this section.

So the PPCs from the region will complete this section, and they will mention the approval or disapproval of the Vice President and the RALO leadership. But they will not make any approval or disapproval in that part because that part is only to mention that the traveler is aware and abides by the guidelines.

Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks, Tijani. I guess I would have a discussion on that point because I guess from the e-mail on the list I would say I have question on that aspect of it. But let's just quickly off this last point, which is point 7, which is the trip assessment.

After the event, the RT members have to make sure to communicate what the travelers – and make sure they complete the trip assessment forms as to how they purpose/end goals of the proposal were or were not realized. Once the trip assessment has been completed by the travelers, the CROPP RT members will then make sure that the GSE and the CROPP RT members can see the trip assessment when it's ready for review.

A final discussion point was that – and this was voiced by some persons here – with trip assessments by travelers, what could happen is that: could they be used to assess whether such travelers would be able to use the CROPP for future proposals? Because I've heard comments indirectly on: how do we make sure that the trips are accountable? So that was my phrasing on this.

The trip assessment was something that we probably have not done extensive reviews of, but perhaps this is something that should change to really analyze: are we meeting our goals? Are we doing the right thing as to [inaudible]?

Tijani? Sorry, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. The trip assessment is not to be reviewed. The trip assessment is to be done by the traveler. I agree with you that the PPCs have to mail it to the CROPP Review Team for that information. Once it is finished, the program administrators will see them. They are always aware about that, and they will use this assessment as a reference for the future travelers' requests.

But for the CROPP Review Team, I think that we have to inform the CROPP Review Team of the assessment, and the CROPP Review Team may use it once the same traveler makes a request next time so that they can ask him other questions to ensure that he will comply with the strategies and will comply with the engagement or the commitment he or she made before the trip.

So, once again, the trip assessment is something that, once it is on the wiki, it will not be changed. We will not review it. We will not change it. We will not ask the traveler to change it. But we will consider for ourselves to make that assessment next time.

Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, Tijani. Thanks for this. All right. I don't think any other hands are raised, so I'm going to just quickly show something here, and then we'll open the floor for other questions.

This was something I was trying to figure out. One of the big problems has been the ad hoc nature of how proposals are reviewed and

EN

acknowledged and so forth. When we have multiple trip proposals at different stages, it becomes very hard to figure out what it was.

This was something I was trying to come up with. It's a kind of what you'd call a combined style of management. The idea behind it was that we could come up with – and this tool is something called hive.com. I should start to type it. The idea behind is it that we can really plan and see a dashboard of what stages there are for each of these proposals.

So the idea is that we start up a particular proposal. The CROPP RT member that it's assigned to processes it, and then, when it is done – for example, okay. The RALO is drafting a particular proposal, and when that is done, then we start the CROPP Review Team review. Then another proposal is coming in that is being drafted with particular deadlines. So you could have multiple trip proposals here.

So the idea is that you can see at what point, which stage, the proposal is at that we're looking at. We have different columns for each of these different stages. The idea is: okay, you're drafting a RALO proposal. You have a CROPP RT review part. Then we CROPP RT has approved it, we move it over to the GSE VP. That has to be done. There's the deadline for that. Afterwards there's a trip report after the trip has taken place for the trip assessment to take place because that has to be done three weeks after the trip.

Again, I just thought that maybe you can use a tool like this. I don't know if staff has any internal ideas for how, if they are using some sort of combined-style dashboard-type system, maybe that can be used. But I'm thinking that this is something we could probably use better

because, right now I would say it's very hard to follow or track what's happening, especially when you have different trip proposals happening at different stages.

Okay. I see a hand raised. Tijani? Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Dev. This is the kind of thing I proposed when I spoke about the spreadsheet. I was speaking about a document on which you have all the proposals and the deadlines. We dedicate areas on this spreadsheet for the CROPP Review Team members to make their assessments, their comments, so that everything is on this document. You can see: "What is the deadline for this, the other proposal? Oh, we have to do something because we are reaching the deadlines. We have to finish our assessment." So you make the call to say that we will accept or not. What is our final word about this proposal, etc.?

So here you give a tool for monitoring. I propose the tool for monitoring and also to put in the comments of the CROPP Review Team so that the traveler will have everything written there and he can consider or she can consider all the comments, rather than following the mailing list where perhaps we can miss something.

Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks for that. Just to say that this tool [for Hive], has mobile apps for Android and iOS. What happens is that you can see the

EN

notifications when changes happen. I thought that would also be a good thing so get a notification on your mobile advice instead of just e-mailing going around. You have lots of e-mails. So that's the idea here. You can also do things like calendar-types of things as well.

Again, it's this type of combined [inaudible] tool. Perhaps, again – okay, I see that Heidi was suggesting that IT could suggest a simple tool. Maybe you could make that an action item, or you can try this tool, or whatever.

All right. Okay. I know we're taking up a little more time here, but I thought I would beg your indulgence for at least ten more minutes to really go back to the wiki page here.

Heidi, as to whether the action item would be for this working group or the TTF, the TTF can test it, but I really do think it's for this working group because this working group is the one that's trying to do this kind of work flow-style of things. Maybe the confluence wiki can be done, but I'm just thinking of some visual way of a dashboard to track everything and to get notifications on it. Maybe the CROPP staff has some ideas on this.

All right.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: [inaudible].

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Sorry, what's that? Sorry

DANIEL NANGHAKA: This is Daniel.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Oh, Daniel. Right.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I lost my connection to the doc here. I like hive.com because it's good because it can help us to able to track things. Also, another challenge that I saw is that, after the trip has been completed, there is a delay in filling in the trip assessments. So we have to get back to the traveler and remind them that, okay, we have to fill in the trip assessment. After filling in the trip assessment, it has to go through those [figures]. So you also have to keep track of that time because, if you fill out a trip assessment, that could be filled in within two weeks. Then it is going on for four weeks, six weeks, two months. I don't think that this is something very good. Probably we could also track that [inaudible].

Thank you. Back to you, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Right. Thanks, Daniel. Again, it's hard to track all of those things, so yeah, that's why I wanted to have: okay, trip assessment reports, those are due and so forth. So, again, to help everybody do all these things.

I guess this is more of a philosophical idea about how the CROPP Review Team is structured. Tijani has posted a text, and he posted it this

morning – well, earlier today. In my mind, it offers a fundamental and I would say philosophical difference. I just want to get some feedback from the group as to how, in my mind, this is supposed to work.

In my mind, the CROPP Review Team is supposed to be working how the ALAC Finance and Budget Subcommittee works. In my mind, this is what the conversations for creating the CROPP Review Team first came about.

How this was happening before was that RALOs would make budget requests to the Finance and Budget Subcommittee at the beginning of the year and the Finance and Budget Subcommittee had their conference calls and they did deliberate on each of these proposals. They'd do either one of several things. They'd either approve it, reject it, or they'd actually modify the proposal. It was then forwarded to ICANN Finance for ICANN Finance to then say, "yes, approved," or, "with caveats," or, "partially approved," or, "rejected."

I could be wrong, but when I read Tijani's draft text, I see a sense that this is a difference here. So I just wanted to bring this up for further discussion. Again, I know we're going past the hour, but I just want to get some ideas or some feedback from everybody on this call.

I see there's a queue. Lovely. Tijani, go ahead, and then Cheryl.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Dev. Yes, it must be like the Finance and Budget Subcommittee. The Finance and Budget Subcommittee is not supposed to reject proposals or a special budget request from the community.

They are supposed to check them, to harmonize them, to ask the people who are asking for it to arrange it, to change it, to make it acceptable because some of the requests are not acceptable at all.

So the duty of the subcommittee is to orient the requesters, to make them comply with the rules, to make them make acceptable requests. It's not our role because if you see the procedure of the additional budget request, there is not the layer of the Budget and Finance Subcommittee. The people can send directly their requests to the controller, and it is written on the form.

But even if we didn't do exactly that in the past, we have to be aware that we don't have to repeat it again. We have to orient. We have to make things clear to the requester so that he withdraws his request if the request is not acceptable. Otherwise it will be rejected. So there's no interest in sending it. We have to orient him to change things so that the request will be acceptable.

Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Tijani. I guess I have a different understanding of how the Finance and Budget Subcommittee works. I have seen this in the past, where proposals are rejected by the Finance and Budget Subcommittee if the Finance and Budget Subcommittee reviews it and thinks that the proposal does not meet the goals of the ALAC or isn't in the ALAC's best interest to submit that proposal going forward. Or they may ask for

modifications or to update the proposal to change it, to change the wording, to alter things.

So, again, this is my understanding. Perhaps – okay. I see Cheryl's hand is raised. Perhaps I'll get some insight into this. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Dev. I'm not trying to [inaudible] that I shall make a few comments. Look, I'm not going to get hung up on what a different subcommittee does. We are particularly focused in this Review Team on working this particular program effectively, efficiently, and most importantly, in a timely manner. It has members of both outreach and the Finance and Budget Subcommittee.

Historically, however, the whole program, the CROPP program, came about because of the recognized shortfall of the larger complete ICANN process, Dev, that you were describing that our Budget and Finance Subcommittee gets into, the annual thing that only happens at a particular timeframe, and the fact that things could be rejected so people can't make commitments and appropriate planning. It undertakes certain activities.

So historically we are really doing CROPP stuff because there was a need for some form of more nimble, more regionally-focused, and more capable of during a financial year's activity, as opposed to a one-bite-of-the-cherry type of approach that existed before.

Recognizing all of that, I don't see a philosophical difference in that, which you seem to be recognizing, Dev, in what's articulated in Tijani's

document. I do, however, think that we need to make every effort within the CROPP Review Team process that we have to make sure that things are demonstrably successful and that we help people to put forward the very best and most workable application possible.

We are allowed to fail. We learn by failing. That's okay, too. Some trips won't be successful. Some things will be rejected beyond our remit, and that's okay. We learn from that. So let's not get too precious over us as a Review Team succeeding or failing. Recognize our job, which was the harmonization aspect, which I think Tijani's documentation takes in quite nicely. But again, I will cede to you all to keep these things simple. If they're not simple, volunteers probably won't do them.

Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks, Cheryl. Again, does anybody want to make any comments or observations before I close off the call? Okay. Let me see. I'll guess I'll do the going once, going twice, going thrice. Okay. All right.

First of all, thanks for taking the extra time on this to go through it. I think what we are going to try to do is try to make sure we harmonize everything and produce a third version of hopefully the final draft, I should say, of the procedure. Maybe we could use also Glenn's infographic to illustrate these points and then post that to the list for comment.

Secondly, regarding the Hive tool, I'm seeing in the chat that Laura and the IT Team may take a while to review it. So I'm going to suggest that

perhaps I will send the invites to everybody on the CROPP Review Team and ask them: "Look, let's play around with this and see what it is and see how it works and if this could work as an interim solution," because I don't want to wait too, too long on this because the CROPP proposals are going to start coming in, and I want to get this all worked out and understood so we can have a smooth workflow throughout the year.

All right. Any final comments? Last words? Going once, going twice, going thrice. Okay, thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] feels like it a last word, but anyway. I'd love to have a last word on this topic. Can you promise me one [Thursday]?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: All right. Thanks, everybody. Have a great weekend. Okay. We'll catch any discussion on the wiki and on the mailing list. Of course, Cheryl, you can have the last word.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I mean I really want a last word. Let's not finish [inaudible]. Bye.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Bye, all. Take care.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks. Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Have a lovely weekend.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, everyone.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]