

**GNSO
Travel Drafting Team
31 March 2010 at 14:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Travel Drafting Team teleconference 31 March 2010 at 1400 UTC UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#mar>

Participants present:

Olga Cavalli - NCA - Chair

Tim Ruiz - Registrar Stakeholder Group

Tony Harris - ISP - CSG

Stephane van Gelder - Registrar Stakeholder Group

Staff:

Kevin Wilson - ICANN CFO

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Kevin Wilson: Actually I believe that I'm required to post a travel guidelines for fiscal year '11, which would be an update to the fiscal year '10 travel guidelines.

In years past this has received lots of comments, and questions and clarity. I think two years we reached a lot of clarity. Last year I think it came down to a dull roar even less. We have made some, you know, if you remember we made some modifications in particular for the GNSO and for - a little bit for the GAAC.

I have not heard any community feedback on wanting to change the level of travel support or, you know, reduce it, increase it, change it. I - every once in a while I hear something from SSAC or there's a little bit of a discussion possibly about GAAC, but I didn't think it would add an (echo on the impact).

So from my perspective I think it's just update the years and maybe clean up the language a little bit and then post it for community feedback. But I did send a note out about a week or two ago saying if anybody wanted to have -

provide input - early input then - for the - let me know. And I hadn't heard anything back yet. I think ALAC sent...

((Crosstalk))

(Kevin): ...(a second) note saying something.

Tim Ruiz: And (Kevin) this is Tim. If I can jump in.

(Kevin): Sure.

Stefan van Gelder I'd like to get the queue after Tim, please. Yes.

Tim Ruiz: And I apologize. I fully meant to make some - to forward some comments to you earlier, but it just didn't work out unfortunately.

But the only concern that I have -- and I think, you know, we've talked about a little bit before -- was just that at least within the registrar stakeholder group, you know, trying to figure out to use the funding - the funds, it just - it would be easier if we didn't have to always make arrangements directly through ICANN Travel.

And I know there's problems associated with that, but I wanted to keep that topic out there and for consideration because - well just to give you an example, (just pick up the time around), we'll probably do - try to do some splitting of funds between our executive committee chair and one of our counselors.

Executive community chair has made some previous arrangements and some - I think he's trying to work that out with the travel folks, but I'm not sure how that will go. But so that the thing that we kind of run into/

Or like in Nairobi, when I was set up to go before that (mixed), you know, where I could get approval to stay versus where the staff wanted to put me was two different things. So not that I would have expected, you know, higher reimbursement for that or whatever, but at least something equivalent I think is all that would've - would be expected.

So - but that's something to think about if there's a possibility that we could work things out so that if a traveler who's being funded made their own arrangements or partly their own arrangements, that that wouldn't necessarily knock them out of being able to be funded. And I know you've made some exceptions (and there)'s that program in place, but (am I) going to see that happening more often?

(Kevin): Okay good. I think that's a good point. I think what all - if it's okay with you, I think what I'll do is I'll draft that as a up-front question and then see if would - see what the feedback is on that.

Tim Ruiz: Sure.

(Kevin): And then I'll also articulate kind of the balance about the reason, you know, articulate. And I've said it before. I could tell it hasn't completely landed. And it's not just external; it's also internal.

It - the reasons for using the ICANN travel agents are questioned internally as well as externally. So what we're, you know, I'm still for it, and I think we still need to use it, but how do, you know, at least I think the question has been raised enough that we need to explore that a bit further.

Tim Ruiz: Great. Thanks.

(Kevin): Great. Is there anything else?

(Tony): Yes.

(Kevin): Oh (Tony) you said you were in the queue.

(Tony): Yes. I just wanted to make the following comment. I think when we're talking about how we're going to look at this in, you know, for the next fiscal year, my point is we're looking - when we're talking about the GNSO at least, we're looking at an entirely different animal that you had a year ago or two years ago.

We have a lot more layers of organization, executive committees, we've got new constituencies coming in. And it seems to me it might be prudent to consider, you know, it may be advisable to have a little more - do more funding for the different stakeholder groups.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Tony): This is just - I know it won't go down well probably with Tim and the registrars, but, you know, we're paying for this sort of thing. But I do think that we - when we're considering building a new - a greater structure in the GNSO with more - main (more) participants, which is what new constituency is - basically is about, there may be some - let's say the greater demand on having some help to get to the meetings. That's just my point.

(Kevin): Okay good. Then...

Stefan van Gelder Yes, can I jump in?

(Kevin): Yes.

Stefan van Gelder: Obviously, as Tim just said, it's something that would be difficult for us to agree to, but for the sake of discussion, I would like some clarification as to exactly what you have in mind in terms of extra funding for the constituencies.

Do you mean that for example if stakeholder groups and the non-contracted parties house, they put on some constituencies as they're prone to do, if I understand the system correctly, then those constituencies should be funded, and if so in what way?

But the take that we've had on it so far, just to keep things both simple and palatable for all parties involved -- and that's the consensus that we reached - - was that we would fund one slot per council member. So you're suggesting that that would - that that should be expanded to certain constituencies. And if so, in what way?

(Tony): Well it's a good question Stefan. I haven't really worked out a proposal on this, but more likely I'm - what I'm seeing is maybe this will be something we should sort of take under wing that there may be a great demand.

Let's say for example you have - as you could - a new constituency comes up, which would be like charitable organizations or something who really do not have funding to come to a meeting, and they would want some assistance and that sort of thing.

And again, getting back to the question of how the GNSO now is being structured where you have an additional layer, which is the executive level, I mean I'm on the executive - the - of the CSG -- commercial stakeholder group -- and I've got to be at the meeting and coordinate a whole bunch of things.

I - it's not, you know, if I don't have funding I can't come. So it's worked out so far, because we've been able to sort this out within our constituency on the counselors. But there is a greater demand on our time, on our participation. This - I mean just as an example, this new working group with vertical integration looks like it's going to have 100 members, and I mean just reading the emails on that is almost a half day job.

So I mean these are just examples of what I see as a greatly expanding let's say scenario for the GNSO -- lot more people, a lot more participation, more layers of organization and coordination.

I just think that this might at some time merit saying, "Well we're not talking just about each counselor gets funding, but maybe we get a larger pool of funding available." And I'm not saying that just to make it quite clear, that this should necessarily come out of the pockets of the registrars. There should - I would imagine everything that's going on, there should be other means to generate some revenue for that.

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim. If I - sorry, am I in the queue?

((Crosstalk))

(Kevin): Yes you're...

(Tony): I was going to step back on, but...

Tim Ruiz: Yes it's funny. You know, some personal comments. I don't want to speak for the registrars stakeholders group as a whole, because it - some of this stuff we haven't really - other than the fact that they're not (pouring) more funding, I, you know, I can't really speak for them.

But, you know, just personally, you know, I want to make sure it's clear that, you know, we don't view - at least GoDaddy doesn't view this as GoDaddy or registrars funding this. I think - that may be where the money is coming through, but I think the point is. is that the money we're spending is actually - most of it is the money of the registrants and the average user. That's where most of the money is coming from.

It's not coming from big corporation. Most of it have been coming from, you know, directly out of registrar's pockets necessarily. For example GoDaddy passes that cost on to our registrant's directly.

The other one's paying for it. And at least in our opinion, you know, they're the ones who are least represented within this whole community. When we put things out for community comment - and we're really not getting feedback from the majority of the people who were actually pinged for all this. So, you know, we just want to be cautious about how we spend that money.

And, you know, the concept that there are volunteers who would be useful to have at these meetings who could use the funding because it's difficult for them to be there otherwise, I fully agree with that. The problem is, is how do we ascertain who they are. And, you know, that's been an issue all along and then why we really, you know, ended up not going down that road of kind of fund based on me trying to determine it can be tough.

I don't know what all the answers are, but I think, you know, as - if we're going to continue to expand funding, we need to be very cautious. You know, just the fact that I even get funded because I'm - it bothers me, to be quite honest with you, but, you know, it's not, you know, when the funding's offered it's not my choice completely to turn it down.

I mean I, you know, I represent GoDaddy, work for GoDaddy. So if, you know, the company feels that, "Yes, you know, if other registrars and other, you know, corporations like Verizon or VeriSign or others are going to be funded, then, you know, GoDaddy's not going to turn it down. So that's where we're at.

So like I can see that continue to expand, and that - and we end up with a lot of being funds being used, whether or not really needed. I don't (know what) the answer is, but those were the concerns we have.

Man: Can I - yes, can I comment?

Stefan van Gelder After - can I get in after? Stefan please.

(Kevin): Sure. Yes I was sort of stepping in as chair just because I'm probably the most involved in travel, but I think this is your meeting. So of course yes go ahead.

Stefan van Gelder It's - I think it might be useful (Kevin) if you do manage the queue though or someone else...

(Kevin): Okay. All right...

((Crosstalk))

(Kevin): I'll be happy to do that. (Tony) go ahead. Thank you.

(Tony): Well I think Stefan spoke before I did.

(Kevin): Okay Stefan go ahead.

Stefan van Gelder Yes. Thanks (Tony). Yes, I have - I mean there's a couple of reactions that I have -- one to - what Tim has just said, I actually have no - once again speaking on a personal - in a personal capacity here. I agree with what Tim said -- that a lot of the stuff that we say here hasn't been vetted with the registrars yet, but I think it's public knowledge that I have no qualms about counselors being funded due to the amount of time and work that they are putting into the process.

And I'm very sensitive to the arguments that (Tony) puts forward on the fact that others, as our workload increases, are called in to make the same kind of time and work commitments that counselors may be making. So that's

certainly not something that I would want to brush away. My question and worry is where does it stop. You know, where do you draw the line.

We found one line that we could draw with relative ease, which is the council, you know, just funding the counselors. My fear is that if we take it further than that, I mean one example that springs to mind is the chairs. Stake - I now for the registrar stakeholder group, the chair puts in an amazing amount of time and work into chairing the constituency and pays his own way to go to the meeting.

So, you know, obviously the chairs you might want to fund them, and then the people on the executive comes are the different stakeholder groups and constituencies and perhaps the chairs of the working groups. I mean the - you mentioned that the (I) working group will - (Roberto) and Mikey are going to put in an amazing amount of effort I think in chairing that group.

So, you know, my question - my worry is where do we draw the line. And wherever the money comes from, it's still ICANN budget - an ICANN budget. I think you still need to limit it in some way.

(Tony):

Well my only comment - I agree entirely with what Tim has said and what you said Stefan. And as a suggestion, I think I would start off by saying, well perhaps we could agree - or discuss and agree to the fact that we could have a provision of - let's say a 50% available increase on what is currently normal, which is not necessarily used except in cases which the travel team as a whole considers it justified.

In other words it wouldn't be drawing a line and saying, "Well there's a slot for this particular function in the GNSO which is automatically funded," but there is this available extra funding which is sitting there and which can be evaluated as per some specific and very justifiable need as the one you just mentioned for instance the chairs of the vertical integration working group.

Olga Cavalli: Hello?

((Crosstalk))

(Tony): It's probably not...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Just to let you know that I've joined.

(Tony): ...the best idea in the world, but it's something which might be considered.

(Kevin): (Tony), Olga has joined the call.

((Crosstalk))

(Kevin): Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Hi. Don't know who's managing the call. Just wanted to let you know that I just joined. I'm - my apologies. I had another meeting that went longer than expected.

(Kevin): Okay thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Tim ...we would like to get in the queue too.

(Kevin): Who is that that wants to get in the queue?

Tim Ruiz: Tim.

(Kevin): Tim. Okay. Tim are - (Tony) did you finish?

(Tony): Yes. Actually I just wanted to make that initial suggestion and just repeat my statement that I know it's far from perfect, but it's the only thing I can come up with right now.

(Kevin): Yes. One question - and Olga I've been kind of acting as at least the moderator, not the chair in your absence, so happy to have you take over, but...

Olga Cavalli: Thank you.

(Kevin): ...one question that came up -- and this is related to Chuck's request to go to Russia -- is that the ICANN travel guidelines addresses travel support for the ICANN meetings only.

We haven't really addressed specifically any other travel support that's been - to the extent that was handled like on the, you know, the IRT thing, and the other activities that sometimes happen. Those were generally addressed and, you know, not explicitly.

Maybe - I don't really know. I'm kind of seeking guidance whether the travel draft - the draft of the travel guidelines for fiscal year '11 should ask that question explicitly or whether we should just wait for feedback on whether there should be any travel support for things like the vertical separation working group.

Olga Cavalli: Tim let me ask you a question if I may. I don't know if there's a queue and people still waiting.

(Kevin): I think Tim's in the queue and...

Olga Cavalli: Oh. Okay.

(Kevin): Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...go ahead, Tim and then I'll make a comment about this request.

Tim Ruiz: Okay. Yes, I think - so well first I just wanted to make another possible suggestion about, you know, how do we decide where funds go or if there - if certain constituencies or stakeholder groups need more funds or et cetera. And that is that, you know, the counselors, you know, represent their stakeholder group or, you know, or their - and/or their health I guess to some extent but primarily their stakeholder group.

And, you know, all the stakeholder groups are not equal in their ability to be able to collect or gather or raise funds. But I think certainly, you know, some have more ability than others. You look at a stakeholder group, you know, registrars for example, you know, there are, registrars who - a part of that group who have - able to generate, you know, hundreds of thousands, if not millions of dollars in profit.

Now maybe there's not a lot of those. You know, then you have a GoDaddy that can generate tens of millions of dollars in profit or more. And so there's certainly, you know, a - more ability to raise funds than what might be demonstrated. And I think other stakeholder groups are similar.

And if (you've got a) stakeholder groups with companies, with businesses that, you know, are generating, you know, tens of billions of dollars in revenue and billions of dollars in profits, you know, I think if those stakeholder groups feel it's important that their counselors or that others attend ICANN meetings and that it's to their benefit within this process, then certainly there should be some call in my opinion within that stakeholder group to raise the funds to make that happen and that that shouldn't fall back on the overall

users and internet users at large to fund everybody in that way, which is what is really happening today.

So that's a possible way of looking at need is, you know, did the ability of a stakeholder group to generate funds. Now that still get a little bit complicated but I think it might be easier than looking at individual, because those individuals represent companies, they represent stakeholder groups.

And the only - (the other) comment I want to make is just in regards to what you said (Kevin) about maybe putting that out there. But I think as far as, you know, like Chuck wanting to go to Russia, but along those lines I think then that as the council looks at the situations, which that kind of - that kind of came up as a surprise to me that Chuck was asking it in that way.

I felt it was more - something that should be formally presented to the council if you've (never), you know, if it (we're) going to be representing the council. If he wasn't then I don't think there's any question. If it's...

Man: Right.

Tim Ruiz: ...(if he wants) to go and it's a personal nature then, you know, but that's up to him but the funding's on himself. But if it's representing the council and the council could look at that and make a decision as to whether it's necessary and that the stakeholder groups want to raise or use funds that they have available for that purpose then, you know, so let it be.

That's my way of looking at it. I don't think it's - it should be put forth as a question, because I know what the answer will be from - at least from those that normally reply to these things. And I would hate to see the funding get expanded in that way.

(Kevin): Okay. And just so I'm clear, when you say that stakeholder groups should consider raising the funds, do you mean within the ICANN budget, or do you mean as a separate revenue, like a - almost a fundraising activity?

Tim Ruiz: Yes, exactly. The latter. I mean, you know...

(Kevin): Okay.

Tim Ruiz: ...I mean the registrars - like what kind of registrars stakeholder groups for example and they'll probably shoot me for saying all this stuff but...

(Kevin): Right.

Tim Ruiz: ...I mean we have, you know, we have a fee that's associated with being a number of the group so that we have a set of funds that we can use for various things. And , you know, every year we look at our budget and how that money's going to be spent and make decisions et cetera.

So - and I think that's probably true of a number of different stakeholder groups. And so there's certainly, you know, the concept of raising funds within the stakeholder group is there, and I think that should - I see no reason why that couldn't be extended to look at, you know, funding for this kind of travel.

So those stakeholder groups are able to do it. And if they can't and they can demonstrate that, then some assistance in funding might be appropriate.

Stefan van Gelder Can you put me in the queue, (Kevin) please?

(Kevin): Sure.

(Tony): Yes, and me after Stefan please.

(Kevin): So Stefan and then (Tony).

Stefan van Gelder Yes. Don't...

(Kevin): Oh wait, wait, wait, wait. Hold it. I'm sorry Olga was before you Stefan. I'm...

Olga Cavalli: Thank you.

(Kevin): ...obviously new at this moderator role. Olga, did you have another question?

Olga Cavalli: No it's just a comment. And I support - and I think that Tim made a very good point in his explanation, but I would like to ask you something (Kevin). I think the point of Chuck was writing about his participation in Russia is more about outreach and not so much related with GNSO.

And I wonder of this is good or not for ICANN and if there are funds for outreach in other regions. I remember helping organize in the gTLD meeting in November here in Buenos Aires and also (Tony) was involved with meeting in Sao Paolo.

Maybe it's another way of making ICANN know in the world, which is good, but it's not related with strictly our GNSO function. And I know that our travel fund should be for ICANN meetings. But isn't there another way of funding some other outreach activities?

(Kevin): I mean the short answer is of course there are. The travel guidelines themselves really grew out of Denise and other department heads treating travel support as a sort of a necessary requirement -- almost like they would make decisions - she and others would make decisions on should I hire a consultant to do this work, or can I pay, you know - pay some travel support to a "volunteer" community member to do the work?

And so that's how it kind of grew and it became, you know, close to a million dollars. And so we said hey for fiscal responsibility and accountability and transparency, we really should have a guideline so that we - it's not a friend of a staff member's decision or, you know, that - it was more based on, you know, some core principles that had been discussed and circulated.

So that's the reason why I raise the question -- does it make sense to talk about funding other than for the ICANN meeting in the context of a travel guidelines for ICANN. And that's the reason I was toying with the idea of actually putting that an explicit question on - in this draft that's about to be posted.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you.

(Kevin): Okay good. So Stefan, I think you're next.

Stefan van Gelder Yes, thanks (Kevin). I think if we - I think the question raised by Chuck is actually very - it's a very interesting question for us. And the first way to look at it is to totally dissociate Chuck from VeriSign. I think it's a personal request made by the chair of the GNSO and if we start look at it with respect to his current employer, then that just throw things out of focus a bit.

So the real question for me is, should the chair of the GNSO engage in outreach activities outside of ICANN official meetings, and be funded by ICANN for that?

And one of the questions that I'd have for you (Kevin) is similar to what Olga was asking. It - has there been any precedent to - for this, because it sounds to me like it's a new situation that we're grappling with, but maybe it's not. And if people, you know, if the SO chairs and leaders want to do outreach, then perhaps you do - you ICANN managing the ICANN budget clear guidelines as to what's considered outreach...

(Kevin): Right.

Stefan van Gelder...and what isn't.

(Kevin): Right.

Stefan van Gelder Yes.

(Kevin): So the short answer is, you know, I'd have to do some research to find out historically beyond, you know, the last few years I've been here, but since I've been here, this has come up. Obviously outreach is, you know, a significant chunk our budget, but we put it in the context of, you know, staff support or, you know, the regional meetings or the registry/registrar. I guess you could kind of call that meeting out. Not really. But...

Tim Ruiz: So this is Tim rejoining. Sorry.

(Kevin): Okay great. Thank you. But I know for example the at-large review or the ALAC review recommended more funds be spent on outreach. And their - the at large and ALAC group are trying to put together budget requests related to that. I'm - and so, you know, I'm waiting with bated breath on what that will translate into as far as a request.

Then as far as for example - the one that pops into my head is board members. We sometimes have board members that say, "Gee, I think that makes sense for us to attend this meeting or attend it more robustly." So I kind of treated Chuck's request as kind of an extension of that sort of sense. And I don't know. I think that's a bigger question than a finance question. I think it's a STC question.

I know at the board level they're specifically addressing that and kind of trying to come up with a better model and making sure - for example one of the things that I've heard is that board members can't speak on behalf of ICANN

without prior written authorization, you know, that sort of thing. So you get those kind of comments that come through.

So I answer - tried to answer shortly or succinctly. I think I didn't, but I think the short answer is no there's not a clear precedence for that. There's certainly have been request and comments about that, but not explicitly. And then I'll...

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim. Can I get in the queue too?

(Kevin): Yes. And just to close it out, obviously NomCom almost by definition is outreach as it's, (you know), recruiting for council members and board members. So...

Stefan van Gelder So (Kevin), just to make sure I understand what you're saying. When board members do outreach, do they get funded?

(Kevin): Well there have been situations where they've gone to meetings and they have had travel support -- meetings other than the ICANN meetings and other than the board retreats. But it's pretty rare and it became - in the last year it grew to the level where we said, "Hey we need to have more explicit guidelines and clarity on who can attend and who's deciding who attends, that sort of things."

So that's the short answer. So yes there has been support, and now it's reached a - or it recently reached a level to the point where we said, "Let's have it more explicit." Okay.

Stefan van Gelder Yes thanks.

(Kevin): Good. Tim you're next I think.

Tim Ruiz: Yes. I mean, you know, my opinion is that if the GNSO feels that there's outreach that's validation unable to it, you know, that's a decision the stakeholder should make of the whole.

And if they agree, then those are funds the stakeholder group should raise and not except ICANN's budget to somehow be, you know, make a reserve of some sort for that kind of unknown spending that could come up throughout the year that could be used at the request of the GNSO.

And again, part of my concern about that is because that money doesn't come from the constituents. Most of that money doesn't come from the constituents of the GNSO as it's currently structured.

And the other thing I want to just point out in regards to, you know, Chuck's specific request and kind of respond to Stefan's point about that being, you know, a person request, trying to - but separate from his role in VeriSign, I don't agree with that. I mean, you know, Stefan you were there and we know how hard VeriSign lobbied to get Chuck his chair.

That's the kind of thing that typically occurs. You know, they were successful; Chuck is now chair of the GNSO. VeriSign clearly felt that there was some benefit in that. So that's fine. So, you know, if there's things that, you know, Chuck feels important to engage in and, you know, the GNSO's going to fund it, if his company agrees that it is then, you know, VeriSign can pay for that.

If this is something completely personal to Chuck, then, you know, why should the GNSO or his company be expected to fund him to these things? You know, now the media outreach where ICANN feels it's important - to ICANN itself -- and ICANN may request this individual or that individual or someone from a particular stakeholder group to attend -- and that may be a different situation to look at.

But those are usually things that ICANN has experience with and can - going to figure in the budget and can kind of expect for the most part -- so, anyway, my viewpoint. Thanks.

Stefan van Gelder: Can I just answer that point that Tim's just made?

Just to clarify, I see what you're saying Tim. I don't think it should be a personal Chuck decision. What I'm saying is Chuck is asking - the way he's put the question -- and I'm not going into whether it's actually, you know, VeriSign wanting him to go whatever -- but the way he put the question is, "I'm the chair of the GNSO. I want to go and do some outreach. I've been asked actually."

He - it's on the wanted to. He said, "I've been asked to go and do some outreach. I'd like to get funded for it." Now I agree with what you said on the list back then, which is it should be a council decision and the council should as a whole agree or not to send the chair or another representative to do this outreach to do outreach at this meeting.

But I don't think the problem is linked to VeriSign. What I'm - I mean whether it be VeriSign or somewhere, you know, another member of the council that's got another employer that may be something completely different, I don't think that's the problem.

The problem is do we - does the GNSO community feel that it's useful for the chair or some other representative to go outside of ICANN meetings to do outreach. And if so, should they be funded to do that? I think that's the way the question was asked.

Tim Ruiz: Right, right. And if that's the case, then the GNSO should be the one looking at where they're going to get the funds to do it. That's...

Stefan van Gelder Yes, I agree.

Tim Ruiz: ...the point.

Stefan van Gelder Yes, agreed.

(Kevin): Good. (Tony) did you have another question?

(Tony): What - I - nothing to add after what's just been said about Chuck. No, basically I was just sort of trying to get back to my original point. And since Olga was not on the call, I'll just refresh it for her benefit, which is that I do think that a little expansion in the available funding for travel to meetings should be incorporated in the next for the next fiscal year.

One thing I just thought of, which would be a good mechanism, would be for each stakeholder group to have let's say one funding slot for travel to a meetings at their decision. Okay?

(Kevin): You mean to...

((Crosstalk))

(Kevin): ...one more person to the ICANN meetings than currently it has...

(Tony): Correct. For each stakeholder group. Like in the non-contract as far as we have the commercial stakeholder group and the non-commercial.

(Kevin): Right.

(Tony): Well each one of those two houses as we call them, would have one slot which they could by consensus decide, "Well we'd like to fund this person to come to the meeting" would be like an additional counselor let's say.

(Kevin): Okay.

(Tony): That's my proposal.

(Kevin): I'm understanding that. Yes. Okay so I think it - unless there's any other questions I wanted to - I need to get off for another call, but - and I'm happy to, you know, join other travel - drafting travel team calls if you'd like. I think my actions are to go ahead and post, you know, in the next week or so, a - the FY'11 draft travel guidelines for community feedback.

And I'll highlight some of these questions so that, you know, like Tim said, I don't want to over-solicit this, but at the same time I want to be responsive and kind of get the focus questions on that, not get into, you know, some of the minutia that - or of - encourage community feedback on, you know, core principal, not on minutia, which is also important but hopefully not purpose for this policy. So I'll go ahead and do that.

And I assume 30 days or so is enough time, although I'm hearing feedback that there's just - the community is overwhelmed with the announcement of feedback that they have to provide. So I'd like to - if you have any suggestions on that, let me know.

But other than that, are there any questions or comments -- more questions or comments?

Olga Cavalli: Just a comment. Given that I think the ones - the document is for public comment. GNSO would probably give our input to maybe we can draft something in the drafting team and then send it to the...

(Kevin): Extraordinary.

Olga Cavalli: ...space. Okay.

(Kevin): Excellent. Good, good. Thank you. Okay good. Glen thank you for setting it up, and thank you all for joining. And is there any - is - yes that's good. If there's anything else we need to do let me - just let me know.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Stefan van Gelder Thanks...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much.

(Kevin): All right, Thank you so much. Talk to you soon.

Olga Cavalli: Bye.

((Crosstalk))'

(Tony): Bye. Thanks (Kevin). Bye-bye.

Man: Thank you.

END