EVIN ERDOGDU:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Finance and Budget Subcommittee Working Group Teleconference on Thursday, 27th April, 2017, from 16:00 UTC to 17:30 UTC.
	Today on the call we have Maureen Hilyard, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Alan Greenberg, Glenn McKnight, Javier Rua Jovet, Kaili Kan, Erich Schweighofer, Nadira Alaraj, and Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong, as well as Maritza Aguero on the Spanish channel.
	From staff we have with us today Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Robert Hoggarth, Ozan Şahin, Mario Aleman, Yesim Nazlar, and myself, Evin Erdoğdu.
	And on Spanish interpretation we have with us Veronica and Marina.
	I'd like to please remind everyone to state your name for the record and also for the interpreters.
	With that, I'll turn it over to you. Thanks so much, Alan.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you very much. Before we start the call, this call had a Doodle for one hour. The call is, in fact, timed for an hour and a half. Does everyone have the full hour and a half available? That is, another hour and 10 minutes left? Is there anyone who cannot make the full call?
	Olivier has to leave. Anyone else?

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.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Alan, Rob has until the top of the hour. So he has about 39 minutes left.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Then Rob should have put an X there but he didn't.

Alright, in that case let us go directly to the Item #4 of Rob Hoggarth and we will do that and then when we finish that we'll see how much time we have and go on to something else. At the very least we must do Item #5 which is discussion of the statement, and we'll then backfill with other things depending on how many people are still on the call.

We will go over to Section #4 – questions and answers on Fiscal Year Budget Requests with Rob Hoggarth. Rob, do you have any introductory comments you want to make? And of course, everyone please, due to the time limitations please be as brief as you can.

ROBERT HOGGARTH:

Thank you very much, Alan. I hope I'm not creating an inexhaustible recording loop or something here that's echoing for all of you guys.

I note that in Agenda Item #4 I've got 20 minutes, and I'm actually sharing that time with you, Alan. So I will be as conscious of that as possible. And my apologies for having to jump off to another community call at the top of the hour.

Just a couple quick notes in terms of summaries and a little bit of context here, and then I'm hopeful what we can do is answer any

general or overall questions that folks have. You should all know that from a communications perspective while Heidi has been fantastic in I think probably working directly with you, Alan, our plan is – and we are currently working on the documents – that we will send out written reports to the various requestors saying, "Hey, to memorialize officially this is the dispensation of your various requests," and offering to have individual conversations with the various requestors and groups for things like from individual RALO requests or other things like that. So to the extent that we don't have time in this limited call today, we do hope over certainly the course of the next couple of months before the FY18 year starts, we will have had opportunities for dialog not only between those of us who helped to manage the process a bit but also the actual implementers as necessary so that everybody's fully on board to maximize their use of the resources in FY18.

Just a real quick sort of context here, Heidi and I have been doing a lot of research and helping out where we can the Finance Team in going through this process. It's amazing how far the At-Large community has come in terms of utilizing this resource in the last five years. Back in FY14 you guys made six requests for additional budget resources. In FY18 you made 24. Of those 24, 19 were "official Yes." There were a number of not approved items and I'm sure that's what folks will want to focus on. But I wanted to sort of flag that overall context, that this process that started somewhat informally and that has been evolving year after year I think has become a useful tool and resource to expand the availability of support to you all.

Is it perfect yet? No. But I think with each year with the patience and flexibility that you all bring to the process we're definitely making

progress collaboratively here and I hope as we identify issues – we've been in FY 18 here and in this process – that we'll continue to improve.

With that general observation I'm happy to take questions on individual items, explain approaches that the staff and Board have taken this year to the process, and perhaps make some suggestions for what you may want to do in your comments that you're going to be filing this week, just to make sure that you preserve some of your requests or put forward some of your overall strategies so that the overall community can see your perspective.

I'll stop there, Alan, and invite questions or comments.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'm first in the queue. I don't see anyone else's hand up.

I have two issues. Both of them are issues of consistency. The first one is travel to ICANN meetings either on a permanent basis for from now and forever or on a pilot basis. The official rules say you don't do that through budget requests. You should do it through comments to the Operational Plan and Budget. However, a lot of people request it anyway. In fact, we were told, "Might as well put it there anyway even though you're supposed to do it through the Budget and Plan."

But when you look at the answers, you get a mixed bag. Some people ask for additional travel to ICANN meetings and they're told, "No. This is not the proper place. Make the request in the Budget." Other people make similar requests, including pilot requests, and are told, "Yes.

Certainly. Why not?" I can't cite the specific cases, but there are at least one and possibly several that were approved with this process whereas other ones were told to go away and make a comment and then it's not clear how they're evaluated or how they're published.

That's question number one. The question number two is also a case of inconsistencies. We did a fair number of travel requests, not to ICANN meetings but to other events. Some of them were answered with, "Yes, we support this. Do it through CROPP." Others were said, "No. We will not support this but you can do it through CROPP." I'd like to understand the difference between those two answers. Thank you.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you. I'll take them in reverse order perhaps, and I'm more than happy to tease out and maybe do some of this in writing so that it's really clear because I'm sort of working off the cuff here.

In terms of the last item, we strive for consistency. They're probably are about 10 or 15 people that look at the various paragraphs or sentences that resolve the 61 various requests that we got this year. Is there room for potential inconsistency in terms of some of the language? Yes, unfortunately, even though we strive to avoid that. So I definitely want to be able to flag those, Alan, and see if the rationale or the information that came out is inconsistent. I think the results are the same but I think it is important, as you note, that we have consistency in terms of describing why so that there is certainty as much as possible in this process.

I'm more than happy to go through those and see where those instances are. The overall intent and spirit of the CROPP program and how it's evolved is that the expectation is that those types of opportunities that particularly focus on outreach and engagement would be funneled through the CROPP. CROPP as a pilot program started out with – and remains at the moment – with five trips per RALO or GNSO Non-Contracted Constituency. As you all know, we've experimented and evolved that process over time, adding Visa support, expanding a number of times. Where we probably need to have some additional discussion is, do we have the capability to expand that program? Because I think one of the reasons for its origination was to be able to take all these individual requests and simply say, "Look, you guys have a resource. It's a program that is managed on an annual basis. So please use that." As opposed to finding yourselves having to make requests for specific meeting support for things like that.

I think as things have evolved with the GSE team, and as those efforts have matured and those teams have expanded, there's still a challenge in terms of figuring out how you all as leaders collaborate with that part of ICANN support, and I think we're also struggling with that a little bit.

In some respects, I think that again, the expectation may be that CROPP isn't big enough and so you guys feel like you have to make additional requests. And in that case, we need to figure out how to expand the CROPP resources now that they've become "core" something that we [plan for on] an annual basis.

ALAN GREENBERG: Rob, if I may interrupt. There's no question that you are going to be seeing requests to enhance the CROPP program and we understand that. The question really was just focusing on, is there a difference between the yes and no, and the point is, if you say, "Yes, use CROPP," you're really increasing your count of ones we accepted without spending any money and you should be honest enough to say, "No, we're not funding this but you can use CROPP." That was the real gist. I think we understand the CROPP program overall.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thanks for clarifying that, Alan. That's good. And that's helpful. Thank you.

The other question was the inconsistency in terms of the difference between ICANN travel or promotion of expansion of slots at ICANN meetings. The intent there as well is – and this was feedback from the Board a couple of years ago – that going forward, any permanent increases in travel funding – particularly to ICANN meetings – needs to go through the overall "more public process," if you will. Every aspect of the ABR is intended to be transparent from a request standpoint and a resolution standpoint. That's all on the community wiki. But in terms of people actually submitting comments, it being summarized, they're somewhat different or supplementary processes, and so where the Board wanted to see those permanent requests discussed and resolved, was at the more strategic level where I think it's viewed that the ABR – this Additional Budget Request – effort is much more tactical and one-offs.

What's tended to happen I think over time is that we have recognized that when one pursues pilot efforts that those are ones that can be more easily accommodated or more appropriately accommodated because they aren't time-bound. And although we say in the ABR Request Principles that no one should expect funding from one year to extend to another, that's probably true of the overall ICANN budget process as well.

If we've missed something where a request for a pilot for this year was not granted, we'll definitely want to look at that to preserve your rights or whatever. I would highly recommend that you just cut and paste or include that request noting that it was rejected and any comments that you all file this Friday, just so that we have that covered and that later we can go to Xavier and say, "We need some flexibility here. Let's accept this on a pilot basis and then figure out how to do something long-term."

Just one last quick point – there have been some cases where this new principle of saying "no permanent stuff" was only really initiated I think FY17 last year, so there may have been some things that took place prior to that before that principle went in place So there could be consistency from year to year or over years but we certainly strive to be consistent within a given year. And so if there are others [inaudible] please flag them for me so we can fix that.

ALAN GREENBERG: For clarity, I don't think the rules say, "Only permanent requests cannot be done through this way," so you may want to look at that. And the

one I was referring to that was rejected was not an At-Large one. I actually look at all of them and there was at least one Pilot program for just this coming fiscal year that was accepted and there was another one that was rejected, and they were told to apply through the Budget process. So it's the consistency I'm looking at in this particular fiscal year. And I'll go on to Maureen next.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sorry. I'm just unmuting myself. I'm probably going to be just repeating some of the things that you've just been talking about, Rob. Several of our – I'm talking APRALO FY18 budget requests – were related to activities that involve RALO Leadership, and what we were hoping is that some of that could become more core. And as you've explained, those that have been referred to CROPP are actually going to be eating into that allocation of five slots that we usually allocate out to other events within our Strategic Plan that may involve other members of our community. What I'm saying is that I know that you said, "No, there aren't going to be any more CROPP slots," but by saying, "If you want to do these activities you have to use CROPP," it's taking that away from our Strategic Plan.

Thank you. That's just what I wanted to say.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you, Maureen. There's one observation that I wanted to make and I don't want to create expectations where there shouldn't be or whatever, but in moving CROPP to the core ICANN Budget arguably that gives us a little bit more flexibility in terms of implementation. Certainly we have to look at that a little bit. But I think the hope and expectation was that we might be able to expand CROPP, depending upon the Budget flexibility that we were going to get on the team going into FY18. The initial feedback that we go is, "No. You can't expand the program," and we struggled to ensure that we weren't going to be shrinking travel slots. But I think that as the overall budget process concludes here in the next two months, we may see that there's some additional flexibility. And I don't hold that out as an impossible hope but something that we'll look at very closely.

In terms of the bigger picture, Maureen – and I think this is important as we collaboratively approach this in the future – and that's that, in the partnership with the Global Stakeholder Engagement teams in the various regions I think it will be helpful throughout the course of the year – and maybe this is something that we should plan for as we begin the FY19 planning cycle which will start very quickly – is to have those conversations about the overall Strategic Plans that each community has. And one of the things that we've tried to do through the CROPP program as part of the eligibility is to say, "Well, please produce a plan, post it, talk with the Regional VPs about it." And if we can reinforce that even more and make some of that information more widely or deeply shared with those teams, that might help us in terms of budget flexibility, not just in the core stuff but within what the relative GSE teams have to be able to help you guys in some of those respects.

Remember – and I'll get off my soap box here after this sentence – this Additional Budget Request process was never intended to be permanent, but I think over time what senior executives and Board have seen is that it's a useful sort of petri dish for growing new concepts and plans. There was a request that was not approved this year doesn't mean that it wouldn't be approved next year because each year has a different budget envelope, there are different competing priorities, and the rest.

For example, this year if you combined all the 61 requests and they were all able to be granted, the total would have been close to $1.2 million and the envelope was half that. So I think that each year is different, but look at these as more strategic requests and please don't accept a not approved decision in one fiscal year as a perception that will exist forever or that it's a decision that might not turn around the subsequent year. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Rob.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is there anyone else? I have another one but I don't want to hog the queue.

Seeing no one else, I'll go to my [another] one. We did a request and it had a title, "Public Media Initiative." This was one originally submitted by Evan and put on to the ALAC's list as opposed to NARALO, and it was essentially pointing out that ICANN has had an abysmal record of talking

to the common man. We do things talking to a different level of people altogether. And the response came back, "This is a very creative idea but the strategic premise of this request is not shared by the ICANN Organization." Then you go on to say you encourage us to work with Communication Team and NextGen program to maybe do something anyway. I'd like to understand that phrase, "The request is not shared by the ICANN Org."

ROBERT HOGGARTH: What I love Alan, is that you do read these things and that gives me great pleasure, particularly with the lot of blood, sweat, and tears, that goes into writing these things. The bottom line on that I think is that you guys have flagged that request to the Coms Teams and that you should do some definite follow-up on that. I think that – and not understanding all the underlying philosophies and strategic approaches [of] ICANN Communications – my unprofessional interpretation of that was – and I can talk about this with Evan directly because it's not something that I'm tremendously familiar with – but the premise that, I think it was a focus on U.S. Congress and what they were thinking about ICANN and how ICANN can burrow into their minds a little bit better and have them understand things, and doing that through an interesting sort of jujitsu route of communicating with their constituents and the rest.

My sense, or at least what I picked up from the feedback that we got from the Coms Team was, "Yeah, that's not the direction we're going in terms of strategy and approach. We follow a more corporate communications model as opposed to some of these 'creative ideas' of 'let's have a contest' or 'let's do this or that.'"

That being said, I think those types of dialogs about communications philosophies should be had, should be conducted, and whether that's Johannesburg or Abu Dhabi, whether that's a direct communication or conversation that you and Evan have with Jana Juginovic or other members of the team, I think that would be very helpful to have.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. It wasn't clear whether it was being rejected because we phrased it as a contest, but you just made it clear. You said, in your mind anyway, that Communications wants to follow a more corporate style of communications. And that was exactly the point that we were pointing out, that that's not the most effective way of getting to some people. And the example was U.S. Congress, the target was not U.S. Congress, although particular Congressmen might well be among the targets. The point was that we're not very good at speaking in a language people can understand. We bellyache on a regular basis but no one understands what we do, but we don't really try very hard to help them. And that was the gist of it. Thank you very much.

Anyone else or do we let Rob go? He still has a few more minutes with us.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: One thing I didn't have a chance to do, real quickly Alan, is that Glenn said something in the chat that, "Oh, I asked a question earlier in the chat," and I haven't been able to find it. I don't know if Glenn has a mic.

ALAN GREENBERG: Glenn, could you use voice to ask the question?

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Okay. I found it. I'm sorry, and maybe Glenn's having some audio issues.

"When is the CROPP FY18 Strategic Plan due? When will staff have the FY18 page up for CROPP?"

We are actually having a call this afternoon that talks about the specifics of getting the FY18 space set up. Last year we were a little bit behind the 8-ball or under the wave or whatever, and sort of [inaudible] together a page on the FY17 site to allow people to make early requests. We're hopeful that we will get something up in the next couple of weeks. I will have a better understanding, and perhaps ask Ariel or Heidi to update you on that after we meet today. It's just a matter of prioritization and workloads on that, Glenn. But our goal is definitely to have it up earlier than July 1st so that requests for July and August can already be considered and processed and all the rest.

In terms of the Strategic Plan, that's really in the court of all of you as RALO Leadership. The requirement is that a community isn't eligible and can't start actually taking trips until they have a Strategic Plan posted. Our recommendation each year is that at least by the end of September if you're being serious about having an annual Strategic Plan, you should have something up and submitted by that time but we don't have any specific deadline requirements for when those plans get put together. And we recognize that each community is different and don't want to impose any top-down sort of deadlines on that. It's just that you can't use the project or the program without having that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Rob. Anyone else?

I see no more hands. I hear no voices. Thank you very much, Rob.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you. And you all know – and I don't just say this – it's always a pleasure to interact with you. Even the first 20 minutes of this hour were [inaudible] enjoyable.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. It's the only break you're probably getting today.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: No comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, we have a hand from Tijani. Is that for Rob? Tijani, we cannot hear you and Rob may be gone already. I don't know for sure.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: I am still here. You still have 13 minutes of my time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, Tijani. We now can hear you.

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you, Rob, for this presentation. I have two questions, one about the CROPP program. I know it will be integrated into the core budget, or it is, for the FY18. So what are the rules? Is there any change? Is there any flexibility or any consideration for special occasions, etc. etc.? This is the first question.
ROBERT HOGGARTH:	Thank you. I'll be very candid in terms of the approach and probably share with you the behind the scenes numbers that I hope you won't hold me to going forward. You may want to mute your mic, Tijani, because I'm getting a recording [reverb].

We anticipate that the program will stay the same with one exception. We had done some experimentation this year with the GNSO community to see if its specific events could be scheduled, give communities an option to pick an event sponsorship rather than travel. That has proven to be a spectacular failure in terms of being able to muster the resources and timing and everything else. So there is a change there in that we're reverting back to direct just trip support and sponsorship.

One of the factors that's a consequence of moving the pilot to core is, 1) it arguably gives more flexibility to the Additional Budget Request process because we don't have one project taking up about a fifth of the Additional Budget Request envelope. And the advantage to all of you arguably is that the resource becomes more consistent over time. The challenge is that that now becomes subject to the vagaries of the ICANN Budget on an annual basis and, as has been shared as part of the

FY18 Operating and planned Budget draft that was circulated. ICANN does not foresee future years of constant increases in the budget. In fact, I think the anticipation is for flat budgets going forward.

The amount that we set aside for the CROPP in FY17, year FY18 is going down a bit. That creates some challenges if in fact if everyone were to utilize the program to its maximum allocation. So far we have not had that issue. What does that mean? That means that probably the six-month timeframe that managers of the CROPP program are going to look at the usage rate, look at the applications that have been submitted, and we may look to collaborate with you or talk with other members of the senior team, and say, "Can we relax some of these strictures that we've established in terms of the parameters of the program? Looks like we aren't going to use this number of trips. Can we be more flexible? Is there a community that wants to use another trip? What's going on here?"

I leave open that possibility, Tijani. But at least initially as we start the year and go into it, the expectation is that it'll be business as usual. We'll have the five. But then we'll try to be flexible as the year goes on. I hope that response is an answer to your question.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you very much. The second question is about the onboarding program. No that it is not a pilot program anymore, I think – or is it? I don't know. I hope the onboarding program will be more transparent and the community will be aware about it, at least there is an interaction with the community about it. I can also remark that, for

EN

example, the Document Development Pilot Program also, since it is pilot, I didn't hear about it and I discovered that even Alan is not really aware about what happened and what is the result, etc. So I hope that the pilot program in the future be more communicated to the community so that since it is a program for the community at least the community will be aware of everything. Thank you.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you, sir. Again, a very timely question. For those of you who had followed the early phase of the Document Production Pilot Program, you know that it ended up being sort of divided into two channels. There was the channel of some sort of facilitation support that was something that folks at the RALO and GNSO Constituency/Stakeholder Group level thought it was something that they wanted to explore desperately to see if there could be some more staff support provided. The other channel was the concept of developing primers about upcoming ICANN Policy Development Processes in an effort to educate the community much more.

My recollection is that you guys have really focused on the channel of the primers and that was more of a preparation and a resource issue with respect to picking that channel rather than the channel of direct facilitation support. There was an Additional Budget Request process request made that was made by the Registry Stakeholder Group. They made the request because they were one of the pilot participants in that facilitation channel. In their view, they had had a fantastic experience and wanted the program to continue, or at least have the pilot continue. There was a recognition that the ICANN core budget

could not support doing that pilot and so the hope was that there would be some Additional Budget Request funds available to that.

There were some funds that had been allocated to that out of the Additional Budget Request process for FY18. They only cover a partial period of the year so that you either continue that facilitation channel for those who are already using it or potentially in a limited way to expand that pilot to see if it's something that can be managed and resourced on a more consistent basis. So that piece will continue.

I'm not sure at this moment whether the primer effort will continue. That has been extremely challenging. Silvia and I know that. Some of you who tried to participate in that effort have as well. I can't speak to whether that's going to continue at the moment in FY18, Tijani, but would be happy to chat with any of you and when we have our scheduled chats with the RALO Leaderships about your other requests and how we might implement them, let's make sure that this is on the agenda just to see if some of you are interested in examining this facilitation channel.

The funds are very limited and I will share with you all that that facilitation pilot may have worked out fantastically for the registries but it didn't work really well for some of the other groups. And actually the reason why I said it was a timely question is that there is a due date of the 1st of May from the contractor who is helping us on this, Dan O'Neill. He's going to be providing us with an assessment report, lessons learned, and everything else, with respect to that facilitation piece. So I'm looking very much forward to seeing that. We'll get that posted so

that folks can see that as well from a transparency and a learning experience perspective. I hope that was responsive, Tijani.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's presume it is. Rob, on that area – one very quick, not a question but a comment and I don't need an answer to it right now – it would be nice in that evaluation if the primers that were written with the support of the RALOs if we had any information on how often they were accessed. Were they actually used? Because ultimately it's not writing them that's the challenge, it's getting them used. And if we have any information on that at all that would be useful to see in any post mortem report.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you, Alan. I'll make that request of Dan. Just to clarify – the report that's going to come out by May 1st is going to focus on the facilitation channel of work. I would hope that that in this fiscal year we'll get some feedback on the primers, not only the process for developing them but yes, feedback in terms of how many folks have participated, are people going to start reading them? And then ultimately I think that's conversations that we all have together as well because if these documents or this process is not of any use to you all, then let's repurpose the resources in some other way or let's test something else out.

Part of our philosophy I think on some of these pilots more recently has been 'Let's fail fast rather than fail slowly," so that we can quickly move

on to something else if something doesn't appear to work, while balancing giving it enough time to see if it could work. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'll just give you one caution, that in at least one other case I was told a specific document had never been downloaded and I know I had downloaded it twice. So apparently there's some glitch in ICANN's recording that, depending on how you download things, they may show up in the count or not. I don't know the technical details, but it's something to think about.

Thank you very much, Rob. We'll go on to our next part. Olivier, I know you have to leave in three minutes. Is there anything you want to bring to our attention before you have to go?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I can stay another 10 minutes, so that's fine. I'll listen and then I might just put my hand up immediately after you've finished your –

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Thank you very much, Rob. What we have on the agenda that we haven't covered is an actual summary of the special request and what was received, what wasn't, what the answers were, and then a review of the Fiscal Year 2018 Statement that Tijani and a number of other people are working on. I would say that the budget request is more crucial because that has a timeline which is very, very, tight. And anyone can read the budget requests and their answers and comment via e-mail if we need to have any further discussion on that. So I would

suggest that we go on to Item #5 as the next agenda item unless there is any strong objection.

Heidi, do we have a strong objection to you not talking for 20 minutes?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Not at all.

ALAN GREENBERG: I suspected that might be the answer.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Tijani, do you want to talk us through this? I did ask that the wiki page be converted to a pdf so we can display it and talk about it here. If we could have that document in the Adobe Connect and if Tijani can unmute his microphone or if we can unmute it for him.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. [I am ready.]

ALAN GREENBERG: You are.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: By the way, the statement was on the wiki the same day we made our call. I told you tomorrow but I did it in the same day. So I am a little bit disappointed because I didn't receive any comment until today, and today I had two comments from Christopher and from you. So now it is very tight. Tomorrow is [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: In my defense I did them yesterday but it was past yesterday for your time.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. No problem.

I don't know if I have to read the statement or if you have questions so that I can answer.

ALAN GREENBERG: First of all, can we get it in the Adobe Connect? Is Evin still with us? I don't see her on the list of present of people. Do we have any call managers on the list? I know Gisella is gone. Ah, somebody has it and I presume it will slowly come up.

[HEIDI ULLRICH]: I see it, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: You do? Oh, dear. I just have a blank screen. Every time that happens I have to log on to Adobe Connect again.

[HEIDI ULLRICH]:   Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, have it scroll to the right place and start talking about it while I reconnect to Adobe Connect.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. So now you have the statement on the Adobe Connect displayed. Have you, Alan? Do you see it?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, Tijani. Most of us except Alan see it [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: And I've just logged off Adobe Connect and I will reconnect in a moment.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. So what is the procedure, Alan? Do you want me to read it or do you want to make your comments and I can answer questions?

ALAN GREENBERG: Why don't you go over it paragraph by paragraph. Don't read it, just say what the topic is and then we'll ask for questions.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you very much.

So first we thank the team because they are [evolving], etc. The second paragraph is about noting with [exception] that the ALAC and the RALO development session, etc. you know it is already which is now moved to the core budget and also captioning project and CROPP. This is the second paragraph.

The third paragraph is about At-Large Advisory Committee supports the CCWG request for extension to FY18 and I see that Christopher is not happy with that. He said that we need to if we support this we have to say that it must be more effective and work is not going well. I understand what he say, but frankly speaking the work in the subgroups is going but there is difficulties in some subgroups and I can tell you in the Jurisdiction Subgroup it is more or less stuck. There are several problems. In the Human Rights it is almost finished, so I hear you. If you agree with Christopher tell me, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: I put a statement in commenting on that saying I can support it but only if we make it a very brief statement saying we believe the progress must be monitored to ensure that the new targets do not once more slip. I think that's a reasonable statement to make and it's just a reminder to the groups that are having problems. And there are a number of groups

EN

– certainly the Staff Accountability one – we're almost restarting at this point and we do have to worry about the time constraints. So I don't object to us saying something like that. I'm not sure anyone's going to pay any real attention to it, but I have no problem going on record saying it. But I wouldn't make a huge thing out of it. Just a reminder that, yes we slipped. Fine. Let's not do it again.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you.

No remark about this? No more remarks? I go to the next one.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think Christopher's on the call.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, he is not.

The next one is about the DDPP – the Document Development Pilot Program. We say here that we wanted it to be extended to FY18 because we don't see it, and we say that we prefer that it is expanded to cover training and the development of policy advice statements.

ALAN GREENBERG: My only comment is, if we say it's a clear success, let's say it's a clear success for At-Large because apparently it was not for other parts of the community.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Can you please repeat? I didn't understand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. I said if we're going to say it's a clear success, say for At-Large. I don't believe it was a clear success for significant other parts of the community.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. I can tell you that the Registry Stakeholder and the Registrar Stakeholder thinks that they made comments on the public comment saying that it was a great success and they want it to be extended also.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. For parts of the community. I worried that we repurposed it for those primers and we really don't have any knowledge of to what extent they were every used, and I do have a bit of worry on that side. It's easy to write documents –

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I will add "for At-Large."

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or just more general parts of the community.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Good.

So the next paragraph is about the Root Zone Maintainer, and I see that you object to that. You have another point of view. I remind you that in the budget there is an increase by 33.33% of the cost of this Root Zone Maintainer contract. So my problem is that we just signed the contract with Verisign and even if it was a zero dollar contract with the American government, it is for ICANN now it is a costly contract, but I don't understand how it can increase by 33.33% in one year.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. It is not 100% what is being reported there. If the Fiscal Year 2017 was the actual expense in Fiscal Year 2017, it makes complete sense that it is three quarters of the Fiscal Year 2018 one because it was only for nine months. It only started on October 1st. So the question really is, is the increase an increase or… the fee is $25,000 a month for eight years. So the fee is not changing.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: But for nine months the fee alone would have only been $225,000 last year, not $300,000. But there is provision in the agreement for paying for other costs. We don't know what they are. I suspect, but I don't know for sure, that part of the $300,000 is the $225,000 and part are other costs associated with the project that we are bound to pay for that's reimbursing Verisign for certain expenses, and that the difference between $300,000 and $400,000 is simply expansion from nine to 12 months. I suspect. I don't know.

I'm just saying it's fair to raise the issue but raise it in such a way that we're really asking for clarification, not claiming it has been in increase in fees because the fees are fixed for an eight-year period. The contract is very clear on that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Very good.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's a good catch to have noticed it, but I think the statement has to be worded in such a way that we understand that not only is there an increase, but the amount claimed for Fiscal Year 2017 is too high also.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. That's right. I think so. And I said that in another place.

ALAN GREENBERG:	By the way, I don't think we should mention the fact that it was free on the U.S. government. I think that was a different regime and that change I don't think is part of this discussion. That might have been a discussion to have during the transition discussions but not today.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Okay.
	Next paragraph is about the cost of the enhancement of our website and the ICANN website.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Heidi, did we ever get a definitive answer as to what it was for and who asked for it?
HEIDI ULLRICH:	For that request for the fiscal year Additional Budget Request?
ALAN GREENBERG:	For the amount that was spent. They said they spent $300,000 on the ICANN and At-Large website hardware and software.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	I'm not following, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I explicitly asked Xavier. He said the answer was posted somewhere. I never found out where the somewhere was. Should we be raising it here again or do we already have the answer?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry. Okay. I understand now. That was an action item from the ALAC call and I understood that to be for the Fiscal Year 2018 budget request, so now let me go back and ask about that particular point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, that was a 2017, wasn't it?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I'm not sure, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Regardless of whether it's already done in this fiscal year or asked for for next year, the questions apply.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Anyway, there's $300,000 are for FY18.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, it's 2018. It is 2018.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	And the planned capital project for FY18, page [15].
ALAN GREENBERG:	My apologies then. Then Heidi, yes it is planned and the question is, what is this? Why is At-Large focused on – as opposed to the ICANN website? Do we really have a physical separate website? And who asked for it? We're going to be blamed for spending the money. The question is, at whose request was this? If this is something IT simply decided they need to do, then I see no reason we should be identified and flagged as the culprit.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Okay. I don't know if Ariel can answer that. Otherwise – sorry, there's a major echo.
ARIEL LIANG:	I think the best way is to have a call with [Laura] [inaudible]'s team and maybe also the Coms Team. Basically the At-Large website is not just [inaudible] pages. There's pretty complicated software underneath. It's not drupal but it's something else. But I'm not the best person to answer that question [inaudible] so I think we should ask [Laura] for that.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Heidi, do you want to get something between you, me, and Laura? I don't want to do a Doodle for a major conference call. Let's just try to get some clarity.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, that's fine. I think an informal call is okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: And Tijani, we'll try to get that done in the next day and then we'll know what [inaudible].

                            Back to you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Now we do.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan. Okay. Thank you. I don't know who muted me. Anyway. I have two remarks about that, Alan. The first one is that the deadline for submission of the statement is tomorrow so you don't have time to go to Laura and speak with her. We put it or we remove it?

ALAN GREENBERG: Comments, people? Anyone care or you want me and Tijani to decide between ourselves?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, I'm going to be in contact with Laura here in the next few minutes so let's see if I can get you some information back on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So we'll try to do it within 15 minutes of the end of the call.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. This is reasonable.

The next one is about this is one point that I raised, we are here asking for travel fund for the liaison to the GAC and also for five other people. My point of view, this is not a discussion of the report, of the budget submission. It is another request which is not in the budget and which wasn't in the budget and have been removed. So if you want me to let it there, I will let it but I want to really say the same thing.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, I'm happy to take it out of your statement. We'll put it in a separate request from me as the ALAC Chair.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I prefer that. Thank you very much. The two last paragraphs are about that. We will not speak about them.

So it is okay now.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Subject to these things that we've just discussed. Now the question is, has anyone picked up anything else that we want to mention here?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks very much, Alan. Sorry, I was sort of doing a couple of things – have we got in there the request for the additional travel slots? We were [explicitly told] so the travel slots for the GAC liaison, for example?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's what we were just talking about that are currently Tijani's last two paragraphs. They will be removed and done in a separate request coming under my name.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That's important. Sorry. I got confused here. Alright, thanks. As long as that's in there, that's good because I think we were repeatedly explicitly told we have to ask for these. So that's it. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. My only other question is, do we want to more explicitly in the second paragraph point out that not just that these programs need to

be – by the way, you have "extended" instead of "expanded" in two different places in the thing – not just that they need to be expanded but they should be expanded in this fiscal year.

Our request for captioning identified that we fund a specific number of meetings in certain categories. In fact, this year we have taken some of our requests and given them away to other groups so that the program could be visible, and that's what helped sell it because there were other people supporting it in other parts of the organization. It's been very well-received.

But going forward, do we really want in this coming fiscal year to take a third of our slots and use them for other people now that it's in the pilot? I would suggest that we want a more explicit statement saying now that it's in the core budget, that there should be provision in the core budget over and above the request that ALAC has made for its use of captioning.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Don't you want me to make it like this – these programs will need to be expanded for FY18 as the activity [expense]?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think we're going to see an expansion of the CROPP, or if it is it's going to happen because of their internal discussions. But on the captioning I think we really need to call it out.

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. So captioning – okay, I will do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, good. Thank you.

                        Judith, go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Heidi, maybe you could correct me but I thought the assumption was that we would get our own [part] of captioning and other constituencies would also get their own [part] and it would [inaudible] out of [our part].

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me take that. At this point we don't know. We made a request for a certain number of meetings for At-Large use. We were told it is transferred into the core budget and we don't know whether the "it" is just the count of meetings we requested or a much larger number to factor in use by other groups. So we're just saying that it should be larger to factor in the use by other groups.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Right. Heidi, maybe – correct me if I'm wrong – but I thought that's what Rob had originally discussed.

EN

HEIDI ULLRICH: My understanding that it was in core and I did not hear anything about separate buckets of funds for the captioning. I think it's basically an overall improvement, increase in numbers, but that it was going to be done by staff. So I would need to get more information on that [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: The question I'm asking is, can we assume that At-Large will get the number of captioning requests that we ask for in addition to anything that is provided to anyone else? There's no clarity on that right now.

HEIDI ULLRICH: My understanding of the original request was for a significant increase in the number of captioned calls. That's not going to happen this next fiscal year. It's going to be a staged increase. So I don't have the answer to that. But again, it's not going to be that significant increase that was asked in the original request.

ALAN GREENBERG: So they were rejecting the request, the increase, but transferring it to the core budget or partially rejecting it.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So the question is, we had asked for the monthly – whatever that allotment that I think it was we [inaudible] I think or something like that.

EN

HEIDI ULLRICH: Again, I'm looking at the request and you were asking for either five RALO meetings a month or four RALO and one ALAC and/or five working groups. That's a pretty significant increase. So I don't think that's going to happen. That's just too much of a jump to go from one year to the next.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Heidi, it's not.

HEIDI ULLRICH: It is. You were asking for six in six months and now you're asking for nine.

JUDITHE HELLERSTEIN: [Inaudible] nine.

ALAN GREENBERG: One person talk at a time. Let Heidi finish.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Judith, you're asking this time per month. So you're looking at 10 -14 or so per month versus six or seven in the entire six month period. So that is a significant jump. So this year we're going to be focusing on an increase but also we're going to be looking at internally how we can expand to a higher number. So part of the approved text is that there's

going to be a study made internally at how we handle these transcripts, etc. So that's going to be delivered by the end of the calendar year and then as we go into the next series of Fiscal Year 2019 Additional Budget Requests, we're going to be seeing if we can increase that number. So again, it's a staged approach.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, is it reasonable to ask how many we – At-Large – can expect in this fiscal year? And should we do it through this comment or do you want to do it privately?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I can do it through Rob. Rob is leading this project so I can either go through Rob or Judith, you can write a note to Rob as you –

ALAN GREENBERG: Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Thanks. Also [with] discussing is we're talking about doing a survey and surveying members on transcripts and asking a question to them of – what is more important, is it more important to get transcripts that are 90% within a few days, in less than a week? Or do they want something that's verbatim but a month?

EN

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Judith, these are all good questions but I don't think we're there yet to take these on yet, and I'm just conscious of the time. Again, good questions, but I don't know if this is the time to discuss them in any detail.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:	No. I was just going to say that if we ask the questions and we get feedback not only from the community but from ICANN At-Large and they say that, "It's more important for us to get transcripts back that are 90% in less than a week," that gives you more push to then with Language Services [said], "This is what the community wants."

ALAN GREENBERG:	But Judith, the GNSO typically gets the transcripts by the end of the day or the next day currently. Our transcripts are done by a different group and take much longer than some of the other ones. So we're not on an equal playing field today.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Okay. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:	Tijani, I think you understand that we should simply point out that on the captioning, we presume the overall being funded will be an increase from last year and let's leave it at that.

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. I have perhaps another remark about captioning I didn't mention before. Right now so far we have captioning in English only. And the most efficient captioning will be in different languages because it is for people who are not native English speakers.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have done at least some in other languages also. I believe I was on a Spanish one.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Tijani, we have trialed one in French and one in Spanish.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Good.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: And we asked in the budget request that we requested, we requested that English and the Spanish and French be continued along with English, but not on equal playing fields. They would still be less than the English.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you, Judith.

Any other remarks?

ALAN GREENBERG:	I see no more hands. Last call. We are just about at the one and a half hour mark.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Just a quick question to Tijani. Tijani, what page is that issue with the website on? I'm working with Laura and another staff member to get you a response but I can't find it in the draft.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Can you repeat the question. I didn't understand you.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Which page is the information, the question, you have regarding the website funds?
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	It was on the… I will call you. I don't have [inaudible].
ALAN GREENBERG:	The statement says page 16.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	16. Thank you so much.

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Yeah, it was page 16. Yes. I can tell you. Yes. It is here. It is page 16 and it is the Planned Budget, so it is for FY18,
ALAN GREENBERG:	Have you found it, Heidi, or do you need more?
HEIDI ULLRICH:	I'm on page 16 and –
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Planned Capital Projects for FY18 – page 16.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Yeah, I see that. I don't see anything that says… Yes, I'm looking at that and I don't see anything that says –
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	It is at the bottom of the table.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Oh, here. I see it. Okay. Just a second. Thank you.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Just above the $3.6 million total.

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Okay. So let me pass that on to Laura and, Tijani and Alan, we'll be in touch with you as soon as possible, and it should just be a little bit today and get that over to you.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay. Thank you.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	I will try to finish everything tonight and it is up to you tomorrow to transmit it. Thank you.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Alright. And hold on. Let me double check. So the deadline for public comments ends tomorrow. I see we're planning a ratification after the fact. Got it. Okay. Thank you.

Thank you all. Thank you for attending the full meeting even though it wasn't originally scheduled for that, and we'll look for Tijani's next version hopefully posted by early tomorrow most of our times.

Thank you all.

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Thank you so much, everyone. Bye bye.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you to our interpreters for extra time again.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you all for your patience today and for joining today's call. The call is now adjourned. Please do not forget to disconnect your lines when leaving the AC room and the bridge. Thanks very much and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]