

YESIM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC Subcommittee on Finance and Budget call taking place on Thursday, 5 January 2017 at 14:00 UTC.

On the call today, on our English channel we have Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Daniel Nanghaka, Maureen Hilyard, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Kaili Kan, Abdeljalil Bachar Bong, Sarah Kiden, Allan Skuce, Glenn McKnight, Nadira AlAraj, Andrei Kolesnikov, Judith Hellerstein, Wale Bakare, Javier Rua-Jovet, Seun Odedji, Ali AlMeshal, Sebastian Bachollet and Erich Schweighofer.

On the Spanish channel, we have Harold Arcos.

We haven't received any apologies for today's call, but Dev Anand Teelucksingh just informed me that he will be joining us a bit late.

And from staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Edrogu, and myself, Yesim Nazlar.

Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and David.

And if I can please remind all participants on the phone bridge as well as on computers, state your name before speaking for recorded transcript purposes and also for the interpretation purposes as well. And over to Alan. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. First of all, welcome to this call. The number of people attending is heartwarming. I don't think we've ever had this level

---

*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.*

---

of attendance before at these meetings, at least not in my memory. This is a relatively important group.

The Finance and Budget Subcommittee is responsible for, among other things, in putting together the special budget requests that funds an awful lot of the activities within the ALAC and within the regions over the coming year. If you look at the history, we have gone from some years where we did exceedingly poorly to doing pretty well these days, that is not only get our share, but getting a large number, a large percentage of the projects that we request funded.

Not always through the budget request process, interestingly enough, but usually we have done quite well. This group is not a rubber stamp. We expect the people in this group to work within their region to put together the requests, and then when they come here as a group, to vet them.

In some cases, recommend changes, in other cases we have rejected projects that we feel either should not be funded or will not be funded for various reasons. And as a result, we—as I said, we had pretty impressive results last year certainly.

The timeline, as Heidi will describe, is exceedingly tight. So, we have a lot of work to do in the next less than a month. I suspect we may—the deadline may end up slipping slightly, although Heidi will tell us it's not—that can't happen. But we have hard work ahead of us.

So, I look forward to seeing the process through. We'll talk a little bit more about the details of how—what we're doing and how we make our decisions, and what the involvement of people is within the RALOs

---

as we go forward. But overall, this group essentially is the gatekeeper to the budget requests.

And as you'll see, we do take our jobs seriously, and it—certainly last year, which was one of the first years that I participated very heavily in the process, it was—it's a learning experience, and quite impressed about how well people have taken the job seriously.

So, I look forward to it. We have a lot of observers, participants, in the meeting, and I hope that will continue. Everyone is welcome to speak to the extent that time allows. When we have formal decisions to be made, if there are formal decisions to be made, those will be made by the formal members, the ones appointed by the ALAC and by the regions. Heidi, have I covered everything, or have I forgotten anything really crucial?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Alan, this is Heidi. I think that you've covered some of the basics. Do you wish to go over the criteria for not only the Finance Department but also what the FBSC from last year developed that worked well for the At-Large?

ALAN GREENERG:

I think that is under agenda item three.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Okay.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: It would be somewhat a rote criterion there, so I'm assuming that's what it is.

HEIDI ULLRICH: That was meant to be a segue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you very much. Alright. We are now on agenda item three, apparently. And yes, why don't we do the criteria first, because I think that's a good example. If we can pull up the document, I think the fiscal year '18 Wiki page has it at the top—has them at the top. If we can put that in.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct, Alan. This is Heidi again. The reason we switched that, and I hope—this is a really key page, this At-Large Fiscal Year '18 Budget Development Work Space, and it's key because it has not only the criteria from the ALAC, which all of the requests coming in from At-Large and the ALAC need to follow, but also the Finance criteria.

And there are, every year, there are maybe one or two more from the Finance Department that are really important to understand before submitting the request. And also on that page is a template, and that is the template that all the requests have to be submitted to the FBSC and then through to the ICANN controllers.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: You're on a roll. Why don't you continue?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh. Okay. So again, I'm not going to go over the Finance criteria. That's something that, as you discuss with your regions, just you need to stress that before submitting any kind of requests to the FBSC to take a look at what those requests are.

And one of them in particular is that requests where anyone from the community is going to be part of that, is basically going to be paid for any work, I don't believe can happen anymore. So, it would need to be a request where there's no—there are no funds coming to anyone from the community.

So, Alan, for the ALAC criteria, I'm just going to read them basically, and if anyone has any questions, Alan or I can hopefully answer them. The first is that outreach should not be a major focus. The reason for that is that we now have funds from the GSE that we can work with, and we also have the CROPP program, that each RALO gets five trips for doing outreach activities.

And I know that there are some discussion about doing outreach at the—this year's IGF in Geneva, and that's something that you can just start early and work with the government engagement, I think we can get some outreach activities going there.

The next request is that if any requests— [SKIP IN AUDIO] —yeah, I think that's important about the CROPP. Then proposals should include

---

ways in which will make the ALAC and/or the At-Large community more effective and develop the At-Large community.

And I think again, in this period of the At-Large review, I think that's going to be a major focus for this year. That's something that you might wish to think about as you go forward. The RALO requests must go through a bottom-up process within the RALO, prior to being sent for consideration by the FBSC.

And that's something that we're not at 100 percent yet, is that as you reach out to the representatives in your region, as you reach out to RALOs, if you could please stress that any requests need to first be approved and be discussed within the RALO before going to the FBSC.

Every year in the past, we've had one or two that have somehow slipped by and they are submitting directly to the controller, and we hear about them very late in the process. So, that also means that we're not able to, as a group or as staff, consult with that person submitting it on how to improve it and increase its chances of being approved.

That's another reason why it's important to go through this process. Then in terms of a general assembly, summit timeline, that is actually now being more streamlined this year, fiscal year '18. It is APRALO that is scheduled to get a general assembly.

I believe we still need to go through this process to do that, but it should be pretty much rubber-stamped. Now for the summit that is scheduled in the next—I think it's 2019. That does not need to go through a fiscal year process for the next fiscal year. Okay.

---

And then the—so Rob’s going to be on the call in about 15 minutes, and he’s going to talk a little bit about the process and the approach that they’re taking—staff are taking for proposals that are unlikely to be going into the core budget. So, I’m going to wait to address that point until Rob comes on the call. Alan, should I continue on to the timeline?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I want to talk about this for a little bit.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Properly, I think, and maybe going forward, I would like to change criteria to guidelines. That is, as I said earlier, this group is a group with discretion, and we will bend our guidelines on occasion when we think it’s appropriate, but for what are perceived as good reasons.

So, you will see occasional outreach things going out. You will see things that perhaps should be part of the core budget but aren’t. Because last year, we, I think quite effectively, used several of these budget requests to call attention to an issue which had been ignored for a long time.

One of them was the translation problem, which still isn’t fixed, the Latin-American/Caribbean mailing lists. But there’s a number of times that we have used these budget requests, I think effectively, bending the criteria. But if so, that’s a decision that’s going to be made consciously as we go forward.

---

So, I don't want to dwell too much on the details of it, but the overall gist is that part of our job is to number one, make sure we make good use and we benefit from these budget requests, and second of all, to make sure that we are increasing the chances that they are successful.

So yes, we are acting as gatekeepers. Some people, on occasion, find that offensive, but this is a competitive process. There's only a certain amount of money in the overall pot, and we want to make sure that what we get is the best use of it. I'd prefer that we make some decisions rather than they be made for us by the—by Finance staff. Tijani, I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Alan. Thank you very much. Tijani speaking. I would like to stress on the fact that the work that we are doing in the Finance and Budget Subcommittee regarding the additional requests is to make those requests acceptable, not to control what's made by the RALOs or the ALSs.

Our job is to facilitate. Our job is to advise. Our job is to correct. It is not to prevent. It is not to stop. It is not a barrier. It must be clear for everyone that no one is here to stop any project, but the project should be acceptable. We are here to advise, to show, to make the requests acceptable. That's all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Tijani. One of the—next thing I'd like to do is not review last year's document, not review last year's requests, but call attention to

---

them. Anyone who was not a part of the process last year really needs to look at a number of different documents.

The first is listed in agenda item 3A-1. We seem to have some noise on the line, if we could try to find out where it is. I think it may be Tijani's line, but I'm not sure. It started at that point. The first document is last year's requests. And if you go through it, and we don't need to now, but anyone new on the group should be doing this, look at the requests, read through them, and you will see that in some cases we did decide not to put forward a request.

And usually that was because we believed that it was so far from something that was going to be accepted, or the amount of it was such that it was not to anyone's advantage—to our overall advantage to do it. The overall pot of money is finite, and I don't know what it is this year.

It's something in the order of a little bit more than a half a million dollars. If we put a request—send a request in for a quarter of that, and this is for all of the ACs and SOs, then if we get it, we're not getting anything else. And so, that's a decision that this group has to make going forward.

But Tijani is correct, in general we are not here to prevent, but we do have to make decisions based on what is going forward. And of course, it is up to each person who represents the RALO to work with the RALO to make sure that when requests come in to us, they fit the overall guidelines and we're not in a position where we have to make—even consider that kind of requests. Tijani, is that a new hand or an old hand?

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

A new hand. I'd like to add something. When a request is not acceptable, our duty, the subcommittee, is to advise the requestor that this request is not acceptable because of this and this and this, and to please correct it according to that. It is not our right to only stop the project and not pass it. We have to discuss with the requestor, to give him what is wrong, and to make him correct it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Tijani. Experience in the past has said when we have done that it has not always resulted in a positive result. But yes, that certainly is something that we should be attempting, recognizing our timeline is very tight at this point. We don't have an opportunity for lots of iterations.

The second document, which I think you want to look at, and that one, we want to look at very soon, is the full list of requests from all ACs and SOs, not only because you may get some interesting ideas from what they have requested, but also to get a feeling for what is accepted by the Finance and Budget—by the staff people reviewing the requests and to get a feel for what kind of projects are more likely to fund and what kinds are less likely to fund.

So, I think both of those documents, especially if you're new, but even if you've done it before, are worth reviewing. I think I've pretty well done that. Tijani, again a new hand?

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

No. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Heidi, over to you at this point. Is Rob with us yet?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Alan, no, he is not. And he should be here in the next 10 minutes or so. So, Alan, if you agree, I will go through the rules. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I was going to say, why don't you go through the process and timetable at this point?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yeah. So again, this is a very, as Alan said, a very tight timetable this year, and we're already on the 5<sup>th</sup>. So, the kickoff was on the 15<sup>th</sup> of December, and the deadline for submission to the ICANN controller is on the 30<sup>th</sup> of January. So, we have about 25 days for that.

And during that time, a lot needs to happen. So, the first is that we have now sent the notice of the opening of the Fiscal Year '18 project. We sent that right before the holiday break. And then, what we're asking you to do is to go back to your regions, your RALOs, and stress they need to start working on this and to go through the RALO for discussion.

So, the RALOs, from the 12<sup>th</sup>—from the 20<sup>th</sup> of December through the 16<sup>th</sup>, RALOs are to review any ALS requests or complete a template on behalf of the RALO and send it to staff. Then between the 18<sup>th</sup> of

---

January and the 20<sup>th</sup> will be discussions of the proposals that we've received with the Finance staff in this group.

Then between the 24<sup>th</sup> of January, or on the 24<sup>th</sup>, there will be a call, and then will be a revised proposal to be sent to the FBSC for final review. On the 25<sup>th</sup>, or between the 25<sup>th</sup> and the 27<sup>th</sup> of January, the FBSC will review all the RALO requests.

And then I will be working with Alan to ensure that by the 30<sup>th</sup>, that the—all of the approved and revised requests are submitted to the ICANN controller. Then, and I think Rob may explain this a little bit in greater detail, then the next stage is it goes internal, and there is a group, a cross-departmental group, that reviews the requests from all AC/SOs and SGs, and then during ICANN 58, there will be a chance for consultations with all, between Finance and the AC and SOs.

Then between March 20<sup>th</sup> and April 14<sup>th</sup>, there will be a final assessment with recommendations from staff. There's a stepped approach internally, as it goes from one level and moves through these consultations with the community, it goes up to a senior level.

And then between May 15<sup>th</sup> and the 31<sup>st</sup> of May, there will be ICANN—a review by the ICANN board, and the board will then approve it—approve those recommendations that are going to through at the May board meeting. Alan, back to you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think time to open for questions. As you'll note from the timeline, we're tight. We're halfway through the process at this point. I suspect in

---

many regions there has not been any discussion yet. So, although in theory we opened the process at the 15<sup>th</sup> of December, it's not a really great time to start a discussion with many of our groups.

So, I think a lot of the focus is going to have to be at the regional side right now, and it's up to the people on this—within this group to use the cattle prods or whatever to get people moving. I'd like to open the floor up to any questions or comments. If there are any. I guess we've been crystal clear. There are no comments. Would you like to do a song or dance waiting for Rob at this point? I know no one wants to listen to me sing.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Are you volunteering, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: [LAUGHTER] Trust me, you don't want to hear me sing. But you're welcome to. You're welcome to, Tijani, if you'd like. Tijani, I'm picking up a sound effect. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead, Heidi.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Rob should be with us in the next five minutes. And again, what he's going to be talking about is basically, given the high number of requests that are now basically in even their second year of being implemented, does that mean might be going into core?

And if so, does that mean that, for example, the—one of these requests that have now—in their second turn in going through the additional budget requests, do they now need to submit another request if there's a really good chance of them going into core this year? Another question, Alan, is additional travel support for the new GAC liaisons. How would that—how should that be handled?

ALAN GREENBERG: I have answers for that if you'd like me to.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: My answers are there are a number of things, like the travel funds for the GAC, that I think we're looking for advice from Rob as to what we need to do to make sure it gets funded. Because that's the kind of request that if it doesn't get funded, we're in big trouble.

And something we worked hard for, in that particular case, is going to go down the—when worked hard for 10 years on, is going to go down the drain if we don't get a little bit of funding. So, there are some things which are not—we're hoping are not discretionary, but they don't fit

---

the model because we've been told we're not supposed to request ICANN meeting travel funding and these kinds of things.

But we are looking for some advice on some of those. And I think we had a hand from Tijani. I saw one from Andrei, but it seems to have gone down. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay, thank you. Tijani speaking. I have a question for Heidi. When she started speaking at the beginning, she said something about something that was possible, but it was not possible anymore, with the additional requests. Can you please, what is it? I didn't understand. I don't get it.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Let me double check. I think it was referred to... Oh, so yes, Tijani. So, this was the issue about outreach. So, outreach activities, for example, travel, requests for travel to conferences or meetings where the primary focus will be on outreach.

And again, that should not—those types of activities should not be submitted. They should go through CROPP instead. Because again, as I mentioned, all regions get five trips, and I'm not sure that all of those requests from every region are being utilized to the full extent. I know they are in Africa, and I believe in NARALO as well, but I'm not sure if other—all of the regions are using them. But I believe we have Rob—

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Sorry, Heidi?

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Is that okay, Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Heidi, question. Does this mean that request for any workshop on the IGF will not be accepted in the future?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, no, n. That's not for outreach. Again, you'll see that those requests for—that have been approved for the IGF, they are primarily for the workshops or a panel. And the element, if that request requests for both a panel as well as outreach, oftentimes it will say approved for the workshop but not for outreach.

And obviously, if that request comes from a region where the IGF is taking place, that might be different. But for example, in the past, requests from APRALO and AFRALO for outreach with an IGF not in their region, it will only—the approval was for the workshop itself.

So, I've been in touch with Mandy Harbor, who is with Government Engagement, already noting that the interest in having increased activities for both outreach and in other workshops, etcetera, at future IGFs, in particular, the one in Geneva.

And I think that if we just start working in advance and have a plan, then we can work with them and hopefully get some activities there without having to go through the request process. I believe Rob is on the call? Rob, are you here?

---

ROBERT HOGGARTH: I am, Heidi. Happy New Year's.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Sorry for my lateness. I'm happy I was able to connect with you all for at least 20 minutes or so.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Rob. So basically, we reviewed the criteria, particularly the additional At-Large guidelines. We've reviewed the schedule. So, I believe what remains for you is discussion on the procedure for requests that have been approved once or twice and stand a good chance of being incorporated into the core budget.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thanks. I'll touch on that briefly, and also be happy to answer any questions that anybody has. Thanks for having me on this call. I have worked with the Finance team now for a couple of years in terms of playing an advisory role to help them in terms of administrating the process.

So, I'd like to think I have some good insights on it. But as I've learned every time I talk to you all, there are additional elements to review or consider and understand. So, thanks for the dialogue. I think just in

---

terms of a quick introduction, and you may have touched on this, Alan or Heidi.

I think it's very important that you've already gone through the ALAC criteria for additional budget requests and the importance of working through your internal community processes in terms of anything that you're going to be submitting to ICANN staff and the board.

In the past, there has been an excellent means and mechanism for streamlining the requests that come from the community, by giving assurances to members of the board and ICANN senior staff that the requests that are coming in are done so through a thorough, thoughtful process.

I think it's worked out very well in the past, and I thank you guys for continuing that effort. In terms of overall work, the interests of those of us on staff who are involved in some of the nitty-gritty on this, our goal is to not make more work for all of you.

We recognize that just this process of submitting special budget requests carries some substantial burden, and so we want to minimize those as much as possible. And the point that Heidi raises, that I guess you all have talked about a little bit, is that there are some activities that start off as requests for a pilot effort, and then for them to be successful all the time.

And what do we do with those? Do you need to keep asking for them? When do they actually ever convert to something that's more formal, or steered to the ICANN overall budget?

---

And the answer to that is it's not set in stone. Generally, the approach that [INAUDIBLE] took early on in the process, collaborating with David [INAUDIBLE] and Sally Costas, because they're the sort of senior recommendation team that interacts with the board on these, is that pilot efforts are the core of this work.

The special budget request process was designed as sort of a venting mechanism and was introduced as that certainly, years ago, now, that acknowledged that the staff or the board are not final arbiters of all this, at least in terms of understanding what the communities need, and there should be an active role that you all can take to expand the resources, suggest alternatives and the rest.

And at a certain point in time, it's demonstrated that success. For example, there were a number of activities that you all have engaged in the last several years that have been in pilot status, and have proven to be successful. So, that's the mechanism that's saying "You guys are right. These are fine. And let's just declare these are now part of the core ICANN budget."

When I look at the list of projects that you all submitted and that were resolved in some way, shape, or form for this current fiscal year, FY '17, there are a number of those candidates, items that were pilot efforts that now should become much more core to the ICANN budget.

These are things that I think you are familiar with. These are things that Heidi and I talk about, not only among ourselves but with the senior and Finance teams as well.

---

And so, I'm happy to go through those individually if you'd like. Probably more productive for Heidi and I to sit down and in relatively short order just run through the list and give you guys feedback to say "This is something that should be core. Don't worry about it. This is something that's on the bubble. You probably should submit a request for it. This is something that definitely needs to be asked for again."

That might be the best approach to do it rather than spend the next 20 minutes going through each one individually, but I'm happy to do that however you guys want. Just to give you a little bit of context here, every year we're challenged by the overall budget process, and that is that right now, ICANN staff is being asked to produce their budget targets for the new fiscal year.

At the same time that you are all talking about and preparing your requests, the requests that staff made are not resolved until the June timeframe, in terms of the overall department budgets that David, Sally, Akram and others all pulled together.

But the actions on the special requests that you all submit are acted upon in the April timeframe, April-May timeframe. So, there may be things that staff make recommendations on now that could be rejected in the May or June timeframe. And if you all don't request it, thinking that "Well, staff made a recommendation for this, so we're covered and we're fine," but then it somehow gets cut in the final budget proofing, then you're out of luck.

So, I think it's a balanced strategy that we need to discuss about particular ones that say "Yeah, just cut and paste and submit that one

---

again.” “Let’s update something,” or “Let’s just reiterate our desire to continue something,” until we know for sure.

But I’m happy to go through each one and say “No, Alan, that one works for core. Tijani, that one we need ask for again. Marie, we need to consider how we’re going to take an approach on another one.”

So, I’m happy to do that in any way, shape, or form that you would like to do on this call, or as sort of a parking lot item that Heidi and I address here over the next week so you guys get some quick feedback in terms of what you should be focusing on. Heidi, I’ll stop there and see if there are any questions, or any remarks need to be clarified.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have a couple of comments. I’m not sure they’re questions. It’s Alan speaking.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Hi, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Three issues. Number one, we still have some things to clear up from last year, and I really would like to get them cleared up before we—so we don’t have to put a similar budget request in again this time, because the answer is still fuzzy. The major one from last year that’s in that category is the use of our liaison travel slots, where we will throw one thing, but the wording said something else.

---

And we really need to get that cleaned up. So, perhaps a one-to-one talk will address that. Number two, last year, like in previous years, we had in at least some cases, it wasn't as bad, but we had some cases where there seemed to be misunderstandings and the response did not really go along with the questions we were asked and the requests we were making.

It wasn't very bad last year, but there were some occasions. And lastly, last year we had several requests which essentially got approved, dollars allocated, but then we were told we can't spend them. The example is funding for a training session that we were then told—and I think that funding included per diem, but then we were told we can't actually have a meeting outside of the normal meeting window.

So, I think we need to make sure that all parts of ICANN are talking together. And if funding is allocated, which implies something else is not going to be allocated, because there is only a finite window of money that you have, we want to make sure that we're not going to be told through a catch-22, a got you, that we can't use the results. So, I think we need better communications all the way around in this process, and I look forward to not having such problems this year.

ROBERT HOGGARTH:

Thanks, Alan.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know if you want to respond or not. You certainly don't need to, but I'll give you an opportunity. Then we have Tijani and Judith in this queue.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Yeah, I very much appreciate your comments and agree with them wholeheartedly. In terms of prioritization, Heidi and I will prioritize that discussion about the liaison travel slots so we've got that all cleaned up.

I agree with you that this is an area of constant and never-ending improvement that we never ultimately achieve, but we constantly have to work on our communication efforts to make sure that not only are we communicating about review in terms of writing but also working internally with our own staff.

So, we're committed to doing that, and continuing to improve in that area. So, we'll definitely keep those in mind as we move forward this year. Thanks very much, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, and one further comment. I will point out that although we've had some missteps in the past, people have been flexible. Three years ago, we had some funds allocated for travel which could not be used logistically, and ICANN was very flexible, and we ended up reallocating that money to something completely different, which was a good use of the money. We did it publicly. It wasn't a secret. But—so, there has been flexibility shown when we have that, these mess-ups. So, for that I'm grateful. Tijani?

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. And thank you, Rob. Thank you. So, other ways, you are always [INAUDIBLE]. I have a question for you. You said that you want—you don't want to overload us, but I am not feeling that is it. Because I was funded to go to the IGF, and you sent me the conditions for it.

And one of the conditions was to make a report, and in the report, I had to give a breakdown of the whole activities of the IGF, the whole administration of the IGF, of the people who were attending the meeting, with a breakdown according to the stakeholders.

So, I had to choose who is applicable to what, and then I have to list the breakdown according to the stakeholders. I don't think this is productive purpose for you or for me, or for anyone, and it took me a lot of time. So, I think that those conditions you are putting for me, I don't argue. I will meet them. I did them. I met everything. But I think that it is a lot of time without any—actually any benefits for anyone. Thank you.

ROBERT HOGGARTH:

Thanks very much, Tijani. Let me respond to that, if I may, just briefly. I very much appreciate you going through and responding to those individual points, in terms of submitting the report. And I hope that everybody else who's done the various travels for the various groups is doing the same thing.

---

The intent there was not to create a tremendous more amount of work, but to be able to document what happened. I mean one of the challenges is that we're trying to be as transparent, particularly in this new age of ICANN after the IANA transition, so that we can demonstrate and you all can have the comfort that we're demonstrating that the funds are being used, that they're being productively used, and that you guys are achieving your goals.

We are more than happy, and I really appreciate the feedback to look at how we might modify some of those reporting requirements from year to year. I think the feedback you provide is critical for doing that. And what we may want to do, and please, in the future, feel that you can always do that.

When you're looking at some of these things, go "Really, guys?" Let's try to comply with the spirit of the law, but if the letter of the law—this goes to Alan's point about being flexible. If the letter of the law just seems to be unreasonable or an extra amount of work, then let's see how we can adjust that and still comply with the spirit.

Because the bottom line is that it is important, and it's really the only mechanism that we have, particularly with the IGF, to be able to go "Okay, did you achieve what you wanted to accomplish, and is this moving things forward in terms of some of the goals?"

So, thanks very much for producing that. We'll look at that and the other reports that are coming in. I think it was very important this year for you to make that effort work, because it may help reinforce the value, because that's also one of our goals here, to be able to reinforce

---

the value of that support at IGF and in other ways, as you all know, with CROPP. So, thanks very much for that feedback, and we'll definitely look at how we can improve that, still achieving the goals, but minimizing the workload. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Rob. Sorry. Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTINE: Yes, hi. This is Judith Hellerstein, for the record. My question is for Rob, is when you were talking about projects, and Heidi was mentioning the projects that have been funded in two pilots, and I'm speaking about [INAUDIBLE] of the captioning projects.

There is now scheduling a second pilot for January and February, and with the extra money that Heidi was able to get, we are going to trial a front in Spanish. I'm wondering, do I—when does it go into core. It was funded in core; the money was put into core. When does it go into core, or do I have to keep submitting special budget requests for extensions and for English, Spanish and French? Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Rob, if you let me give a modification to the question. Normally, when people request pilot budgeting, you're requesting the budgeting to do x, and if you do it two or three times, it goes into core. Captioning is a different case. We have very limited funding to do—to try captioning.

---

If it were ever adopted, we would expect the amount of money that will go into the core budget will be far larger than the pilot. So, it's a different kind of pilot than we have looked at in other cases, and I want you to answer in that context, not just will the limited money that we have gotten be put into the core, but how do we transition from something that was a nice idea to something that's now the business that ICANN does? Thank you.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you, Alan—

JUDITH HELLERSTINE: Right. And then Alan, I wanted to add on to that, and then how do we look at the analysis of ICANN spending x money on transcripts, which the idea was that if caption was going to be proved effective, and transcripts were of the same quality, that the money could then be put into have captioning for everything using that same funding that's funding for transcripts?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, since we have mentioned the tradeoff of captioning versus transcripts in our requests, I presume that's part of the answer. Rob?

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thanks, Judith and Alan, for that. One of the reasons why a pilot has to take at least two years if not longer is, again, the calendar. So, a pilot gets approved for the beginning in July, and six months later we're

---

having to create the budgets already again for the next fiscal year, when there may be a case that the pilot hasn't fully engaged, or it's still in the planning mode, where you've only had two or three instances of a particular activity.

Then there was a recognition very early on that that wasn't tenable. You simply couldn't make an appropriate evaluation on four months or six months of work. And so, that's one of the basic justifications for moving forward. One of the critical elements about moving an activity from a pilot activity to core is demonstrated evidence that it's actually working.

We've had a number of pilots that haven't worked, and people have said "Yeah, we're glad we tried it. It hasn't worked. Let's move on." Many of you are very familiar with the community regional outreach pilot program. CROPP still has two Ps in it, and we still have been calling it a pilot, and we've been doing it for four years.

So, I mean part of it is, and this may address the point you're making, Alan, it's ultimately what is the magnitude? When we're talking about CROPP, we're talking about six figures. When we're talking about the pilot for the captioning project, it was like \$5,000. Completely different scale.

But to your point, Alan, is if this ultimately becomes part of the core, it could potentially be six figures or higher in terms of the ICANN policy budget. Right now, and let's just use this for the case study at the moment, the first year was a pilot.

I think we did somewhere around six to nine calls. We said "Gee, we need to have more, so let's expand the pilot for the next fiscal year."

---

We actually—Judith and Heidi were able to work out, and Heidi was integral in doing this, as Judith mentioned, is to be able to say “Gee, can we continue this? Can we expand this? Can we do this a little bit different?”

We’re learning things. I think it’s at the very basic, we would need to show that things are being evaluated, being assessed, and that there are some actual improvements that were achieved. I mean one of the goals of this project is by doing captioning, we’re actually saving transcription costs, and so we should be able to do this for more calls.

I think where my head is here, for this one, is coming in with a request that shares the current assessment, and I’m not talking about a formal assessment, Judith, just something over the course of several paragraphs. “This is what we’ve done to date.

We’re finding this to be very productive. We think we should now move to the next phase, expand the type of languages that we’re doing,” as you’ve indicated is going to be a test, “expand this to more calls. So, we’d like to continue the pilot, but we’d like to continue it at a higher rate. Let’s double the funds. Let’s...” whatever the right thing is there.

To say that “We would like to do more with this because it’s proving to be quite successful.” And then what you, me, Heidi and others would need to do is really hold hands with Christiana Rodriguez and members of the translation and interpretation team, and then say “Okay, how can we expand this? How can we move it forward?”

But this would be the kind of thing, and I think this is true just about all the pilots, is having an assessment that says “Yeah, we think this is legit

---

and should go to a core.” And that’s just part of our communications as a group that can actually take place, I think, outside the—this effort, or outside this committee, but ultimately link back with this committee. I hope that was responsive, Judith and Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yep. Thank you very much. I see Judith has her hand up again. We are starting to run out of time, and as I said, I at least have a hard stop. Other people can stay on the call if they wish. One comment about—going back to the IGF. I think ICANN needs to do some work, and I’ve had this discussion with our CEO and he agrees, on more on a philosophical case of what are we trying to accomplish at IGFs and who should be there.

We jump through hoops to get funding for a couple of days to put on a workshop or something. I don’t have a clue what ICANN spent on the IGF this year. I’m not talking about funding for the IGF, but I’m just talking about travel. There were 10 board members, and I believe uncounted staff members.

And I think we need to rationalize what it is we’re trying to do. I don’t know what hoops people have to jump through internally to go to that meeting or what directors have to do to get justification for funding, but I think we need a closer to a level playing field there than we have right now for IGF.

It’s not a discussion we can have in this context, but it has to be had within ICANN on a wider scale. Judith, do you have anything very brief, because then we’d like to go to wrap-up?

---

JUDITH HELLERSTINE: Judith Hellerstein, for the record. Yeah, Rob, I guess I would like to discuss with you offline of what your suggestion is of how to put a next level—submission in, because we are—we finish up our calls in February. But this has to go in before then. So, that’s why. Thanks.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thanks, Judith. This is Rob. I would be more than happy to collaborate with you and Heidi on what that would say. I think the bottom line is, given the status of that project, there does need to be an additional submission, to talk about the next phase of that program.

So then, I think you have a great story to tell. And so, I think—I hesitate to say even [INAUDIBLE], but I think it’s something that you can make a very good case on in terms of moving forward and expanding the pilot effort. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Heidi, any further—any wrap-up comments or further things you want to add?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi, Alan. The thing again I would stress is that if you could just start now to work with your regions. I’m happy to be on all of those calls, to discuss any of the proposals. I’m happy to answer questions with proposals that you’re thinking about, and if need be, discuss them

---

with Rob, or Finance. So, I think that's it. I'm excited about what I'm hearing in the chat and what I'm hearing on the Skype chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: And Heidi, what is our official deadline for accepting requests from RALOs?

HEIDI ULLRICH: From RALOs, it is, again for the—first, we need to have them go through the process. So, it is by the 16<sup>th</sup> of the month, 16<sup>th</sup> of January. So, 11 days.

ALAN GREENBERG: It is 11 days from now. And presumably, most of them have not been written yet.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Similarly, we have a communal effort of the ALAC, or individual ALAC members suggesting things so the ALAC request can be done within 12 days. That's a rather tight target, so everyone, don't feel your duty is done because you've attended this meeting. We have some work ahead of us. Heidi, anything else?

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think that's it. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: We do have an item of next steps, but I think we've been pretty clear what the next steps are. I think we have to get our track shoes on and start running. Tijani, you have your hand up. Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, so I would like to say that the timeline is so tight that the interaction between the subcommittee and the RALOs and ALSs can be very, very—we have very small chance to do it because there is no time.

We should [INAUDIBLE], and I would like it to be corrected by the fact that all the RALOs start now and do their requests very, very soon so that we can have the feedback of the committee before the project is accepted or not accepted. So please, start now. We have to find perhaps a new way to remind all the RALOs that they have to start now. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. To the extent that RALO chairs and secretariats are not on this call, and a fair number are, I will ask that staff to make sure to communicate the message. Anything else? Then I thank everyone for their attendance. Rob, I assume that we'll have a private chat sometime to make sure we're clear on the liaison issue if you think you still need more input from me, and we should get that done moderately soon, but not today.

---

Anything else, anyone have any comments? Heidi, Rob, or anyone else on the call? And then I will adjourn this call two minutes early. Thank you all.

YESIM NAZLAR:

Thanks, everyone. Bye-bye. This meeting is now adjourned. [INAUDIBLE]  
Thank you for your participation, and have a wonderful rest of the day.  
Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]