Adigo
nashtonhart _ 2009-06-12 0736 APT _ 1008568 _ 230868

Conference Participants listed alphabetically:

▪▪

Adam Peak
Adigo Operator
Alan Greenberg
Avri Doria
Cheryl Langdon-Orr
French Channel
Gisella Gruber-White
Heidi Ullrich
Kevin Wilson

▪▪

Kevin: Great. Thank you very much. We can start.

My name is Kevin Wilson.   I'm the Chief Financial Officer for ICANN. I'm here to present an update for the FY'10 operating plan and budget.

The purpose of this discussion -- in addition to highlighting where we are in the status of developing the operating plan and budget… the process… I'd like to reiterate the highlights of the draft of the FY'10 operating plan and budget.

I think for most of you on the call -- but just in case, this is being recorded… So I won't skip over too much… Most of you on the call will already know most of this, because it's following quite closely to the framework that was presented at the Mexico City meeting. Posted and discussed before and after the Mexico City meeting.

Then the third purpose is just to further engage the community. We want to encourage as many questions, comments and suggestions as possible -- to ensure that this is a community-based plan. Then ultimately, these are the draft slides. I'll be taking notes.

The presentation yesterday had notes, as well. I'll be taking notes on this, because this will be presented to the board -- along with any other community feedback that happens before and during the Sydney meeting/ So that the board can vote on it, and hopefully adopt the budget at the board meeting on Friday at the Sydney meeting.

If you look at any one slide, I think probably the overview of the FY'10 operating plan and budget is the most important. We put it up front, so that we can cover the most important bulletpoints, first.

I think the most salient point is that in addition, this is consistent with the framework posted in Mexico City. The community feedback was pretty clear, based on the economic situation and

ICANN's position, overall. It was important that we constrain budget growth to under 5%. This revised draft budget that's posted on the 17th of May reflects that growth.

There's still accommodation for certain areas of growth that we think the community and ICANN need to do. Particularly in contractual compliance and technology operations, and some [base hiring] for new gTLD efforts.

Essentially, this budget is reflecting a refinement of the numbers, and a belief that we're approaching operational maturity in many areas of ICANN.

I mentioned the 4.9% growth in the overall budget. That doesn't mean there's a shift in direction and emphasis, but this is the financial assumption in terms of what the resources are that are required. We'll explain that more as we go through.

Also, I wanted to emphasize some of the comments I've heard out there but not fully digested. This is a separate thing. This budget assumes that there will be a separate budget amendment that gets added to this budget, that would account for the new gTLD program -- about 90 days before it launches.

The idea is that when we get close to the launch date, and we're clear on what those numbers are and how they will be reflected, this includes both the revenue from application fees -- as well as the cost to process applications, to hire panels to review, et cetera.

We believe that that does not need to be approved now, as part of this budget -- but instead, when the launch date is known more definitively, and the costs are more able to be estimated -- and revenue is able to be estimated -- then we can put that in there.

The draft document was posted on the 17th of May. For those of you who might not know, the bylaws require this to be posted 45 days before the fiscal year ends, to allow community comment.

As most of you know, we've added over the last two years, this framework concept. So that the meeting prior to the 17th of May -- where there's opportunity [to provide feedback to] the operating plan and budget, as well.

In addition to honoring our commitments, in this budget, we've provided more comprehensive analyses and more detailed schedules and analyses. This is from direct feedback that we've received from the community. Such as -- specifically -- At-Large. Others in the community have asked for more comprehensive analysis and different views of the budget; more in line with the way they're thinking. We've worked with the board finance committee and the board overall, as well, in addition to that.

There's been more -- I want to say -- 50 or 60 pages, at least, of community feedback posted on the framework. We've analyzed that and synthesized that better than ever before. I always welcome more suggestions on that.

Then just to clarify, the budget is to be approved in Sydney -- as I've said before.

This next slide will be familiar to all of you. It's just -- once again -- reiterating that there are two 6-month periods in the operating-plan cycle. First is the development or update of the 3-

year strategic plan. That was posted in January. Then the operating plan and budget was developed after that. We're close to finishing that. This slide, once again, just highlights that development.

This slide is the strategic plan, with the nine strategic priorities spelled out in brief terms. Obviously, the details of that -- including the community feedback on it -- are posted on the website. And I think the most important thing is just the continuing implementation of the new gTLDs and IDNs. Certainly from a financial resource impact.

Moving forward to the slide called, "The Snapshot of the Operating Plan." I will correct this on the slides for the Sydney presentation. This is not the framework. This is really the snapshot of the draft-operating plan, which was posted on the 17th of May. I did change the chart, but I hadn't changed the words, yet.

For those of you who may be needing the details, this essentially reflects the same numbers as we showed in the framework in Mexico City. In terms of the new gTLD program, it's still showing as a fairly significant resource requirement. With some growth in contractual compliance and technology operations, and a little growth in other areas.

The difference is -- just to highlight the differences for those who [might have a different view]… The first is that there are more funds available or provided for travel support. About $300,000 more in travel support. That's to support the GNSO counselors at full support. It also assumes that the At-Large travel support is… I'm not sure exactly what the word is, but it's something close to, "Remaining stable."

The reason I hesitate with the word is because it doesn't mean the At-Large summit is duplicated again in FY'10. it just means that if you… [It's essentially] at the FY'08 level. There was some discussion about reducing the support down to what the other SO, ASO, ccNSO and GNSO support levels were -- at half the counselor equivalent. Roughly, the equivalent of half the number of counselors. The decision, based on the strong feedback, was that we would support it at full level. We can go into more detail in that in a little bit.

Thank you, Cheryl. We appreciate that.

Cheryl: [laughter]

Kevin: I could see you're enjoying this. Great.

Cheryl: I think we should fund a summit every year. Of course, that's just me. [laughter]

Kevin: I wanted to emphasize, too -- the feedback that I received or that we received wasn't unanimous. There are people that believe that travel support, for example, should not even be at the level that it is. There are some people that believe that certain people or certain groups are supported at too high a level.

It's not a consensus, but the strong balance was that there needs to be travel support. This still is a really, really valuable impact on the ICANN process. To get the work of ICANN done, that travel support needs to happen.

It doesn't mean that we should back away from remote participation and regional meetings and looking at and restructuring the meeting structure overall. Those are definitely on the plate for FY'10 to address -- and hopefully start implementing more robustly. But anyway, I wanted to mention that. That's the idea, becoming loud and clear. It's not just a travel club. We have to be very conscious of the fiduciary responsibility to do that.

Just to cover very briefly the key activities of the operating plan. Obviously, the new gTLD is the largest -- at 7.6 million. There's a slight change in this, just because we looked at the staffing requirement and the support system. There was a slight $100,000 or 200,000 increase in the cost for this. That was more a fine-tuning of the cost estimates, rather than a desire to change the concept of completing the implementation or setting up of the application processing.

Once again, I want to drive home the point -- this does not include the full panel cost or the dispute resolution costs, et cetera, that are built into the application cost. That would be covered in a separate [inaudible] new gTLD budget -- as well as the revenues associated with the applications.

Once again, the budget assumption is that the IDN program would launch in FY'10. That includes both the fast-track process as well as the IDN support for the new gTLD.

In addition to the IDN implementation, we see on this Slide Number 3, the IANA Technology Operations. There are some requirements for us to continue strengthening those areas. In particular, to prepare for the scaling that's expected to be acquired with the increase of new gTLDs.

Security, stability and resiliency -- there's a paper out on that -- on overall ICANN SSR efforts. The financial assumption is that these plans will be implemented.

The primary financial impact of that plan are business continuity efforts. The need for more bandwidth and backup. More servers. To ensure that we have strong business continuity.

As mentioned several times, contractual compliance is still perceived as a core area that does need some growth. That's primarily to complete the core staffing, as planned in the past -- and also to complete the WhoIs Accuracy Study. And possible follow-on [after these, for that].

The meeting logistics -- Number 6 on the operating plan -- is… The plan for the FY'10 budget is essentially flat from FY'09. Essentially, the financial assumption is that we continue with the three annual ICANN meetings. But there are some small budget dollars and a high number of staff efforts… and community efforts, I'm sure -- in other committees -- such as the Participation Committee… to look at new approaches to meetings. More remote participation.

In particular, in considering changing of venues or changing the locations. And even the number of meetings. Those are all being looked at. But the financial assumption is that we continue as we've been doing.

Constituency support -- this is a catchall, which includes direct support for DSOs and ACs. Supporting organizations and the advisory committees. Including At-Large and ALAC. That's projected to be roughly flat. I think there's some growth planned for the Asia region, for that.

Policy development support, in addition to what the current program is doing. I think there's obviously a little slight shift from GNSO study to GNSO improvement and implementation. In particular, some funds available for programs to train and provide support for future policy leaders.

The next area of operating activities… Global engagement and increasing international participation. The idea here is that there would be more resources provided in the Asia region. A slight increase in translation-work budget.

We believe that we've found models that will allow us to spend money more efficiently, and get more words and more quality words for the same amount of money. In addition, there are a few hundred thousand dollars more on translation work, over all. Hopefully in FY'10, the translation efforts -- which have been developing from a number of you and others in the ICANN community -- will continue. We'll achieve more operational maturity in that area.

We mentioned briefly before, the travel support for the ICANN community. This is still considered to be an important area. This is the one area that had several hundred thousand dollars spent on travel. In particular, the GNSO supported [it] at full counsel level. The idea is that that would increase productivity.

Just as a little bit of an aside -- a little bit of a travel administration… I think our strong goal is to make travel support a boring topic at ICANN. I think that's going to be the gold standard. We know that there are a lot of administration activities that have captured the time and bandwidth of community members. The goal is to make travel a very boring topic, with the idea being that the amount of support and the way it's supported and who it's for is more routine in nature.

I think we've made significant progress on that, and we'll look forward to feedback on the recently posted travel support guidelines. To ensure that when we finalize that right after Sydney, that that's reflecting the best wisdom of the community possible.

These next three areas -- Ombudsman, Forward Support and Nominating Committee Support -- are all expected to be flat. No growth. Continuing as in FY'09.

I wanted to highlight unit operation. Once again, a small growth in there. Primarily as that group becomes more operationally capable, to handle the DNSSEC signing efforts that are expected in FY'10.

This snapshot of the FY'10 budget -- I will correct the [sub] titles here. Thank you, Cheryl [last night] for pointing these out. I'll fix them before the next presentation.

Really, this just highlights the items that were shown in the framework -- with just some minor adjustments that we showed before. I'll walk through those adjustments.

The revenue numbers still reflect the dot-com step-up to $18 million, as determined in their contract. For those of you who remember, the total revenue is about 68 -- 67.8 million, I think it was -- in the framework.

We've reduced that for a couple of reasons. 1 -- we looked more at the transaction volume. A little more in detail with the registrars and registry, at the transaction volume expectation. Based on the downturn in the economy, there's still growth in the domain names -- but not as much as we had shown in the framework. So we've reduced the transaction volume growth. There's still a small increase.

In addition, in this draft budget, the assumption is that the transaction fees for registrars would drop to $0.18, for those who signed the new RAA. So, for those who have anniversary dates in future years, they'd have the opportunity to sign the RAA on the recently approved RAA, and to sign those early. Those are protections for the registrants -- and those protections would go into place earlier. So we provided an incentive by reducing the fee to $0.18 for those registrars.

In addition, there's a variable fee charged to the registrars that's a set amount each year. That would be reduced by 10% for those that sign the RAA. That's the budget proposal, now.

The last thing that we did here -- which I haven't put on the slide yet -- we lowered the ccTLD revenue. We're looking for feedback from the ccNSO group and the TLDs, as well, on the accuracy of that. That's now at 1.6 million, as a budget estimate.

Once again, just to drive home the point… The new gTLD application fees are not included as part of this budget.

This slide just really highlights, I think, all the points that we've already made -- to constrain the growth to under 5%. So if I hear rumors that budget growth is under 5%, I know that I've been successful in my communication, here.

The contribution -- for those of you doing the math in your head and wondering, "How do we reduce the revenue by several million dollars and increase the cost and travel support?" Maybe a couple of others by some hundred or half-million dollars or so. How does the math work out?

Well, as you could imagine, the budget assumption that we have here is, it's coming out of two areas. One is, we've reduced the contingency. In the past two or thee years, we felt it was prudent to have a contingency, so that if we came close to budget, we wouldn't have to go back to the community and the approval process, to get an approval for that. So we built in a contingency to be prudent for each year's budget.

This year, we believe that our cost estimating and the growth has been to build in that, [as much of] a contingency. So we've reduced the contingency. That's one area. The other area is to see -- as you can see, here -- a reduction in the contribution to the reserve fund.

So, although the budget forecast is 4.9 million, it's still greater than that in FY'09. The idea is that it's still less than the approximate $10 million per year that's been projected to be required in accordance with the strategic plan of coming to one year of operating expenses.

I think I've covered this throughout in an undertone. The separate new gTLD budget amendment. I don't think there are any new points, here. No -- I think this has been covered elsewhere. So let me -- in the interest of time -- highlight the 3-year financial impact analysis, which is included in this draft budget.

I'd like to jump to the slides. You can see the assumptions here. I wanted just to point out that the first slide shows the revenue cost-neutral model. There's a series of models that we're using for this calculation. This first slide shows how the new gTLD is revenue-cost neutral. In accordance with the GNSO policy that was passed.

This is just one assumption that I put up on the slide here, showing how -- by capturing the revenue from the application fee -- and then the application expenses over time for those new gTLDs -- in this case, resulted in a small net positive amount. So I wanted just to show you how that was modeled, in a very brief way.

I see Adam… Can we go ahead and answer your question now?

Adam: Hi. Later is probably fine. I think Alan just indicated he might have some similar questions. So why don't you get to the end, and then we'll take questions.

Kevin: Okay. Great. It looks like we have a number of questions. Good. So I'll go ahead and finish this, just to keep on track.

Continuing with the 3-year financial impact…

This chart shows how we're projecting the gTLDs in operation. It's showing how we developed this model. This is one scenario with approximately 500 applications, and how that would affect overall ICANN.

This is the all-important slide, here. This shows in bold, the new gTLD impact on the ICANN budget. That, of course, could be very significant. Along with the core existing operations on that.

I think the important point from this slide here -- for those of you who'd like to get into the details of the financials, I'm happy to do that… But for this slide here, I think the important implications are that -- 1 -- the model that we have now demonstrates the revenue covering the costs for the new gTLD application process. That's been a key tenet of the whole program. It is revenue-cost neutral, and we can model for that.

The second implication is that there is a very strong requirement that we have detailed cost accounting and reporting. Not only to do that and calculate the revenue-cost neutral, but also to communicate with complete accountability and transparency. So that all can understand that this really is revenue-cost neutral, and that it's clear up front on how we're capturing those costs. And how -- at the end of the day -- whether it's three years out or whenever that time is when we look at the revenue we've received from the new gTLD round, and the costs associated with that round, we can report if there's a surplus or a shortfall. Or if we got lucky and landed spot-on.

Then obviously, there are implications of what to do if there's a surplus, and how to handle a shortfall.

This also demonstrates, as the ICANN model matures, that there might be an opportunity both to completely fund the reserve fund -- and therefore not have in the budget a surplus plan to build up the reserve fund -- as well as an opportunity to reduce or change the mix of revenue sources.

The last thing I wanted to cover in this presentation is just the additional views of ICANN. The new charts, in addition to the traditional accounting view. The ICANN budget has always been organized in alignment with the way accounting systems work. There's now a functional reporting view, which was launched on the dashboard, six months or so ago.

We now have that as an integral part of the budget. So we actually have a budget by functional area. We'll be able to report on that variance from budget by functional area, and actual expenditure by financial area in FY'10 activities reports.

Then most of you know also that we have a new view. This is really a direct request from the community and the board, to show our spending in a way that makes most sense to the community members.

We came up with a new acronym called EAG. Expense Area Group. It reflects, essentially, the organization chart on the ICANN website. It's in alignment with the interest groups.

I'll walk through the pie charts. This is the traditional accounts view, with personnel, travel and meetings, professional services and administration. Then this is the functional reporting view. This gets a little busier, as you can see. I think there are 15 activities that are in the ICANN operating plan. Accordingly, each of those has their slice of the pie.

We wanted to drive home the point that these are all cross-departmental -- cross-functional. We don't want to leave with a menu concept -- the pay-for-service -- that any one of these slices could just take their piece and go off. There's much more interdependency, in addition to overhead support that supports all of that.. Finance, HR, real estate and those sorts of things.

There are also cross-departmental teams. Those people involved primarily in global engagement are also heavily involved in At-Large and policy development. IDN and that sort of thing. You can't really look at it in a single slice. It's important to look at it in its different categories.

This last one is the EAG view. The Expense Area Group view of the FY'10 budget. You can see here support for the generic TLD activities, and specifically support for the GNSO. Similar slice down here with 17% for country code support. And support for ccNSO activities. I think I hear a lot of people on the call from the At-Large group -- so about 7% from the At-Large support and ALAC.

Once again, I want to emphasize that this isn't a discrete menu of services provided, there. IANA is involved in all of these. Finance is involved in all. ICANN's budget is very cross-departmental and needs to be taken as a whole.

However, we felt it was very [strong] to report on that. We've prepared a paper, and I'm happy to share that with all. It's posted on the website. We're seeking feedback on whether

this is properly responding to the ICANN community. The idea is that it's important that the readers of this understand this.

I understand that not everybody wants to become an expert at cost accounting at ICANN. But it is important to know that there's a methodology and logic behind that. We appreciate feedback on that process.

I want to open it up for comment. Obviously this is a time for comment online in the call, here. At the Sydney meeting, there are several workshops and several meetings set up. [You can have] more if you'd like to. Then obviously, the board will vote on the budget and operating plan for FY'10 at the Friday board meeting.

V: Are we ready for questions?

Kevin: Yes. Alan -- you want to start?

Alan: Adam was first, I think. Let him go first.

Kevin: Okay.

Adam -- you here?

Adam: My question was about the contingency fund. This was something I think we'd mentioned on our previous call or in one of our submissions. The ALAC and other groups are also undergoing review. The ALAC review process or the review itself has quite a lot of recommendations. Things that the ALAC should be doing, in addition to what it does, now.

Assuming that those are passed during the budget year that we're talking about now -- FY'10 -- if they're not in the budget and there isn't a contingency fund, then we won't be able to do them for a year. Which kind of makes a mess of having a review in the first place -- the sort of thinking I'm trying to get at.

But I may be misunderstanding what a contingency would be. [If] one of our recommendations was that if something were recommended in the review to happen, then funds be made available in some form of contingency, to make sure they could happen.

Kevin: Right.

The way those are handled -- I'm going to speak generically -- and then we can talk about the ALAC review, in particular.

Generically, any new activity that appears in a given year is handled one of three ways. The first way is, someone anticipated it when we pledged it at the development. So there are a number of items that are put into the budget as placeholders.

So that people have -- for example -- planning for a meeting in June 2010. That doesn't mean that we know where it is and what the contracts are and that sort of thing. We haven't done that, yet. But we're working on it. So there's still a placeholder for that meeting. There are plans for that.

The second area is, if a new activity happens that isn't specifically budgeted, there's an effort at either reallocating resources… maybe some other area has dropped down in the priority list. So we reshuffle resources.

There are actually four.

The third is -- as you mentioned in the contingency fund -- if there's just no budget room for that item, then we can pull from the contingency fund. We work with the board finance committee and the board on that, in accessing those funds.

Fortunately, we haven't had to do that, because our operating plan and budgets have been more aggressive than we were able to implement for various reasons.

The fourth way is if there's a very significant item. Then there can be a budget amendment. As I've understood them from the ALAC review, I doubt if the suggestions would rise to that level. But that's certainly an opportunity to do that.

Adam: That's fine. My only concern is, I was trying to say that if something's recommended, we don't want to have to wait a year to implement it, when it's obviously something that's desired.

Kevin: Yes.

Adam: The other was, what happens when -- for example -- the new gTLD program slips. That [inaudible] a lot of people, it seems like it might, too. But I think you just answered that, as well. It would be an amendment or whatever.

Kevin: Right.

That's a big driver of why we decided to put that as a separate new gTLD amendment, rather than have a tough discussion about the assumptions in that budget now, when we don't eve know exactly when it will be. Let's wait until we're more sure.

Adam: I've got other questions, but I think we'll leave those. Alan, I think you probably have something you wanted to say on a similar general theme.

French Channel: And a question from the French Channel, as well, when you get a chance.

Kevin: Sure.

French Channel: Whenever you're ready. I know that there's an order in the line. I don't want to cut in front of everybody.

Kevin: I'm a victim of the bottom-up consensus basis of running a meeting. So let me change that, and I'll be directed.

Let's start with the French Channel question.

French Channel: One moment, as I'm getting the question.

My question. First of all, Kevin, I wanted to thank you for your presentation. It's very clear.

Kevin: Who is this from?

French Channel: Oh, this is [Hallah], by the way.

In regards to the revenue, however, I do not see -- for example -- the revenues received from the sponsorships. In which portion of the budget is it that you've posted the revenue coming from the sponsorships? In which section? In what category of the budget is that actually placed? I don't see that.

Kevin: Okay. I'll answer that question.

The sponsorship revenue is -- I think -- budgeted at about USD500,000 right now, for the year. It's shown as "another income" item in the actual draft budget.

Without making people dizzy, I'm going to jump. Or I'm hoping to not make people dizzy. I'm going to jump to the revenue slide. You'll see there in "other," it's about 1.5 million, and it's included in there.

So the $500,000 is budgeted for sponsorship revenue. The rest of that "other income" includes things like interest income and financial income. Any other questions from the French?

V: [inaudible] Alan.

Kevin: Let me switch to Alan.

Alan: First, just a statement. I'm not a lover of increased budget items. But it was delightful to see increased allocation for compliance.

Cheryl: Here, here! [laughter]

Alan: On more substantive issues, I am not as positive.

There's a lot of talk about outreach and engagement. Specifically, I admit I have not read the budget document, word-for-word. But I have done searches on a number of critical words.

There's a lot of talk about engagement and outreach, but there is very little or virtually none specifically related to outreach with regards to At-Large, and outreach with regards to new constituencies for the GNSO. Those are areas where the external reviews have said it is critical, with regard to the GNSO, the board governance committee at the time said that ICANN will have to put resources into it.

In discussions in forming the stakeholders' group, it's clear that there are going to have to be resources put into it. But there's no mention of it. So I'm wondering if you have any comments on that, and then I'll go onto a couple other shorter questions.

Kevin: Yes. I think there are generally resources available, but they're existing resources in those areas. Other than in indirect things -- like travel support or recruiting dollars for non-com or things like that.

As far as specific operating plan bulletpoints on much, much more expensive dollars on outreach dollars… I'd want to understand better about what the framework for that is. My understanding is that no, there are not. There are others on the call that helped draft that part of the operating plan that could address that better. But I'll get back to you more, Alan, if there's anything more specific like that.

Alan: Yes. I think the message that I and others are trying to send is to say that we need new constituencies -- or to say we want more involvement from the field and At-Large, but not actively trying to get it. I know there's a lot of money going into translation and into documents and things like that. But not explicitly focusing on those kinds of outreach activities means there will not be any outreach, and the growth won't happen that we're expecting.

The next substantive one… You've said several times that At-Large travel is stable from FY'08. Unfortunately, that is not the case. In FY'08, there was funding for the level attending ICANN meetings for the ALAC and At-Large leadership, which is stable. FY'08, we had a significant amount of travel allocated to bringing ALS to ICANN meetings and -- I believe -- some regional meetings. I'm not sure.

In fact, the summit funding was moderately stable with FY'08. Instead of bringing people to three meetings a year, we brought more people to one meeting a year. So we are definitely not stable with FY'08.

I don't know where that noise is coming from.

Kevin: Alan, just so I'm clear… When you say… Do you consider 15 as… Do you think I'm saying that there are 15, when you support it?

Alan: 15 to three ICANN meetings?

Cheryl: No. It's not the same thing. It's -- in fact -- the At-Large ALS representatives in '08.

Kevin: Right. Yes. My understanding -- and I'll go back and do some fact checking. So consider this as an initial thought. My understanding of FY'08 is that there were approximately 15 ALAC members for each ICANN meeting. In addition, there were about 8 regional ALSs supported for each of those meetings.

Alan: That's correct.

Cheryl: Yes.

Alan: But that's not all there were. Those two components had been carried over to FY'10. And we are delighted that the cuts that were talked about were not made.

Kevin: Right. There's no question about that.

Alan: But in FY'08, there was an additional component, which in FY'09, was transformed and slightly enlarged to be the summit. This year, it's disappeared completely.

Kevin: Okay. Unfortunately, it's hard… And I wasn't part of the development of FY'08. That was before my time. But I certainly was part of the implementation of it.

The aid that was supported… The way we've handled that right now is in the draft budget -- and also in the draft travel guidelines. We considered it as 10 for each of the ICANN meetings. The thought was… and this is where we want to have feedback and show on slides yesterday… that there would be an opportunity to mix-and-match those 10, to allow for more regional support.

In other words, to push down to the ALAC itself and the committees themselves to come up with the best and most efficient way to do it.

Alan: Kevin, that's a fine decision that we can make. But let's be very straight about what that is.

In FY'08, there were three components to the travel funding for At-Large. There were 15 ALAC members. Roughly 8 RALO leaderships. And then about 12 or 15 people per meeting from ALSs. You're now saying that the ALAC is assured, and the 8 to 10 of what we're calling "RALO leadership," we could change into ALS regional meetings.

But we're going from three components to two. The third one has disappeared, and you're saying if we really value C more than B, we can take the money and put it into C.

Kevin: Yes.

Alan: But there's a component that has disappeared. So it's not level with FY'08. There's a significant decrease from FY'08.

Kevin: Okay. I hear what you're saying.

Alan: The problem is, when people talked about the summit, they talked about it as a new expense -- and to a large extent, it was not. Instead of bringing a moderate number of people to three meetings a year, we brought a larger number of people to one meeting a year.

There was some growth over that. We're not ungrateful for that. But it wasn't a brand new total expense, as it was discussed at the board level, and such.

Kevin: Okay.

Alan: The other one I had… just trying to find it.

French Channel: And another question from the French Channel, when you get a chance.

Alan: I've got a couple of smaller ones, but I'll let other people come in, first.

Kevin: Okay. Let's have [Ava]…

Cheryl: [Allah], go ahead.

French Channel: Thank you.

What I wanted to know is in regards to…   The question basically is in regards to -- once again -- assistance for travel funding. I know that for a lot of us, we've always expressed a concern where we…   So for those of us, for example, that -- let's say -- cannot travel…

There's been a major concern where funds have been allocated for one member, but then that member is not able to travel. What is the possibility of being able to transfer the funds allotted for that member, who's no longer able to travel, to another member? In order to keep that engagement and that participation going?

Kevin: I'm sorry. I just did not understand the question. It might be a little early for me.

French Channel: Basically, usually for the travel support -- right…   There are different specific members that are given an allotted amount. Meaning that they're allowed to travel.

But let's say one of those members -- who was given an allotted amount -- is not able to travel. Can the funds destined for that specific person be used for another person to take their place?

Kevin: Oh. I see your question. Yes.

The short answer is, "Yes." The way the travel guidelines -- which are actually posted and available for…   The draft travel guidelines are posted and are available for committee feedback. We hope to finalize them after the Sydney meeting. The way those are designed, they generally follow what we discussed in prior years.

Instead of ICANN staff determining who in the community should be travel-supported, we allocate travel slots and travel headcount for each community. We then let the community decide with their own processes.

Some people heavily rely on staff. Some develop travel-drafting workshops. Sometimes the chairs are more involved than others. Each group designs their own processes. That would [handle] for substitutions.

We specifically do not say that for travel, the chair or the committee members are the only ones supported in this. Because in fact, my understanding is that oftentimes someone in a working group that's not even a committee member should be the one, or they're the best person to be supported.

We allocate slots, and then the committees and SOs and ACs make their own decisions.

V: In fact, for ALAC, that's always happened, to some extent. Usually -- and unfortunately -- unlike the GNSO, where a particular constituency may say, "We don't need any travel support," way in advance…   In our case, it's usually cancellations or people who can't travel for one reason or another.

But if you look at this meeting, we have done several substitutions like that.

Kevin: Great.

Then I want to emphasize that the draft travel guidelines are [inaudible] shortly after the budget was posted. There were plans to… I know the summary was posted in English and French, right away. There were plans to post it in English and French. I think, actually, all five UN languages. I will double-check to find the status on that. It might be posted or it might not. I apologize that I have not followed up on that. I will follow up and make sure that that is posted in French.

[Halla], did you have another question?

I think that's an old hand. Okay. Great.

Alan, do you want to ask another one?

Alan: Yes. Just a small clarification. You were talking about the lowering of the ICANN fee for domain to $0.18. That is for all registrars that sign the new RAA -- whether it's because they're doing it early, or simply that their contract is being renewed. Is that correct?

Kevin: That's right.

Alan: Or is it only the early ones?

Kevin: Oh. No, no. Yes. For example, three or four have already signed the new RAA, because their anniversary date came up this or last month.

V: [Hello].

Kevin: Those people have already signed the new RAA. Those people would be eligible. Yes.

Alan: Okay. So anyone who is working under the new RAA pays the lower rate.

Kevin: Yes. Much more [inaudible]

Alan: That wasn't quite clear from the presentation. I assumed that was the case, though.

Kevin: Yes. Good.

I just checked the travel support guidelines. They are only posted in English. So I will follow up on a translation group and see if I can get that higher on the priority list.

If we need to, we will extend the deadline for closing that -- if that's necessary.

French Channel: And another question from French, when you get a chance.

Kevin: Yes. Go ahead.

French Channel: Thank you very much.

First of all, Kevin, for the presentation… This is related to…

Kevin: Is this also [Howah]?

French Channel: No, no. This is [Elbi].

V: Thank you, [Eddy].

French Channel: I'm sorry. Give me one second. I have a bit of interruption.

Cheryl: [laughter]

French Channel: Okay. I'm sorry.

Cheryl: No problem.

French Channel: What I was saying… First of all, thank you for the initiative. My comment -- and this is still related to what [Hawah] asked. This is [Yelbi], by the way. I definitely want a politic where there's more participation of the community. Finally, thank you for the presentation.

But mainly, how to continue engaging more members of the community in regards to the travel issue, and how to get better at that.

Kevin: Are you still translating?

French Channel: Oh, no. I'm done.

Kevin: So is that a question or a comment? I think that was just a comment. Right?

V: Let's assume so, until we hear otherwise.

French Channel: Yes. It was a comment. Sorry. That was my mistake.

Kevin: Yes. I appreciate the comment. Yes.

The ICANN process works best when there's active community input. The reason we have the travel support program at all is heavily driven by being productive with the ICANN activities. It's nothing other than that. Including outreach and including supporting people that need the support. But the real driver is to get that work of ICANN done.

That's the reason why those who have called for reductions in the travel support… their requests have not been honored as much as they would like. Because we as a community realize the sense of the comments is that travel support is important.

By the way -- my CFO hat on -- I'd wanted to cut costs everywhere I can. Obviously, travel is always an easy one to cut costs on. But after being at ICANN for two years, I realize that

would be a pennywise and pound-foolish. I'm not sure with Australian currency, the expression I should be using for that. But it would not be wise.

Cheryl: [laughter] "It would be a dumb move," is the currency.

V: I'm glad to see you saved money by not doing per diems this meeting, though.

V: [laughter]

Kevin: Alan and others on the call, I happen to know that I approved a wire transfer yesterday. So be careful where you put your criticism.

V: [laughter]

Cheryl: Now if we lose our sense of humor, it's a sad thing indeed.

Vs: [laughter]

Cheryl: Adam. You have your hand up. Please go ahead with your question.

Adam: Yes. There are a few. Not particular major things.

I'm interested in translation. Are you doing a monitoring of how many downloads there are for each language, and how effective the translation is? If so, are you going to continue to translate into all languages, even though it may only be downloaded once? Something like that. Or will you start targeting more used languages?

Translation is extremely expensive. I think it's extremely important, as well. But there's no point in wasting thousands of dollars on two downloads. Depending on what the average is. That's one question.

Kevin: Yes. Let me answer that one, if I could.

From a budget standpoint, yes. Of course, we do. We have a detailed spreadsheet, and we debated whether we wanted to put more people to sleep reading the operating plan and guidelines by putting that table together -- showing how many documents, how many words, and what the cost-per-word is in Chinese versus Spanish -- and the analysis of that.

So we do have analyses of that, [to build up the budget]. We elected not to show that -- in the interest of accessibility.

The question you raised -- the really interesting on -- which was brought up by the translation committee -- is efficacy and value of that. It's an interesting question.

Do you judge the success of translation by how many people downloaded or not? That's a question. For example, if they have to go through an English website to get a Chinese-language document, that might not be a good measure of how important that Chinese document is.

They're wrestling with that. I have not heard definitive results from the wrestling. But they are wrestling with those very issues. Those statistics are tracked. I'm not sure at what level they're being communicated, but I think that's a really good comment. I'm drafting another e-mail on that right now, that I think it's important for us to communicate at least a response to your question.

Adam:	Thank you. A couple more.

One was… I hope I don't lose the page. It's on Page 21 of the operating plan and budget. It mentions travel for vendors. Who are vendors? This is a very simple question.

Then going on to the next page, the airfare costs average of $4,000. Did that used to be split up? Is that the cost of business plus economy? I think before, it was split into something like an average of $2,500 for economy and worked out for economy and…

Kevin: 2,000 and 6,000.

Adam:	Yes. Okay. So it's got… So this is the lumped-together fare, is it?

Kevin: Correct. Yes. Then "vendors," are consultants that go to the meetings. Scribes that we've paid to go to the meetings. [inaudible] ICANN systems.

We have a few people for example, that go to the meetings that are familiar with our setup. Mostly they're from [Bear Land]. Do you know who those people are?

Adam:	Oh, yes. No -- I…

Kevin: [inaudible] system.

Adam:	I wouldn't call them "vendors." That's all. I thought that it might be them, but those are more like, "consultants." "Vendors," sounds like… I don't know who it sounds like.

Kevin: The problem is, normally when we use the term, "Contractors," "Contract," has another meaning in ICANN language.

Adam:	It sounds like the people that have the booths outside the main room. You'd think they…

Kevin: Ah -- I see.

V:	People that sell their services.

Adam:	Yes. Exactly.

Kevin: So in addition to translating into English, Spanish, French, Chinese, Russian, et cetera, we need to translate into Kevin's accounting background.

Cheryl:	No, plain English will do.

Kevin: Anybody that we write a check to is called a "vendor."

Adam: Ah!

Cheryl: Mmm! I understood that.

Kevin: You actually are a vendor. And I will never, ever call you that, because I know you'll be insulted.

Cheryl: [laughter]

Kevin: If I slip, you'll understand why.

Adam: [inaudible]

V: I think it's cool to be a vendor. I'm jealous of vendors!

Cheryl: [inaudible] now.

Vs: [inaudible]

Adam: You're more like a vending machine, [inaudible].

V: Oh!

Adam: No, then… But… Where was I? Yes. On the draft travel support guidelines, there are some bullets. I think you covered a few of them when you were replying to the French Channel, what happens if -- in the exception that I want to do this, that and the other?

The answer is pretty vague. It says, "To ensure efficient responses to such requests, ICANN has established an "Exceptions Response Process."

A couple of things about that. Could we actually have details of what these "exceptions" are? If I ask for an upgrade, am I going to get it?

Very often… Or an upgradeable fair… By the time it's come to the constituency travel process, it's too late to go anywhere near an upgradeable fair, because there aren't any seats left. That's kind of…

Can we know what the rules are, rather than having them [vague]? We've been through so many public comments. If there are $300 rules or whatever it would be…

I will say that slides of Latin America [LOCOM] would really like me to be able to get an upgradeable fair. I'd be completely knackered for three days afterwards if I have to sit in economy for two 12-hour flights. But that's just my [inaudible] preference.

Kevin: Can I respond to that one first?

Adam: Yes. Sure.

Kevin: That's something very near and dear.

The process by which we established this, this time, was that every exception be approved by me. That wasn't always the case. We had a variety of people making decision on that in the past.

So we decided to get a point process. For those of you getting to know me, I'm very collaborative. I don't think there's any decision that I make unilaterally just based on the whim of my own thoughts. I get consensus as much as possible from community and the key staff that are involved in that, so that I don't make a dumb decision.

It's easy to say, "No." But it could be foolhardy for ICANN to say no to someone. An important chair or working group member needs to be at a meeting. If I say, "No, we're not going to spend $12 extra," that would be a foolish decision. That's the reason we decided to have a point person and to also have a collaborative process.

As we identify patterns, then certainly they'll go on to the guidelines very specifically. Before they become definitive patterns that go into the guidelines, they'll go into an FAQ. So people can start to plan for that.

Until then, they kind of have to do that. Just so you know the thought process… Rather than me going out and saying, "Here's a dollar amount…" And I know that people have brandished various dollar amounts because they didn't have the point person making this judgment process… When you put a dollar amount out there, it gets out there and then people start to [inaudible].

Even worse, it's possible that we could have a hundred $290 decisions that would have a very large financial impact. So rather than going down that slippery slope, I'm capturing every exception. I have a file for them. After each meeting, I will elevate it at least to the FAQ to say, "Here's how all the exceptions were handled." Hopefully, into the next guidelines -- and maybe into this final guideline -- it will be really clear on if I can find [enough]. That's my job. To synthesize all of those exceptions [to agreements].

Alan: Kevin -- could I ask a follow on to that? It's Alan.

Kevin: Yes. Let me just finish that one point, though.

On the exception -- just so you know -- because I know it's near and dear, and people are wondering how we're doing. There are some people that say, "Gee -- how come you're not granting my exception? It's to save the company money." Well, the reason why is because probably -- on average -- most exceptions are cost-[inaudible]. On average. And we're doing an analysis on the overall impact.

The overall impact is surprisingly pretty cost-neutral. I just wanted to let you know that. Of all of the exceptions we're granting, there are enough people getting exceptions granted that cost the company less than there are more. So we're averaging it out. That's good.

If it were heavily in favor of costing the company more, then I'd have to adjust the guidelines some. Sorry, Alan. Go ahead.

Alan: The question was… And I don't know if this applies to me, because I haven't looked… But if someone were to come to you now and say, "I can get a really good fare that I can likely upgrade to Seoul…" Can we get the tickets bought now instead of whenever you start the process in months from now? Would that exception be looked at kindly?

Cheryl: [laughter]

Kevin: Well, yes. I shouldn't say it publicly. I'd like to do it privately, if I could.

Cheryl: No, no. Put it in the record, Kevin.

Alan: It doesn't mean yes. It just means looked at or would be considered. That's all I'm asking.

Kevin: Of course. Yes.

There were people that bought tickets to Sydney in November and we [inaudible] and we're reimbursing them, even though we said it would never happen again. That kind of thing.

Also, just so you know… Steve and I are working really hard -- and maybe even at the Sydney meeting -- having the travel summary of how to do this for the Seoul meeting. So we don't even come close to the deadline. So people like you -- who like to plan so far in advance -- can do so.

Cheryl: Yes. In fact, many of our community want to plan far in advance.

Kevin: Right.

Cheryl: A number of us -- please remember this… This is so important. A number of us -- a significant number of us in the At-Large community -- need to actually apply to our employers to get the time off.

What we do to earn our daily bread is utterly unrelated to anything having to do with ICANN. You've got people that are taking vacation time to come and represent their ALS.

Kevin: Right. I'll ping Steve again, and we should meet. He's going down there on Monday. But the goal is that we'll have a website. We certainly have the e-mails and the infrastructure to handle it, to actually get out a travel summary. It's called a travel summary for each meeting. Travel guidelines for the year.

The goal is that very shortly after Sydney -- and maybe even at the meeting -- we'll finish the travel guidelines and we'll also have the travel summary for the full meeting.

Alan: Before we get off travel, are we likely see hotel confirmations soon for this coming meeting?

Cheryl: [laughter]

Kevin: That's a serious question.

Cheryl: They're all staying at my place. We're having $200 cab fares each way, every day. [laughter]

Kevin: So you have not received hotel confirmations?

Cheryl: None of us have.

V: I certainly haven't.

Cheryl: None of us have.

Kevin: Okay. We probably emailed them. I mildly monitor the list, and then I focus on the [inaudible]

V: I emailed the list a week and a half ago or so, and was told there had been a lot of last-minute reservations. So things are all a mess.

Cheryl: Could I just share with you, Kevin? That increased my concerns levels. Significantly. But that's not for this call. That's for another conversation.

Kevin: Well if it helps any, I know I'm spending a lot of money for hotels.

Vs: [laughter]

V: We'd just like to make sure it's for us.

Cheryl: Yes!

V: [inaudible] which one you're in.

Cheryl: Yes! Exactly!

V: Preferably, before we get on the plane.

Cheryl: Yes. Call us [inaudible], but knowing where to tell the taxi driver where to take them is a good thing.

Hello -- we'd like to go to Sydney, please. [laughter]

V: There is only one hotel there. Right?

Cheryl: [laughter] Yes. Right.

V: All right. We've abused Kevin; enough on that one.

French Channel: And just from the French Channel, how would this…?

Cheryl: Go ahead, [Hallah].

French Channel: [Howah] does have to go. So she does the goodbyes to everybody. But yes, [Ovi] does have another question.

Kevin: Okay.

Cheryl: Please go ahead.

French Channel: One second. They're saying, "bye," to each other.

Good afternoon to everybody -- please -- from [Howah].

Cheryl: Bye-bye, [Howah]. Thank you.

V: Good afternoon.

Kevin: Thank you, [Howah]. I approach your comments and questions.

Who are we waiting for?

French Channel: One second.

I have a question. Is there a time dot that we have to wait between the announcement of a member for their participation and then when they get their reimbursement? How does that work?

Kevin: Is there a time between the announcement of what and what? I'm sorry.

French Channel: From the moment you get the announcement of participation from a member -- how long does it take to get the reimbursement?

Cheryl: When they are authorized and accepted sponsored to travel under ICANN's dollar. When they get everything. Information -- confirmation of arrangements -- and of course, per diem.

Kevin: Right.

There are four components of reimbursement. The first is airfare. Those people that are on the approved travelers list get their airfare booked through ICANN. We pay the travel agency for those funds. Hopefully, the traveler is notified of the itinerary and agrees to the itinerary, first.

For lodging, similarly, the lodging is booked and afforded. I've got a note here to follow up with the travel team to find out why the confirmations aren't going out.

Then as far as per-diems… You might have seen the e-mail I sent out this week. I actually saw most of the wire transfers going out. We had a wire transfer of…

By the way -- a number of people are still providing incorrect banking information. They're missing a digit or something like that. So we really need to make sure that information is captured correctly. And obviously, we need to capture it earlier, too.

V: Kevin -- on that -- if you would use the information you had… Just ask them if it's the same as the previous one that worked. That would make your life a lot easier.

Cheryl: Yes. Mine hasn't changed for the last seven times. But there you go.

Kevin: Okay. Well, I have some thoughts on that.

Anyway, those who get wire transfers, it should happen before the meeting, with sufficient time so that you can see it before you get on the plane to come to the meeting.

Then for those that don't get their funds through wire transfers -- either because of poor information or late information or were late for whatever reason… Or some people just prefer or can't receive the wire transfer. Then we provide cash at the meeting.

We try to minimize that, for obvious security and other reasons. But we will provide that.

Since it's Sydney, we happen to have an office there. So we have a local account that helps us. He's going to work with Steve on making the distribution as cleanly as possible. I have a whole paper on the lessons learned from Mexico City on that.

I'm expecting great improvement -- most-improved awards -- from Mexico City to Sydney on per-diem payments.

Cheryl: [laughter]

V: Kevin, on that, you said you were approving them. At one point, we were told that when they are approved, we will also get an e-mail confirming that, and telling us how much and what to except.

Cheryl: [inaudible]

V: I haven't seen mine, yet. But if you could check to make sure those are really going out, too.

Kevin: Yes. I know. Yesterday I approved the… I didn't want to wait 'til the e-mails went out before I sent it. I released the funds, and then I sent an e-mail to Melissa to send out the e-mails. So she's doing that.

Hopefully she's not doing them one-by-one, but rather a generic e-mail. But I'll follow up on that.

V: They need to be one-by-one, to verify the details, I think.

Cheryl: Yes.

Kevin: Well, my point is that hopefully she's not taking 100 people and writing a creative prose for each one.

V: Okay. I hope the target next year is somewhat earlier. I don't really desperately need this cash to be able to travel to Sydney. But I'm getting on a plane in three business days, and obviously -- if you just approved it yesterday, it hasn't come, yet. So we need to get it months earlier. Not a day or two earlier.

Kevin: We understand. Yes.

Good.

Well, I feel that I've monopolized a lot of your time today.

Cheryl: No, no. Hang on. Hang on. Alan -- you still have your hand up. Do you have another question?

Alan: I can't put it down. Some master has to put it down for me.

Cheryl: No, no. You just go down to the little dropdown box to the bottom left of your screen, and say, "Lower hand." It's very simple.

Alan: I don't have a "lower hand," on mine.

V: "Clear my status," does it.

Alan: Ah!

Cheryl: [inaudible] Avri's done the training, obviously. Thank you, Avri.

Alan: Thank you.

Avri: No -- I looked at it.

Cheryl: Yes. But you're a woman. You do that sort of thing.

Adam -- you've got your hand up.

Alan: In some previous meeting, it didn't work. But thank you.

Adam: Yes. This is probably not something that you can answer, Kevin. But I was just wondering…

Do you know what the total costs for running the l.root is? And why does ICANN run a root server? That's probably not a question you can answer. But I think it's actually a question ICANN might consider. Because I don't really know that it's in the mission.

Anyway, obviously, l.root servers are quite important. But why does ICANN have to run one? It's a lot of money. Not that you could sell it to somebody.

Cheryl: [laughter]

Adam: Well, you could. Chinese would probably pay your budget for the next 10 years, if you offered them a root server.

I'm sorry. This was meant to be a serious question. Do you know how much running the l.root server is? I think in the public forum, I will ask the question, "Why does ICANN run a root server?"

Cheryl: Kevin, you can take that on notice, if you so desire.

Kevin: Yes. I'll definitely take that on notice. I will wisely not directly answer the question. Although I have my own understanding. But yes, I'll let those more appropriate answer that question.

Then as far as how much is the l.root process? Now -- once again -- I don't want to paint this as a pay-as-you-go and "how much are we offering it for," service.

French Channel: And another question from the French Channel.

Kevin: Hold on.

French Channel: Do you know if the reimbursements already started for the Mexico meeting? There were some concerns in regards to that.

Kevin: Good. Let me finish the question for Adam on the cost of the l.root. Then I'll answer the question about the Mexico City meeting.

French Channel: Thank you.

Kevin: If you look at Section 14 of the operating plan, there's a thing called DNS operations. It's sort of an expanded version of the l.root service. That includes other efforts, in terms of signing the DNSSEC, and signing capacity and other l.root-type services.

I'm cautious to say -- or I want to extend caution -- to not interpret that as what the cost of an l.root is. But let me put it this way… The ICANN l.root functions are handled in that area.

V: Thanks.

Kevin: As far as Mexico City, my understanding is that everything in our inbox related to Mexico City per diem has been resolved. There have been two or three requests from certain people saying, "We haven't heard back on problems that you've voiced," and we have not heard back from those people.

We've made several efforts to talk to them. I've asked our [compliance] team to tell the At-Large staff or the staff at ICANN that are involved most heavily in At-Large, to communicate that with staff, so we can identify if they've just received their funds and therefore they're quiet, or if -- for whatever reason -- they can't read our e-mail.

I want you to know that as far as I know, the last I checked -- about 4 or 5 days ago -- there are no Mexico City per-diem issues remaining. If you know of any, please e-mail me directly. I'd really like to know about them. Okay? Good.

Thank you all very much for the…

Cheryl: Thank you, Kevin -- but my hand is still in the air.

Kevin: Oh -- I thought you had not learned how to lower it.

Cheryl: No, I [inaudible]

[laughter]

Cheryl: …changing my status, should I so desire. At the moment, I don't.

My question actually goes back to -- partly question and partly comment -- on something that was raised by Adam, and responded to by you. That was in terms of looking at metrics in a cost-value evaluation, on interpretation and number of downloads.

I have to take off my ALAC chair hat, and put on my ACRALO representative hat.

Something that bothers me greatly are the simple measures done by normally people who have very good connectivity and familiarity with use of download tools and ability, even, to connect to the ICANN-style website. Having that as a real measure of the effectiveness of a single document in emerging economies. Particularly those in the Asia-Pacific region.

I think it is a highly-faulted and risky system, if one starts to measure a cost-effective analysis of cost-of-interpretation into a language such as Chinese -- which may be a second or familiar -- if not first -- language to a number of readers in a region. Where we don't see what viral marketing or what number of times it's transmitted in a data projector onto a wall at a meeting, and discussed [as a] point of view.

Yes. I'm getting very sensitive about it. But I just think that the cost per letter of interpretation versus the effectiveness of having properly and timely interpreted documents for something that is supposedly a global organization -- with an outreach [to the] the Internet end-user -- needs to be carefully measured, and not underestimated.

Kevin: Yes. I think you helped me clarify it in my head, so I can communicate it more effectively.

I think the point is, as you were addressing Adam's earlier question… We need to measure leadership as well as the cost-per-word and things like that. But you need to have a higher intelligence than just the technical tool, to measure the effectiveness of something. Otherwise, you won't get out of the box.

You need to know how we can make this effective -- not just cost-efficient, or to only do things that have high clicks or high-eyeballs-per-minute or per-document at the initial stages.

Cheryl: Yes. Then you get into all sorts of complications -- like bandwidth requirements and everything else.

Kevin: Right. Yes.

Cheryl: Even the ability to look at the form that you're offering the document in. Not everyone might be able to read or download a PDF, and make meaningful sense of it.

Kevin: Right.

I know, for example… I'll give you one little hint of what we're doing internally.

We had a group -- more than a brainstorming session -- or the next version of that -- on the website. On how to make it more useable and consistent.

I know as an English reader, it's hard for me to find financial information, at times. As someone who's drafting those things. So I can imagine if you were a non-native English speaker and a non-native financial speaker, how hard it would be to find the appropriate information.

So those are being addressed. That doesn't mean [don't] stop making the comments until we get it right. But I wanted you to know that we're not blind to that. We're not deaf to that. We're heading in the right direction, I believe, to keep the speed of what's happening.

Cheryl: Thanks, Kevin. I'm very heartened and pleased to hear that response.

Kevin: Good. Thank you, Cheryl. I appreciate that.

Avri, thank you for joining, I appreciate that. [inaudible] not just At-Large, as well.

V: [laughter]

Kevin: [inaudible], as well. I appreciate that.

Cheryl: Oh, look -- we're going to break down these silos. Don't worry about it. [laughter]

Kevin: All right. Great.

V: We like silos.

Cheryl: [laughter]

Kevin: Thank you very much. Okay. Good.

Well, we'll look forward to seeing you all in Sydney. Hopefully, I'll meet you. I know I'm meeting Avri with the GNSO Travel Group, particularly. If there are any other specific meetings that you'd like me to attend to present the budget or travel or any other areas in financial matters, I'd be happy to do that.

V: Okay. Thank you.

Kevin: Thank you.

V: Thank you, Kevin.

Kevin: Good night.

Vs: [farewells]

[session ends]