
PRAGUE – Constituent/Stakeholder Travel

Tuesday, June 26, 2012 – 18:00 to 19:00

ICANN - Prague, Czech Republic

Steve Atonoff:

This is a presentation on travel support. It's provided by ICANN for the various community stakeholders and others. This presentation was put together by myself, Steve Antonoff, Joseph de Jesus who is in the room with me, and Karen Lettner who is also part of the administrative support group at ICANN. Karen is back in Los Angeles, cleaning up after the mess that I made getting us moved from the Marina Del Ray offices to our new Los Angeles offices.

Next slide please. So the agenda for this meeting is as follows. We are going to discuss the FY 13 draft guidelines, a little bit of what's new, talk briefly about upcoming meetings and what to expect, as well as some planning for FY 14, and then time for questions. Given the intimate size of our group, I don't expect that this will take us more than about 20 or 30 minutes, just from a time management standpoint.

Next slide please. So what's new, we've got additional support for GNSO, the GAC, SSAC and At Large, so there were additional requests made all of which have been approved and then there's even further requests coming in for some of the many subgroups including BCIPC, ISP, the NCUC, the NPOC and NCSG Exec Groups. So from what was a very modest program just three or four years is continuing to expand, which in my opinion is actually a very good thing since it's fostering participation in the ICANN meetings.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

What else is new is that we continue to work on increasing the flexibility in the use of the allocated funds that are coming out of the budget. And that's one of the goals that we have is to continuously seek new ways to create flexibility in the use of these funds.

Next slide please. We've also made some changes in our reimbursement process, and we'll talk about that a little bit – oh, that's much better, thank you on adjusting the slides – and then we've also made a change on that in the past we've had travelers who would book their own hotels and then come back to us and seek reimbursement. And frequently what that did was people would book a room in the host hotel, ICANN prebooks rooms under the presumption that we will need X number of rooms including for the supported travelers.

As an example I believe, Joseph, our final count for this meeting was 170 or so supported travelers, plus ICANN staff, plus Board, plus Vendors, and so our meetings team blocks enough rooms for all of those folks. When supported travelers go off on their own and book their own hotel room and then submit it on an expense report, we've already paid for a room for them anyway. So now we double pay. And so the only way we think we can manage this is to just stop reimbursing folks for their own hotel bookings. And we want to communicate that to the entire community. That if you're a supported traveler, we will get you your room, please do not book it on your own.

Next slide please. In addition we are finding that we are having an increasingly difficult time getting folks actually booked through the process. This includes purchasing their airline tickets, ensuring that we have a room for them at the ICANN meeting, getting per diems

calculated and paid in a timely manner. So we are starting to put in place some time limits, that say if you were requesting reimbursement for a certain expense, that has to be done in a reasonably timely manner, I believe in the new guidelines we're saying within 60 days after the close of the ICANN meeting, you should submit an expense report, otherwise, it becomes just an accounting nightmare for the organization to deal with these one off expense reports five, and six and seven months after the meeting has closed.

In addition we send out an email to everyone who's been nominated for support, what we're saying is when you receive that email, you need respond within a certain time period. We do have travelers that sometimes respond two months after this welcoming email goes out. We spend a good deal of time and energy trying to track those people down to determine are they really going to the meeting, do they really want the support, can they be responsive to the travel agency and to our team in terms of getting them booked. So we're saying if you don't respond to the welcoming email within a certain timeframe, we're going to go back to the supporting group, report that and ask them if they want to nominate someone else. So the funds don't go away but we just need to keep moving forward, so that we're not chasing after people who are occupying a spot that could otherwise be used by a participant who will show up and participate in the meeting.

The same is true with responding to the travel agents. So the travel agency sends out itineraries to folks and if they don't respond, airfares change pretty dramatically with lack of response, and again we end up losing that space for somebody else to come. We're trying to encourage participation not lose participation from people who are

nonresponsive. So we're making these changes to try and encourage people to be responsive, and if they're not, they understand that somebody else may go in their place. And that's really the reasoning behind these changes on time limits.

Next slide please. What else is coming? We're doing some additional work on visa policy. We've had some very, very interesting challenges with travelers coming from certain countries going to other countries where obtaining their visa is a challenge, it's difficult. When this process was much smaller – if that's for me, I'm busy, no worry to Johnny, thank you. I'll give you a moment. Not a problem.

So we are changing the visa policy to better reflect what we're able to really do. We've in the past actually paid more in travel expenses for an individual to get their visa than to actually get to the ICANN meeting. And so we are working very diligently now with the hosts for the meetings as well as the governments in the countries where the meetings are held to try and facilitate the visa process and only on an exceptional basis will we even consider paying for travel for somebody to go a visa to travel to another country. There will be meetings where we may have no choice in order for travelers to get there. But where there is a choice, the traveler can't see say oh, gee I'd like to go to Paris to go get visa and ICANN you should pay for my airfare and a week in a hotel. So we're changing the policy to limit that to some degree.

There is a change in the wire transfer fees. We've learned that we have folks who were wiring \$20 US and paying \$50 US in wire transfer fees. And so we're saying there's got to be a better way to do that. We'll give you the cash at the subsequent meeting, and if you don't end up going

to the subsequent meeting, then we'll wire you the money and pay the fees. But for smaller amounts if you're going to be at the next meeting, we'd ask that you accept the cash at the next meeting instead of getting a wire.

One of the interesting things that we're learning about wire fees, when we wire, when ICANN wires, we instruct that ICANN will pay all wire transfer fees, both at the origination and the destination. What we're learning is, is that some receiving banks still charge the receiver in addition to the fees they've already charged ICANN. So we're trying to figure out long term how we deal with this, because we end up double paying these receivers' fees, because we've already designated at the front end of the wire process that we pay both ends. So just for those of you that are not aware, we pre-designate at our bank that we will pay the fees at both ends. That's why many people who are receiving wire transfers are not paying any fees, because ICANN is.

It's these certain banks that choose to in essence I'll use the term double-dip, if you're familiar with that term and charge the receiver a secondary fee. And then we also do not pay incidental fees at transit hotels and what this means is, we have travelers who because of the nature of their journey, end up having to overnight somewhere in the middle of their journey. And we do put them in a hotel. We actually pay for those hotels.

What we don't pay for is the mini bar and the movies and the incidental fees, included in their per diem is a calculation for a day of per diem for that overnighing. And so the individual is then responsible for any incidentals they may incur out of that per diem, that's the purpose of

the per diem. So we're just making it clear, that you're being paid a per diem, you are also not being paid for incidental fees incurred for that transit hotel stay.

Next slide please. Before I actually get into this slide, I think some of you if not all of you are aware we currently have public comment ongoing on the draft guidelines, and those public comments will close on July 13th. Some of what I've talked about we've already received some comment on and we will be addressing all of that in the response to the public comments in the middle of July.

So there was some comment about these visa fees for example. There has been some really excellent comments coming in and they will all be addressed at the closure of the public comment period on these guidelines, and then we will actually issue the final guidelines for FY 13 in advance of the Toronto meeting.

So what to expect upcoming. In Toronto; Canada, like most other nations does have visa requirements for travelers coming from certain nations. And while Toronto is a major international hub, again there are still flight limitations. Our team always looks at what is it going to take to get travelers to the meeting. One of the things that Joseph does is he takes a map of the world, he puts a big circle on the destination and then he takes literally colored tape and he starts literally plotting out the routes from every place we think we're going to have travelers coming from. He usually covers about 90% of all the travelers. We never know who's going to be nominated for support; but generally speaking, it's reasonably consistent from meeting.

And so Joseph starts to learn very early on what might be the limitations for certain specific travelers, so he can start planning with the travel agent early on, what's it going to take to get this traveler from where they live, where there's only two flights a week from their island to a major city where they can travel on to get to the ICANN meeting. We know we have those situations; we're trying now to get further and further in front of that. So that's part of the flight limitations.

And then just make everyone aware we have a very interesting challenge for Toronto, so the Canadian government has some very specific requirements on who is allowed to "work" in Canada. And so they have this work permit process and initially in discussions with Canadian government we were concerned that they wanted everyone who was going to work at the ICANN meeting was going to need a work permit. So one could argue that the members of the At Large community work at the ICANN meeting. And we have convinced the Canadian government that it is participation in a conference and while it is work in a sense, it doesn't rise to the definition of the Canadian government.

However, all of our technical staff, whether it's ICANN's IT staff, the very folks from Veriland that you see here and even our interpreter translators who are sitting in the back, they are technically working. And so we are diligently as we speak working on their work permits. They're probably laughing behind me knowing about all the information they had to provide to us that is now in process so that we can bring the translators who are familiar with ICANN, familiar with all of the DNS jargon that we use in these meetings without having to hire local translators, local audio visual folks, local IT staff who are not familiar

with ICANN, so it is our expectation that the Canadian government will approve all of these work permits and all of these folks will be able to come to the meeting and work. And I am reasonably confident after a conversation that I had earlier today that this in fact will happen. But just to make you all aware this is an actual requirement that ICANN has to comply with.

Next bullet point when these slides were prepared we knew the meeting was in Asia-Pacific, we now officially know that it is in Beijing, and I believe what that will mean is that the vast majority of folks traveling to the ICANN meeting will need a visa. This will include virtually all of the ICANN staff with perhaps the exception of Dr. Xiaodong Lee who is from China, he may be the only ICANN staffer who does not need a visa to come and obviously many of the participants in the ICANN meeting from our various ACs and SOs will likely need a visa and now that we know it's Beijing, believe it or not the work on this will begin when we get back from this meeting. So hard to imagine, but that's how much planning we have to put into this, so Joseph, good luck. So we'll get started on VISAs for Beijing and as soon as we have more information, we'll start publishing that out to the community, so that even though they may not have selected their supported travelers, the community can start to think about what's it going to take to get the folks we want to this meeting, to get them there.

The other thing I'd like to point out about FY 13, there are only two ICANN meetings in fiscal year 13, so a little unusual, it's a timing issue. Our fiscal year runs from July 1 to June 30, so what's been budgeted in the actual budget that's been approved by the Board is two meetings,

not three. So that's why the money looks a little different than it has in the past. Because Africa which in July of 2013 is actually fiscal year 14.

Next slide please. What that means is that there are four meetings in FY 14 and so everyone needs to plan around this. We have Africa in July, then Latin-America Caribbean region in November of 2013, Europe tentatively in March of 2014, sorry about that a typo, now that I'm looking at it, and North America tentatively in June of 2014. So those are the four meetings in FY 14.

Next slide please. So budget preparation for FY 14 beginning January 2013 as I think we've learned from some of our discussions earlier today, there were some requests that went into the FY 13 budget process, which began January of 2012 that got approved. I would strongly urge our various ACs and SOs to start thinking about FY 14 now, so that they can present what their requests would be for FY 14. I think the earlier that everyone gets into this process and starts to think it through, the higher success rate we're all going to have in getting those requests really into the process of the budget and getting approval for much of that, which personally I like to see.

And then of course the guidelines for FY 14, the draft will be published by June of 2013 again for public comment and discussion at the ICANN meeting.

Next slide please Joseph. So with that I'll open this up to any questions that folks have or comments on where we're at on stakeholder travel. Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: So you mentioned lots of changes, particularly the reimbursement process and you said that you pay the fees for reimbursement from the departure to arrival and I assure you that I have to pay fees every time I get home. So next time I will pray for you to send me zip code from which you've sent the reimbursement, so I can go out to my bank and ask them why they have collected a second fee from me.

Steve Antonoff: I think I will go back to our Finance Team and discuss this with them and see what we can do to provide evidence to anyone who is being asked to pay a secondary fee, so they can go back to their bank and say a fee has already been paid to you for receiving this, why am I being charged a secondary fee.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you. The second point the incidental costs of hotels and transit hotels that is, you said that internet is not included and it's an incidental cost. To me that's not an incidental. Access to the internet must be the base wherever we go we are still working you know Steve, so even when we're traveling we're still working. For instance we spend a week here and that costs us money, but at least we can work remotely through the internet. So if we do have internet access when we get to the meeting that makes a lost day.

Steve Antonoff: ... your request, we will certainly take that under advisement and come back, thank you.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, as regards visa problems, this is a big issue for certain people particularly. Particularly for Africa and because I represent Africa I will mention the topic. So in the future, if we can envisage the visa process early enough for the traveler to go through the procedure and looks at what he has to do and tells you what the steps to follow are, what he has to do, so whether if he has to go to another country and he needs a visa, he can tell you and you can check that Steve. You always have means to check whether they really need to go to that other country to get the visa and what the neighbor's country would be where they could get a visa where is the least expensive that is.

Because we can't ask volunteers who come here who spend a whole week for a meeting to pay themselves for travel to go get a visa at another country. I don't think that's very reasonable.

Steve Antonoff: Understood. Alan, I was quite surprised to not see you earlier.

Alan Greenberg: I had a conflict, but I am here now.

Steve Antonoff: Thank you. We'll take that under advisement Tijani, thank you. I will say that sometimes the challenge is that by the time the traveler is responsive to the process, it's too late to follow the less expensive way to get the visa, and then they still expect ICANN to pay them to now have to fly somewhere to get a visa, when they could have done it had

they responded three weeks earlier via a courier method, or some other method to get a visa. And it's balancing those types of issues that we're trying to address.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I fully understand what you say, but if we start the process early, and if people are responsive, normally there is no problem.

Steve Antonoff: Understood. Anything else, Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Now, I have to see the slides on there and I will tell you, thank you.

Steven Antonoff: Questions from anyone else? So Alan, since you've just joined, I'll reiterate the fact that clearly the guidelines are currently up for public comment, the public comments are coming in. We will respond to those at the close of the public comment period. I noticed you had at least one public comment in there. And we're seeing some very good ideas coming in and there is probably some updating of text that needs to take place in the guidelines. I appreciate some of the observation that's in there. I found it both accurate and well-timed.

So I do appreciate that, we'll formally respond to all of that, and then when we publish the final guidelines, not the draft, I think you'll see that there's quite a bit of that input that will be taken into account. So very much appreciated. Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Last point concerning the request for reimbursement, and you said sometimes it is better to be reimbursed under upcoming meeting. For me it is not the right way to do because it is not – I am always able to pay and wait for the next meeting. So the transfer is a very good thing, it is never a small amount since it is the per diem for the week. So I would check with my bank concerning the fees and I prefer to be reimbursed before the travel.

Steve Antonoff: So I just want to make sure that I'm clear on this. What we're discussing in terms of asking folks to wait until to the subsequent meeting is when the amounts to be reimbursed are nominal, not when it's a large amount. Clearly when somebody is to be reimbursed their per diem or if they've had a significant expense that's to be reimbursed, we will make those reimbursements immediately. It's when we receive a final reimbursement, somebody ended up having to pay \$20 fee to get their visa, and they've received all their other money and now a month after the meeting, they send us a bill for \$20 and it's going to cost us \$60 to send another wire. What we're asking is if they're going to be at the next meeting, can we just hand them \$20.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: And also I have a question about the why the ticket fare cannot be paid at the same time of the per diem. Since the ticket is bought the bill is sent to you, you have everything and you said we will not pay until you come back from the meeting.

Steve Antonoff:

So this is an interesting balance, this is the whole issue of should we even pay the per diems in advance of the meeting. We do wire per diem to supported travelers who then don't come to the meeting. They now have the money because we've wired it in advance and they're not at the meeting. If we then also paid for their plane ticket, we've now wired even more money, that we're probably not – well, I shouldn't say probably, that's an unfair statement, that we possibly won't get back, and we have from time to time not been able to recover money that we have wired to supported travelers.

So as a balance on this, what we've said is we'll wire the per diem in advance under the presumption you're coming to the meeting, but you should attend the meeting to get reimbursed for the airfare. Alan?

Alan Greenberg:

Two things. On that subject, you're correct, if you wire them the money for the ticket, you would be out, but that's not very different than if you had bought the ticket for them and for some reason they didn't come. In neither case have they pocketed the money directly. In the latter case, they may be able to use the ticket for a trip somewhere else nefariously. Has that really been a major problem?

Steve Antonoff:

So to answer that if we've purchased the ticket, we control the tickets through our travel agency, we oftentimes can get most, if not all of the money back, because we control the ticket. If the individual has

purchased the ticket themselves and we have reimbursed them for it, we have no control over that ticket whatsoever.

In fact if we call the airline if the person has a problem in transit and they ask us to help, and we call the airline, they won't recognize us since we were not involved in the acquisition of the ticket. Whereas if we've purchased the ticket through our agency, we can assist in any issues with the traveler in getting to the meeting or home from the meeting, plus if the traveler doesn't make their flight or chooses not to come, we have recourse for recovery against the funds that have been expended.

Alan Greenberg:

Yes, I wish I could get you to buy me one of those refundable tickets, all the tickets you ever buy for me are not worth a penny, other for reuse under my name later.

Steve Antonoff:

Well it really depends sometimes on the airline and it depends as well where the ticket is coming from, the country where it's coming out of.

Alan Greenberg:

I understand.

Steve Antonoff:

We frequently have tickets where there is a charge, they're called non-refundable tickets, but in fact if you pay \$150 or \$200 fee you can recover the money. And so if we spend \$2,000 on ticket, we'll spend the \$150 to get the \$2,000 back.

Alan Greenberg: I was being somewhat snide. A real question though, what was the intent, what was the motivation behind the new rule saying you will not pay for the traveler's wire transfer fees?

Steve Antonoff: So earlier in the discussion before you arrived, when we wire, we actually instruct our bank to pay the fees at both ends. So we are actually paying both the origination and the destination wire transfer fees at origination. What we're finding is that some of our recipients, their banks are also charging them. And I don't know why the bank does that, since they've been paid as a destination bank under the original wire transfer instruction.

So the term I used earlier was I think the bank is double-dipping because they think they can. Tijani raised a very interesting point which is if we could provide information around that original wire transfer instruction, you could go back to your bank and say you were paid, this was the instruction. I know you were paid, because I have proof you were paid. Why are you now charging me again? And it would be an interesting discussion for the traveler to have with their bank, their home bank where they're receiving.

Alan Greenberg: Well, I would have phrased it somewhat differently. Before instituting a new rule I would have picked a couple of examples where it's happening and investigate it and it may well take investigation from both sides, not just from one side. I mean when I get the money, I don't have any

tracing information and it's very difficult to trace, but between the two of us and forgive me, Tijani I'm not living in Tunisia where it's hard to contact them, I'm living in Canada.

We should be able to figure out where the ten bucks is going before penalizing the travelers for something banks may or may not be doing. I know there are examples where you may be paying, if you hadn't paying the wire transfer fee, maybe I'd be paying \$25, so there may well be a portion that you are prepaying and that I get charged anyway. I don't know. You're the only people in the recent years that have sent me wire transfers. But in the past I've always paid a fee.

So let's investigate it again. It's going to take a little bit of time, but at least we'll learn something about the system, before we penalize travelers who already are getting dinged in a number of small ways. You know my taxi fare to the airport is \$40, I'm not asking you to pay for it. On a trip like this where I get an extra day of per diem travel each way, I'm floating. When I go to Toronto it's going to be a real rough one. So let's not penalize people for arbitrary reasons without at least trying to find out why.

Steve Antonoff:

Noted.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

But Alan it is not – you will not lose anything in getting the original sheet of transfer. You will use it, if you can use it. If you don't want to use it, it's not a problem, but to have it, it's a very good thing. And I know when I go to my bank and if they don't want to listen to me, I can go to

the [card] and they know that I can do that. So they will think three times before saying no, we cannot do anything.

Steve Antonoff: Other questions or comments, either. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I have my standard one, and it's the one I implied in my – I don't remember if it was in my comment or the ALAC comment, but I'd like to work together to minimize the number of times you have to treat something as a special case, where the request can be readily traced as being reasonable. I will give the specifics time and we're talking about – who we're talking about I'll tell you if you want, but it's someone trustworthy who saved \$1,500 on airfare but had to stay two days extra in a hotel.

And ICANN's position is tough; you're getting a vacation, pay for your own hotel. And that's not reasonable.

Steve Antonoff: Noted. I'll respond in this manner. The challenge is where is the water level? So if a person stays two extra days and saves \$1,500 and we pay \$200 a night for the hotel, so we've net saved \$1,100, but if they've stayed five extra days and we save the same \$1,500, now we've saved maybe \$500. What if we only saved \$100, where does the line get drawn, because at \$100, are we supposed to be paying the per diem for all of those extra days that the person is now staying to save us money?

Alan Greenberg:

I think it depends on the circumstances. In this particular case, the airline only flies into here several times a week. The more expensive airlines fly every day and they charge a lot more. And the other aspect is you have to look at who you're talking about. Is this a one-time traveler that you've never seen before? I've run customer service organizations, and you know when someone calls in and identifies themselves, you look them up on your database, and if they have a tick beside them, this is someone you should listen because they really aren't bullshitting you.

And there is a difference between travelers who are in one category and others, it's maybe not completely fair, but some people are not going to try to rip you off for \$100, or \$200. And others might, I've run operations like this, and yes there are some people who abuse it badly and others are more trustworthy, and you've got to differentiate it how you interpret the rules.

Steve Antonoff:

The challenge we've got in the differentiation of it is that ICANN actually has limited if any authority over those people. So if it was staff members, we clearly have authority over those who are trying to cheat the system and can deal with them. But for a volunteer, I can't say to a stakeholder group you have to throw this person off of your supported list, because they're trying to cheat the system, we have no control. So we have to treat everyone the same, even though we know that some of them are nefarious and some are not.

Alan Greenberg: No, I don't think you have to treat them the same. You have staff people who can tell you who to put the "good guy" tick beside and not – and you don't have to publicize it.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I was able to say the same. When we spoke – when I asked you a question and you responded in the same way, I couldn't tell you that you know people. I don't think that everyone will take the money off the ticket and will not come or will change it for other – reimbursement you if there is a failure, if there is a problem. Some will not, but you know that some will.

Steve Antonoff: And the challenge for us is being put in the position of making that very subjective determination as to who's nefarious and who is not. And while I appreciate the fact that it may appear to be obvious, again, I'm not sure that's the right position for our team to be making those judgments.

Alan Greenberg: Then you pay the price number one of a lot of extra manual intervention which shouldn't be necessary, and on top of that you're treating some people – some people get worn down and stop asking you when you say no the first time, and it really puts [them] in an unfair position.

Steve Antonoff: Understood. Anyone else.

Male: Just listening about what Alan’s contribution, I mean could you then contact the Chair of the AC or the SO regarding this issue, regarding that, would that help?

Alan Greenberg: Let me answer for him, so I don’t embarrass, so he doesn’t embarrass us. There are some chairs you could call and ask that question to, others will say I don’t want any part of that decision.

Male: Yes, yes, that’s right.

Steve Antonoff: This is strictly my opinion, not the opinion of ICANN, or as I like to jokingly say, not of this station or of its advertisers, so this is strictly my opinion. I would really encourage the community in general to establish some guidelines around this that ICANN could then follow.

And if the community could agree that the chair for example had some authority to deal with what I’ll call problematic travelers for lack of a better term, and it was more codified, so that it was clear that the community was supporting the fact that problematic travelers are just not going to be tolerated. Then I think Alan we could move far closer to what you’re proposing which is – if people are behaving like adults, clearly we can then respond to that. It’s very unfortunate that we have to treat everyone at the lowest common denominator. I personally don’t like that.

My own personal instinct is to want to do what you've suggested. We just find ourselves in the very uncomfortable position of being unable to do that, because of the very unusual circumstance of this construct.

Alan Greenberg:

I think as I said you'd find some chairs who will be quite willing to do it, some who as a matter of policy would not, you're not going to find everyone agreeing and that's life. But luckily people are divided into roughly four different groups or five groups, and you could make the distinction should you choose, and I dare say you make the distinctions anyway; you just make them at a more senior level.

And that same senior level; I mean I know you've treated me well on occasion and it's cost you an extra \$200 and I know you'd be inclined to say no to someone else who you knew had abused the situation. So you end up making the same decision, it's just a real hassle and it costs you and your staff a lot of time, and I think there could be ways to do it. I mean a related issue is – this is my pet peeve, you've heard it from me before, you know don't make a traveler who has got to be at a meeting at nine o'clock in the morning, arrive at midnight the night before after traveling for 36 hours.

And your rules right now are such that if my flight were to arrive at five, it's scheduled to arrive at five minutes after midnight, you'd let me come in a day earlier, because if I start on Saturday, you wouldn't ask me to come in on Saturday five minutes after midnight, you'd let me come in on Friday five minutes after midnight, which essentially is Thursday. If the flight is scheduled to arrive ten minutes before midnight, I have to arrive on Friday, and that level of reasonableness, I

think you need to adapt to that, and again it's a matter of who you can trust and who you can't.

I summarized the methodology which you used when at a meeting a few meetings ago, I was refused a specific route, and the way it could be summarized is you would pay for an overnight room if I could only use it for a few hours, but if I could actually sleep in it for the whole night, you won't pay for it, and that makes little sense.

Steve Antonoff: Noted.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I know Steve, it's not easy for you, I understand very, very well, that you don't want to be but I think that there is a problem here. Sometimes as he said you pay for five hours in the hotel in transit, but you don't pay one extra night in the venue. This is a problem. Flexibility you said, this is the flexibility.

Steve Antonoff: So I think that my take away on this particular one is to go off and do some thinking about how we can construct some guideline that would make sense in terms of arrival. I don't know what the right answer is, but I think there is a better answer out there, and we'll go off and consider that.

Alan Greenberg: I do have about six memos on file that I could pull up if you'd like.

Steve Antonoff: I'm sure you do.

Alan Greenberg: But again it comes down to is this person deliberately picking the flight that comes in a five minutes before or after midnight, so they can get a day of vacation into it. You know are they nefariously picking that flight knowing that that's the one that will get them their day of vacation on site, can that happen? You bet!

It comes down to a judgment call on the people which is either going to be made de facto or it's going to be made at your level. And I think your time is worth more than that for – there is a very significant number of the travelers who you would – if you had to say can I trust them, you'd say yes. Others you don't know, other's you'd say no, there is no bloody way I can trust them. I know they're going to try to get anything out of us that they can. Do you want to have to reveal who is in each category? No. But implicitly you know who is in each category.

Steve Antonoff: Well, we could be forced to have to reveal that. Because if we treated two people differently and it came out in a meeting and someone said why did you do it for this person and not for that person? Our only possible answer would be, because we happen to know that person is nefarious.

Alan Greenberg: On the trip that you refused me that way, another member of the same group was treated the other way, so there wasn't consistency. I let it go, but I understand your problem.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No, but Steve you still have the means to verify if he is making it this way to get one extra day or one tourism day. Now with the internet, it's a few minutes and you know what are the whole possibilities and you will see that if it is fair or not fair.

Steve Antonoff: Understood.

Alan Greenberg: It's a difficult job.

Steve Antonoff: If there weren't problems and challenges they wouldn't need us. Anything else? Well, thank you all for attending. I deeply appreciate your input. I think we've made progress over the past few years and much of that progress has come thanks to the valuable input we receive. Lots of room for improvement and we'll continue to work on it. So thank you all very much for coming.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you, Steve for your openness. It's not the first time that you prove that you are open and you interact very positively and I think that you and your staff beginning from Matt who is with us now tell the

others now you are open and I do appreciate it. We had sometimes some troubles, problem at midnight, after midnight and they call and Matt answer it. I never forget it. And now we are discussing improvement and you are open and this is very important, thank you, thank you, thank you.

[End of Transcript]