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**Submission:**

The FY12 Travel Support Guidelines DRAFT were posted for public comment; a copy of the FY12 Travel Support Guidelines DRAFT can be found [here](http://www.icann.org/en/topics/travel-support/draft-travel-support-guidelines-fy12-14apr11-en.pdf)

<http://www.icann.org/en/topics/travel-support/draft-travel-support-guidelines-fy12-14apr11-en.pdf>

The Travel Support Guidelines reiterates the Purpose of Community Travel Support.
 **FY11**
Note: The Travel Support Guidelines clarify the travel support currently provided in FY11 to all the SO/AC’s namely ASO, At-Large, ccNSO, GAC, GNSO, RSSAC, SSAC. This amounted to support for about 60 community members to attend each meeting at a FY11 budget cost of 1.1m$ and an forecast actual cost of 0.9 m$. The saving is mainly due to meeting two of three locations in the Americas.

Comment: The BC appreciate the difficulty in estimating this cost in Budget without knowing meeting location.

Note: The Travel Support Guidelines also clarify the travel support currently provided in FY11 to the non constituent stakeholder groups namely Fellowship Program and Nominating Committee for 47 members per meeting at FY11 budget cost included within these groups own budgets of 350 k$ and an forecast actual cost of 528 k$.

Question: We note the Board travel guidelines are not included in this document and ask in which document this can be found?

**FY12**

Note: The Travel Support Guidelines estimate support for 66 community members to attend each meeting at a FY12 budget cost of 1.1m$ plus 512 k$ for the non constituency stakeholder groups.

Comment: The BC notes differences between the Travel Support Guidelines and the FY12 Draft Budget and Operating Plan and expects the to be brought in line following the final Board approval of the FY12 Budget in the planned second version of the Travel Support Guidelines to be published for comment before implementation for the Dakar Meeting.

**Section 6 Community Travel Support Guidelines – Supporting Details**

Quote: “Selection process: Each community group adopts a selection/allocation process to determine who from the particular community group should receive funding, in order to meet the policy making needs of the group. Examples of a selection/allocation process include: a travel committee with members of each constituency (or geographic region) or an independent selection committee (e.g., the Fellowship program) that follows a publicly posted process to select their ICANN funded participants for each ICANN meeting; or the community could ask ICANN staff to execute a process based on some criteria the community group identifies. While the calculation of travel support funding is based in part on the size of each council and its liaisons, the community group is encouraged to support participants based on what will best serve their community’s policy development work.”

Comment: The BC support that it should be up to the constituency to determine who should receive funding in order to best determine policy-making needs of the groups. The funding elements (travel, hotel, per diem) should be divisible based on the recommendation of the individual group. The mechanism of the selection of the recipient should be self determined by that group and described in their operating practices The BC has such a mechanism.

Comment: The BC believes that if a community group does not have a mechanism they could turn to ICANN staff for help and assistance in developing one.

Comment: The BC believes that funding must be dependent on a commitment to active attendance at the entire ICANN public meeting with a focus on the purpose agreed for their participation and ask the travel department to seriously consider the implementation of this across the community.
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This document was posted to BC members for review and comment on 24-Jun-2011.