

---

MARRAKECH – RSSAC Work Session: RSO Funding  
Tuesday, June 25, 2019 – 10:30 to 12:00 WET  
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

FRED BAKER:                      Jeff, this is your show.

JEFF OSBORN:                      Let me just open this up. I had one late change. And there we go. Good morning. My name is Jeff Osborn. I'm with ISC and this morning we're covering our next step in the RSSAC funding function. For those of you who were here in June, in the June meeting, I think we got an awful lot done. I'll do a blanket apology that I care a lot and I'm very passionate about getting this right and not getting it wrong. So, in advance, I'll apologize to Fred and this time I expect this to be much smoother. We've sort of worked through some of the complicated issues and we've gotten answers back.

So, the second thing I'd like to say is thank you all for getting answers back from your organizations. It was kind of a silly exercise in some sense, as I had an awful lot of people say these are dumb questions. But getting it back, it feels tremendously more valuable that we are remarkably in sync on a couple of things and I think it sort of establishes a groundwork that's going to make taking this forward better.

---

***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.***

---

If we can go to the second slide, I purposely removed the table of results because we've had some people who have asked that that set of answers be not yet written in stone. So, instead you get to admire Brenda. Brenda is a gray wawa and has deep thoughts about funding for RSSAC.

The summaries, rather than the data, are on the right. This kind of looks funny without a table there. And it's paraphrased. So, again, this is our initial set of conclusions. We asked whether your organization could be funded. We had, out of the 12 organizations, the three US agencies said no for what I think is obvious reasons, and all nine of the others said yes under the certain conditions.

To the second question, the US agencies had really good reasons they couldn't be funded and they varied from the long version of "duh" to with a lot of work, you could probably fund research but it's complicated. Anybody stop me if I'm mischaracterizing this but I've read this like 30 times, so I'm pretty sure I'm [on top of it].

"Would you sign an MOU?" was the question where an MOU legally is sort of conversationally like a contract but does not carry teeth. To review, it was interesting to learn there are three kinds of agreements. The gentleman's agreement which means nothing except for that you both said the same thing, the Memo of Understanding in which you've documented the same things

---

but it carries very, very little power of law and the contract. The contract has four components. I learned more than I needed to. But we're talking about service-level agreements that look much more like a contract.

So, other than my own organization, ISC, there was an agreement that people would sign a Memo of Understanding if the terms were completely agreeable.

Then, would you accept funding? Again, the nine commercial-ish organizations including education said yes, and as to "Would you sign some form of agreement of any kind while accepting funding to operate the root service?" Again, we got basically the nine people.

The three exceptions, if it wasn't obvious, have all made words to the effect that they are willing to go along with this. They're simply not commercial organizations, so the funding isn't relevant.

This is the heart of the matter, so if anybody either doesn't understand or has a question on this part, it would be a really good time to bring it up now. Brad, did I do that in a way that's reasonable for your part? Okay.

I don't know whether this is the setting for it, but if I end up with time, I'd be really curious to hear what was involved in trying to

---

get permission or information out of each of your organizations on this? I literally read this to the chairman of the board who said yes, N/A, no, yes, yes. And that was the discussion. But I'm assuming this went through steps, this went up through layers. And if it's none of my business, I'll wait until after the second [inaudible]. But I think it's interesting to see how far away we are from the ability to make policy around money because it's entirely possible that this organization just isn't going to be able to finish this process. Next.

Again, this is pretty much what we agreed to. Again, if I'm misstating this, let me know because this is sort of us putting stakes in the ground as to what we can do next. Next.

So, in coming up with a financial model, I've gone everywhere from we need to have "a" financial model to we need two financial models to we need twelve. I'm currently at ten, where I think there's going to be one for the governments and nine individual ones for the individuals.

I'm really wondering – and maybe today we can even make a decision – how far we need to go as this group in determining what we want to do because making financial commitments and getting financial estimates that are reasonable out of our organizations just might be out of the bailiwick of the people here. I'm not sure whose organization sent them here to make

---

financial decisions or was expecting them to but I'm getting a smirk from Russ that tells me probably not everybody. Is that a reasonable statement?

BRAD VERD:

I would think that's a reasonable statement but I'm not trying to put words in anybody else's mouth. This is the Technical Expert Group for RSSAC for the root server system, not the financial expert.

JOE OSBORN:

Okay. So, one of the odd things we're going to have to get to at some point with this discussion is ... Well, let's see if my next page even addresses it. We're going to get to the end, but what we do with this is going to be unlike other things.

Basically, what these models would consist of is somebody pays an RSO or the next slide – not mysteriously says or nobody pays a government agency.

So, the idea was there's a baseline payment for an SLA and everybody from Goran down has said if the root server operators are doing something they hadn't done before, then somebody should pay money.

---

It's my understanding that this whole shooting match started because there was a requirement for some additional form of a synonym of control. They never said control but it's kind of what it felt like. Responsibility or feedback or something. The idea that the root server operation was not under the – what's the word I'm looking for?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Accountability.

JEFF OSBORN: It was not accountable to ICANN, thank you. So, they were looking for some form of accountability. I think it's important to remember that all of these steps are in regards to us trying to figure out how to be accountable to ICANN.

And this is where I get frustrated because what they tell us is, "Go write a policy." It's like, wait a minute, you're the one who has the need and the money. It's an odd position to be in. It feels like we're turning into the supplicant and that will continue to feel odd to me.

So, where you get this baseline payment is a good question. We're all unusual in that, if not you guys, somebody in your organization knows exactly what it has cost you to operate a root for a long time. We've got it really pretty clearly for seven years and a good

---

idea for closer to 20. If they picked up the historic cost going forward, I'm sure we could give them a lot of input. If they want to buy T-shirts for the softball team that F-root operates, they're not going to get anything.

So, somewhere in between there lies what we're talking about. Do we want to base this on existing service, the desired level of service, the forecast level of service, some agreed rate of increase and capacity?

I would have said the size we are now would have stood alone except that I keep hearing about people from OCTO giving speeches about the imminent failure of the root server system because we're not catching up fast enough. So, they're implying this needs to be an increasing amount of money over time to get us to some level of sufficient.

So, there's a baseline that should cost money and then there are additional pieces of functionality that [inaudible] imagine you could a la carte off this thing.

It would be a failure I think if they started from the point of view of saying, "Nice job. Now we want you to do all these additional things." Rather, I think that baseline is kind of key.

I could see things like additional reporting or instances or triggers. When you have a latency exceed this point, do

---

something. Fire up turbines or put balloons into the affected area and [inaudible] the DNS from [inaudible] something.

Again, the ICANN Organization, which always gets mealy mouthed into or the community or the something else, but whoever the hell those people are must have some outcomes desired. So, having us come to them with what it is that they want strikes me as something that will ultimately be frustrating.

BRAD VERD: I understand what you're saying but let me rephrase.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay.

BRAD VERD: And I'm going to look – Carlos and Ozan, help me out here. So, ICANN Org executes, implements, whatever you want to call it what the community wants. Does that make sense? So ICANN Org would not be putting the SLAs on us, even though you might be signing a contract ... You'd be signing a contract with them, but whatever those SLAs or what they desire would be defined by the community and then implemented or executed by ICANN Org. Does that make sense? Does that make it a little bit more clear for you?



---

JEFF OSBORN: Yeah, when you've had a big [inaudible] of ICANN, that makes sense. Otherwise, when I got here, it didn't.

BRAD VERD: I get it. I'm just saying that ICANN Org is not the one who's going to be defining the requirements. They're just going to be executing what the community has said. These are the requirements. I believe that this ends up with a contract with ICANN and then the SLAs or whatever the requirements are, they're executing what the community has defined. You just got to stretch the rubber band in a different direction. Think about it a little differently. Does that make sense?

JEFF OSBORN: I apparently haven't had enough Kool-Aid.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think one of the reasons for ... Looking for the right phrases here. It could be that the community doesn't know what it wants, and right now there is no body within the ICANN community looks at the future of this. The strategic and planning function that we've been talking about. So, we need to have that one engaged first in order to do the specification that Brad mentioned, and only then

---

can we turn this around with the contract and funding function and so on.

JEFF OSBORN: Au contraire. ICANN likes to present itself as driven by the community but there is actively a squad of folks in OCTO who are traveling the world telling of us failing and how they would do a better job of replacing this organization with their own series of hyper roots and a big global beefy L-root. So, they can't have it both ways. They can't be sitting back waiting for the community and rolling hand grenades into the other tents.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think you're conflating ICANN community and I have Org here.

JEFF OSBORN: Guilty.

BRAD VERD: I will add that we have talked to OCTO. The messaging has changed recently. I agree with you that that messaging has happened in the past. It has very recently changed in slide decks that were given to us. We're trying to address that.

---

FRED BAKER: Yeah. I gave a list of specific complaints based on the APNIC talk and the Russian talk to David in Kobe, and between there and then here we have met with him twice and there's been a change. We'll see if new decks come out saying those things. But yeah, there certainly have been messages to the effect of the [RSS] doesn't work. Well, it's the one thing that has never had a minute of downtime.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay. I'm going to process my suspension of disbelief for a second. Going from one contentious item to the next, the fourth bullet up here also is something that we have been avoiding that we're going to have to stop avoiding at some point.

We had always talked in 037 about something not making it through the "you must be this tall to ride this ride" part. The reason that becomes important is there are two classes of RSOs that somebody would be paying for. The one is that attempting to maintain its level of service with some changes and improvements and the other that are attempting to catch up to the minimum standard.

BRAD VERD: If I may, I think a piece of the funding piece, why this becomes important is that if there are some that need to catch up, you

---

need to figure out what that budget is and how much is that. We keep getting asked, “What’s this going to cost?” Part of that is figuring ... You have to define what good looks like and then what does it cost to get up there.

JEFF OSBORN:

So well put. Thank you very much. Anyway, I’m trying to define those things. The next slide is brief. It’s just the idea of the unpaid MOU from the agencies. I didn’t know what else to say other than it will look similar, but because there isn’t money changing hands, there wasn’t a whole lot to it.

So, next page. I think we needed to write a policy or policies because that’s how anything gets done here. So, the additional building of frames or designs of what these should look like and the writing of policies, I didn’t know which slide to put first. So, this is the one of which I am more ignorant.

I’ve indirectly been told a number of times that the way this happens is that we write a policy and the community manages to absorb it or approve it or something and then that comes down to us.

So, in reading all of the great cartoons that are on the ICANN website about forming policies, I think I’m at the point where the

---

faceless little man hands the faceless little woman a rectangle and I think it's a policy. That's as much detail as I could find.

So, if we go to the next slide where we're back in language I understand, this was a strawman, where it basically said, okay, let's take the metrics to the point that we have them and try to put some numbers on a piece of paper and if somebody said, "What can you actually hand to somebody and say approve this?" this is the best I could come up with for now.

Just as you don't put a string of decimals after the figures are no longer significant, this doesn't have detail because it stopped being significant. This was operating the P-root. I hope we don't ... Never really had one. At guaranteed levels. And the four things that were easiest to measure in the metrics table were the UDP and TCP versions of IPv4 and v6 and that was latency availability, whatever they were measured, every five minutes. And then in addition, [inaudible], staleness. And then BPQ was TBD in almost its entirety.

Then, similarly, there was a strawman version of this for the RSSs in total and I thought it would be presumptuous and a waste of time for me to try to get ahead of what the metrics group is doing because I'm really suspecting this is going to feed into at least what a big part of the legal portions of what we're doing are going to do.

---

I've been sitting in on each of the metrics sessions and following them and I think Duane's been doing a good job with it but it's a slow, frustrating slog. It really is.

Again, I think this suffers from the ... We are loathed to say somebody is too short for this, because we say somebody is too short, it's going to be several somebody's and then that's all going to get awkward. Let's go to the next slide.

FRED BAKER: May I ask a question before you go to the next slide?

JEFF OSBORN: Sure.

FRED BAKER: Root server SOA staleness. So, we're serving 95% stale data?

JEFF OSBORN: There's a long story in here.

FRED BAKER: I have a feeling that should be less [inaudible].

---

JEFF OSBORN: If you read the document, you're right. That doesn't make sense like that. It made sense with the document because it was more a matter of how many of them are the old one, and it should be less than 5%. So, that should be more than 95%. But if I give this again, I will change it. Do you want to put any color on that, Duane?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Jeff, may I make a quick interruption? I just wanted to mention that from ICANN board, we have Akinori and Lito here and Akinori is chair of BTC And Lito is the point man for basically [inaudible]. Just for the room to know.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay. Anyway, the strawman was in about five minutes you could fill this out and I did in various versions and made it look like a contract instead, in return for X hundred thousands of dollars per unit of time Organization P is willing to do these where the penalties for failing to each of the whatevers are monetized in such a fashion, measured quarterly, paid annually. It is not difficult to do except that none of us have agreed yet that anything like this is a wise thing to do yet. But, as I said before, I'm suspecting there are going to be somewhere between nine and twelve organizations individually negotiating something like this.

---

BRAD VERD: If I may. I agree that there will be 9, 10, 12 organizations negotiating contracts. What I don't think – at least what I hope – it would be negotiated would be what the metrics are. The metrics should be defined here and they should be plugged into what the contract is and what would be negotiated would be the Ts and Cs, the terms, the liability. All those legal things. But these metrics as defined by the community should be followed.

JEFF OSBORN: I would just like to remind you that the last time I asked for a yes or no answer out of this group I got six answers.

FRED BAKER: One thing that I believe you're saying on this slide, Jeff, is that effectively these numbers represent threshold. Is that what's the picture in your mind?

BRAD VERD: I'm sorry, I don't mean to put words in your mouth, Jeff, but these are not anything that should be read from the metrics working group or work party as something that should be followed or looked at. This is just an example.



---

JEFF OSBORN: This was just restating what their group has done so that I'm consistent with what they have yet which is not ready for publishing, right?

FRED BAKER: But of all of the various discussions, the hardest one that we've had to reach so far – and we are not there yet, I don't believe – and that is the threshold value. I think that's sort of a first stab at it here is what I'm saying I think.

JEFF OSBORN: Yeah. It is impossible so we're only going to do one of them.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. I just want to comment. These are also just ripped out context to a large degree. So, you cannot really use them as they stand here. You need a lot more context around them before you can relate to them in a good way.

JEFF OSBORN: This is a slide I wanted to be legible. It's hugely under-detailed.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Understood. I just wanted to be sure that everyone understands that.

---

JEFF OSBORN: Yeah. Ozan? We can go back if you want but I kind of almost wanted to start with the action items. I think we need to do something different to get to the next step. One of those may be, if we want to write policies, we have to have – I would absolutely volunteer to be a part of it but I am not a work group. I have not really been a working member of one. I sat on the sidelines before. I haven't ever written a policy. I've written a ton of proposals but they're very different from the way this is done.

BRAD VERD: Can everybody mute their computer, please? If you're in the Zoom room, mute the Zoom room, not just your computer.

JEFF OSBORN: Should we use the benchmark set by the metrics group? I think as a working plan we probably agree yes because we have nothing better to shoot for, for now.

Then, how and when to coordinate with ICANN. That again is the part where I was saying before. I'm frustrated that we're supposed to develop the thing but they're the ones ... Some value of ICANN asked us for this and some other value of ICANN doesn't know what we're talking about and we need to circle that square. Liman?

---

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Big question. Is this something we want to put in place before we have the structures that we hope is the result of RSSAC 037 and the continuation of that?

JEFF OSBORN: Could you repeat that?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Is this something that you envisage that we put in place before the RSSAC 037 and the continuing work is done and we have the structures in place that follows that? Because I see a lot of value in doing this work and put it on [inaudible] and say this is the contract and the title, things we want, when the funding function is put in place and when you have assigned all these functions that we talked about to various bodies that can execute them. But until then, I'm a bit uncomfortable talking about the end points – or rather, the other end point of this contract.

One is obviously the root server operator and I'm fine with that, but the other end point, I don't really know who will be signing the contract from the other side. To me, that's not a done deal yet.

---

JEFF OSBORN: One of the things that makes this whole process so odd is that we had been kicking the money can down the road for most of a decade, where in any normal organization the board's first question would be, "What is this going to cost me?" And it was in fact their first question. When I go back with this and say ICANN would like thus and so and this and that, the first thing I'm asked is, "What is this going to cost me?"

So, the fact that we're able to live in a world where we kick costs down the road, it's kind of fun but it's really abnormal. So, leaving this all for last is really a strange world.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sorry, I didn't mean that. I meant we can do a lot of work but we don't need to specify who the other party is yet. We would like a contract to work [out this].

BRAD VERD: I think the answer is yes, Liman. I think this is just doing work, creating ... So, I think, the conversation I've had with Fred and Jeff and the admin team is that this work, as you said, we can work on it now. We can have lots of discussions. We can come up with templates, what ideas are and what not. And then this is a body of work that it's not a document that RSSAC is going to publish. This is a body of work that's handed off to the GCW as an

---

input for how they finalize the model. Here's a bunch of work that RSSAC has done that we believe is going to be beneficial to you, specifically when it comes to the funding piece.

So, we can have the conversations now, but coming up with who is ... What Liman is saying that you're pointing to ICANN asking for these things, when really ICANN asked us to define accountability. We then went and defined accountability and we raised all these questions. We did.

And now, it's odd that we're coming up with the framework to answer these questions but we're doing it as the community, if that makes sense.

JEFF OSBORN:

But we're not the community. We're not the empowered community. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

So, let me be blunt in responding to your bullet point three. Should we coordinate with ICANN in defining SLAs? No, because we are not coordinating with anyone because we don't have the structure in place yet. The way to coordinate is through the strategic and planning function which is not in place yet.

---

BRAD VERD: If I may, I just think this comes to some terminology that we're getting wrapped around the axle on which is you say ICANN and I think what – and you say I have and when you say no I think what you're saying is ICANN Org. But we do need to talk to the community about SLAs.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: We do but not yet. We first wanted to find this new model for how to interoperate and how to make that work. When we have assigned that, we know which bodies are going to fill the various functions, then we can start to talk. We can do planning. We can do working groups. We can do templates. We can do everything beforehand.

If the way to engage with ICANN for the SLAs is to involve them in the Metrics Working Group, I'm fine. If it's a formal request from RSSAC to the board, I'm not fine. Or to other possible community ...

BRAD VERD: I'm sorry. I'm not following what you're saying here. We can't talk about ... I mean, we're talking about metrics now. There's a metrics work party which eventually I think we all believe will feed the SLAs. We're talking about SLAs, so I don't understand your

---

statement that “no, we can’t do that” because we are. We’re doing it.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: If you [inaudible] that statement, go through the Metrics Working Group, again I am fine with that. That is the right way for me. But if you, at this point, would reach out to ALAC and say, “Would you please help us specify the SLA for this?” I would be very uncomfortable.

BRAD VERD: And I think what I just said is this body of work that’s being done within RSSAC would be handed off to the GCW which would include the different pieces as defined by our recommendation the different pieces of the community that would do that. ALAC is not one of them. There’s a liaison, right?

Anyway, again I feel like we’re getting wrapped around the axle on terminology and jumping the gun to the very end when there’s so much work that has to happen before we even get there.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I am with you 100%, but that’s not what I read on the slide.

---

JEFF OSBORN:

Okay. The slide is my fault and I wrote it. Like I said, being only here two years, I am the neophyte. So, I will apologize in advance if I got the language wrong. It wouldn't surprise me at all.

The real thing I'm trying to ask is it felt to me like I've run out of things I can do by myself between these meetings. We either need a group that writes proposals or we need to finish the metrics from the work group such that we have a set of things we can build an SLA around or, in the normal world of doing a custom development or somebody, you talk to the customer as soon as possible to see whether what you're doing is what they wanted. So that's why I said, "Should we coordinate with ICANN?"

I guess I'm learning that this isn't that kind of organization, so we have to finish the whole product before we ask the customer what they want. I don't get it, but that's apparently what told to do. So, drop the three bullets, and then at some point way out there, there may be a negotiation with ICANN that that's not the scope of this meeting.

FRED BAKER:

Well, okay, let's define ICANN. I think in this context ICANN is actually probably the Registry Stakeholder Group which I will be talking with in a couple of weeks. I would expect that we would be telling the TLDs that we actually intend to deliver their data and things like that. So, yes, I think we do wind up coordinating



---

with some version of ICANN. To me, it's primarily the TLDs on these things.

As far as will we each wind up negotiating "please give me \$100 million tomorrow" we probably will. I don't know how else this is going to work out.

JEFF OSBORN:

Thank you. This is all helpful. What I was trying to do with this is determine what next. What are the next tasks we should assign between now and either the next ICANN meeting or the next workshop or something? This is where I was feeling like: where do we go now?

FRED BAKER:

Well, I guarantee that the metrics are part of it. We're pushing that pretty hard. That's at least in part the thing behind the question of thresholds. What's not good enough or what is good enough? Policy proposals, to this day I have no idea what Goran expects us to deliver him. I don't know.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Two things. Why he wants [this] delivered, policies. Finding out more about that. I would encourage finding out more about that. To you, Jeff, just to try to go from confrontational to information

---

seeking instead. What is in your mind when you wrote that? How do you envisage that, coordinating with ICANN? What was it that you had in the back of your head? I'm misreading you, obviously.

JEFF OSBORN:

What I had there was ... I keep mistaking this for a commercial organization. It's not. In Sales and Marketing 101 they say you find somebody with a need, you hear the need, you come up with what you think the need will cost, and then as soon as possible, you go back and say, "Did you really say about \$100,000 every six months to do this thing?" because otherwise, everything else you're doing is a waste if you don't go back and check. All I'm doing here is trying to figure out. They said they wanted something. They said they had money. Why wouldn't I check?

The last time we spent three years not checking with them, they asked one question and it's the one thing we hadn't covered. So, why do we want to do that again?

BRAD VERD:

We don't. But here's where I feel like you need to give a little in your reasoning and/or logic which is: do we coordinate with ICANN? Right now, that sentence doesn't work. That's what I feel, I'm interpreting, that you have a challenge with which is we are, by the nature of our role here in RSSAC, going to be defining those

---

SLAs. So, we are defining the requirements for ourselves which is very weird. I get it. But we are doing it on behalf of the community and that's where I feel like some of this discussion around thresholds we've had has been so difficult.

As you stated, some people might be below what we believe the threshold should be and that's a hard discussion. And as we've stated, if we define it in what good looks like, and there are members that are below it, that's okay because of this funding aspect that we could bring them up.

JEFF OSBORN:

If you'd like, I can ask Ozan to either put "we shouldn't" in there and "we don't" or just delete it all. This is my work for the group, so if you guys disagree, bullets come out real easily and we'll just kill it and we're going forward.

BRAD VERD:

Look, this is an ongoing issue that we have with this terminology of ICANN, ICANN Org, ICANN the community, ICANN the Board. From my perspective, it seems like we continue to have this misinterpretation when it feels like we cleared up when we go back and we think of the intent. There is no intent here to do something malicious. We're figuring this out. This is greenfield.

---

So, when we say the community should be defining the SLAs, that's really this is the expert group and we should define what good looks like for the root server system as the community. We hand that over to the GCW who, in the finalized model, should implement that as part of the different functions. It would be handed off to these are the SLAs, the metrics that RSSAC has come up with. That working group rubberstamps it and says, "Yeah, that all looks good." Then some contract is worked out. That's down the road as far as time goes. If you time box all this, this is many months or years. You're not going to get a contract tomorrow. We're not there.

JEFF OSBORN:

The last document they put out showed them putting funding out into this, the first quarter of calendar 21. So, that's 18-plus months.

BRAD VERD:

I think we all need to be careful of how our reaction, when we read the word ICANN, if our reaction is "no" maybe we just stop and pause and say, "Okay, somebody is probably meaning something other than what I'm thinking. Let me think about that one extra second before I respond." That's all I'm saying.

---

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Guilty as charged. We also need to be more careful when we use terms that we maybe recognize as being imprecise because you say they have money. It's not clear to me which "they" you are referring to. I look for more precision there. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: So, "they" in this case would be ICANN Org which is where the money is and they are asking us how much it is assuming they have funds. So, I think it is reasonable when we say "they" you're talking about where the money is coming from. That's kind of what you're saying, Jeff, right?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Again, you're saying "the" money as it was a single source of money.

BRAD VERD: That is correct. We don't know where the money is coming from. We don't know and we're not defining that here. So, yes, money can come from anywhere. We stated that in the proposal. We stated it numerous times. Nobody is changing that. So, I don't feel like if you say "they" ... Money has to come from somewhere. We don't know where it's coming from and that has yet to be defined or identified by ICANN Org or the board.

---

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Or the individual root server operators. If I choose to receive money from somewhere else, that's fine I hope because that's the current situation.

BRAD VERD: Again, I don't understand the argument. The argument is that what we're trying to move forward here with 037 is the implementation of it and we're talking through funding. So, assuming ... The mythical bucket of money – and we can call that mythical bucket “they”.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I would actually be more happy if you didn't put ICANN but if you put the funding function or the SPF ... Use the RSSAC 037 model when you carry on this discussion because that's what we're working towards, I hope.

JEFF OSBORN: If my keyboard connected to that screen I would be changing all of this but it doesn't.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Fair enough.

---

JEFF OSBORN: So, that's 45 minutes of the very generous 90 minutes I was allotted. What I'd like to see coming out of this is just: what next? What would we like to do next? I'm feeling a little under skilled. I have a full-time job. This does take a lot more time. The amount of work I turned out stunned me given how much time I know I've spent thinking about and working this and throwing away pieces of paper. But I just want to make sure I'm doing it in the correct method. If a policy group or a work group or team or anything needs to be formed or something, I don't want to have erred by not calling for it. Otherwise, I'll just continue to make stuff up for the next one of these and hope it moves us forward.

RYAN STEPHENSON: What was Goran's tasking? What was his exact words? What was his requirements for this task?

JEFF OSBORN: I quoted Goran talking to someone and I didn't say who it was but it was Fred.

FRED BAKER: There was nothing that was sent. I walked up to Goran in the hallway and I said, "Could you please have a business

---

conversation with Jeff?” And he said, “Write a policy.” That was the long and the short of it.

JEFF OSBORN: In his defense, he and I have tried to have that conversation and we don’t see eye to eye, necessarily.

BRAD VERD: I wouldn’t read too much into that statement. I wouldn’t.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Okay, because I think that would kind of help just clearly define the path, whether he wants the RSSAC to develop a community – an ICANN community – process for an RSO to receive funds or not. It would just help us maybe further define. And maybe, Jeff, that’s the [task] that you need to have is just querying more information, to be a bit more specific other than develop a policy and to start assuming.

FRED BAKER: My perception, which could be wrong, is that this is probably one of the activities of the – what is it GWG? That group. We’re going to have to figure out – channeling Norm here. ICANN never spends a penny unless it has a rule that says it’s allowed to spend a penny and there are some set of conditions under which the penny gets



---

spent and that rule – a policy – needs to be written. I have zero idea how one does that but I think that’s what needs to be done. So, I would expect that to be an output of the GWG and community process that forms it.

JEFF OSBORN:

Dare I say that the action item needs to be that we form the GWG so that we can do the next thing?

BRAD VERD:

That’s part of the process, right? Right now it’s out for public comment. Public comment ends August 9<sup>th</sup>. When the public comment is done, then all the public comments are pulled together and if there are changes that need to be made or what not to the plan ... The concept paper is the plan forward and if there’s feedback from the community that require modifications, then those will be made. Then part of the next step will be to constitute the GWG which, as we found out this morning talking to Cherine, that is one of the goals given to Goran is to get this started and going. And right now the timeline is somewhere around September. But we have to go through the process which is the ICANN public comment process and consume those comments and make changes if necessary. So, that is happening.

---

JEFF OSBORN: We're a bit of a lame duck right now.

BRAD VERD: What do you mean?

JEFF OSBORN: The lame duck. The organization that's actually going to do things doesn't exist yet and we're fading away.

BRAD VERD: No. We're not fading away. If anything, we're going to plug in to whatever the new process is. So, no, I would not call this a lame duck. We're not all being excused and a new group is coming in. This group is going to be here. These people are going to be here in some sort of fashion. I'm sorry, it was Russ and then Ryan.

RUSS MUNDY: I think a way to think about it, and one of the things that came to mind during this discussion, is that if there was some at least high-level illustration of the steps and what was expected from each of the steps – and I know ICANN in communications does that sort of thing periodically – I think that might help clarify that, for instance, the ideas of what would be the general terms and conditions that would go in and the metrics piece that would go in to these agreements, that that would be at least reviewed by

---

the CWG activity that's doing this, and they always need expert input. We're the experts. We're giving them the starting point. Part of it is the dollars aspect that you've been working on. Part of it is the metrics.

So, after it goes through that process, how much of it they explicitly decide to define in the cross-community group and how much of it gets directly handed to ICANN Org to get definitized and MOU'd or whatever the document is? That's something to be worked. But I don't think we've actually seen a picture of the flow and I don't know if that would be helpful to others or not but it seems like it might be to help see where these definitizations will happen. But we're providing expert input for all of these things.

BRAD VERD:

So, if I may, I don't think there is any definitive flow. As we stated – this was in ... I forgot. Well, it doesn't matter. At one of the ICANN meetings, we said, "What work can we do before 037 is instituted?" What can we get done? There's a litany of things in our queue, one of which was this funding piece that we didn't go into detail on on 037 that, as you've clearly stated, we should have. So, this is part of it.

But nobody is asking for these things right now. There's no requirement. There's no definitive "this is the flow" or "this is going to plug in". This is RSSAC having working the queue trying

---

to figure out what we can get done with what we all believe – I think we all believe – will help when the GWG goes to implement that model.

JEFF OSBORN: The GWG does not supplant and replace RSSAC.

BRAD VERD: No, and the RSOs have three members on that. This was all defined. It was all shared. It's been public. The timeline we talked about in Kobe. This has been ... I felt like it was over shared.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Well, in Kobe we also went and explicitly added RSSAC. We had that editing session with the BTC.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. So, what the GWG is is in the concept paper, so the response to RSSAC 037 basically said we need some group to figure out how we bring this model into play. Then it goes away and that model works. So, that thing that's created in order to do the transition is the GWG.

---

BRAD VERD: And that’s why I’ve been saying all along this is an input to the GWG to help them in the implementation of 037. Help me help you.

JEFF OSBORN: It’s just so unlike any other commercial deal in the history of the universe and that’s my problem, so I’ve got to back away. The GWG is made up of three RSO components and then nine other random people who can’t spell DNS. So, rather than have anything like a contract, we’re going to hope that group does something right and then they’re going to come and offer us six chicken McNuggets to do something.

BRAD VERD: We’re not going to hope. We’re going to influence because we’re going to be engaged with them, right? This isn’t go work off in a vacuum and come back and hand you a contract. There are three representatives from the RSOs represented in that group to go off and figure out how to implement 037. And then once they finalize that plan to go to implement it – and I don’t have the timeline in front of me – would be the implementation of it which would be the creation of the different functions, whatever they’re called because the concept paper basically renames all of our functions to something else. But the functions remain the same, what the work is that they’re doing, and that is where RSSAC fits into those

---

functions. So, we're not lame ducks. We're just fitting into those functions that we defined.

JEFF OSBORN:

Okay. Again, then, going forward, what should people who are in this room and currently unable to do so do, going forward? Is there a discussion item? Is any of this up in the air, need to be voted on? Does something further need to be tasked?

BRAD VERD:

In my opinion – personal opinion – what we need to do is work on the Metrics Working Group and define what good looks like. This is why I keep coming back to that. I keep saying that. It's paramount. This is the technical accountability for the root server system. I agree with your statement earlier that bar feels a little low. So, we need to define what good looks like, and when you define that and then you want to figure out costing as costing gets worked out, which is one of the goals of Goran handed to him by the board is to figure out how much this is going to cost. As you start looking at it, if you have a root server operator that's below what the bar is, again, you can cost how much it is to bring him up to it.

So, this is different. How do I say it? A volunteer organization running this for as long as they have is not a normal commercial

---

entity or a commercial thing. We're working through this and it's not going to be a flip the switch.

RYAN STEPHENSON:

So, Jeff, that would be then ... I'm tracking what Brad is saying, and of course, to add to the GWG, we also at Kobe agreed that as the RSSAC we'll get to review the final model that gets developed by the GWG. We also have the transparency that the GWG, once they work their documents out and so forth that the community, RSSAC, can go ahead and view.

But that's probably now one of your bullets, whereas we could use the time that we have in a session like this to brainstorm for the funding discussion and that would be one of the bullets to bring RSO up to speed they would probably require funds. Those funds may come from ICANN or another source and that would be good enough for right now.

This is something that once we do get these collection of ideas, as Brad's been saying – and sorry to reiterate, Brad – but we can go ahead and just provide that document, that information, over to the GWG. We deliberated upon this. This is what our idea is. Feel free to use it. Or if you have a better process, have your own.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I have the impression that we are not so clear on the process. We are moving things forward. Some of us might fear that, at some

---

point, we might be locked up in some situation or that our expectations won't be met. Maybe that's what needs to be clarified – the work party we do, how they're going to influence and at what point in that process. When I say clarification, it's mostly our thoughts on that.

BRAD VERD:

I don't have a response other than a question. Are we not clear on the process right now with the concept paper and the public comment and what it would be going forward? We edited the concept paper so that when the final model is reached it comes back for RSSAC approval and then board approval. We edited that. If we're not clear, let's get clear.

FRED BAKER:

Jeff, I'd like to push back just for a moment on your characterization of the GWG as a bunch of blithering idiots who can't spell DNS. I'm reading from the concept paper here. The GWG comprises nine invited representatives from the ccNSO – now, country code TLDs I think can spell DNS – the RSOs and the Registry Stakeholder Group which is to say the generic TLDs and I'd like to believe that they can spell DNS. And the IETF and IAB. I'd like to believe that they can spell DNS. So, I don't think these are a bunch of blithering idiots.



JEFF OSBORN:

Well, I'm one of 20-some-odd people here, so at some point, I should just shut up and realize when I'm outvoted or it's not necessary to say. But it was my understanding that the root server operators are a relatively independent group and if you want to come along and put them under SLAs, then it's going to cost you something because we prefer to be independent, thank you. And then the first thing we do is water ourselves down by 75% and say, "Trust us. These people will come up with something that will be okay."

So, I apologize for saying they couldn't pronounce DNS, but on the other hand, there's a lot of arcana in this room and a lot of this that's difficult to grasp for the casual observer. I will argue that 75% of the GWG will be made up of people for whom this is arcane. And that's a little disconcerting.

This is the giving up all the birth rights first and then some day money will happen thing that I keep being confused by, because this isn't the way it works in other places. This is giving up a bunch of autonomy up front before money has changed hands when I think we said we're pretty autonomous and we're pretty independent but we'd like to talk to you about a way we can offer you SLAs in return for money. And the first thing they do is – or the

---

first thing that's happening is we're giving up a bunch of autonomy and independence. Is that not a fair characterization?

BRAD VERD:

No. I don't see this as giving up a bunch of autonomy or independence. I guess this is we have an influence in there and we also have approval at the end of the process of what comes back. If during the comment period a comment needs to be made from you saying that the structure of the group should change and there should be 12 RSOs in there, then that could be a comment.

But this group is not ... The GWG is not going to define your contract. They're not going to take anything away from you. They're finalizing the model. Our recommendation, RSSAC's recommendation to the board was, "Here's our proposal and our recommendations state you need to come up with the final model and you need to do that in conjunction with the community." That's what this is doing. Nothing is being taken away. They're taking our proposal and fine-tuning it and basically identifying how to implement it. Then, comes the issue of how to implement it. And somewhere in that process of implementing it would be the opportunity to give up – I don't want to say independence but to sign an SLA while receiving funding.

---

[WES HARDAKER]:

I think another way to look at it ... This is a long process and I recognize your frustration, Jeff. To a large extent, I see this as – going back to the language that I think matches you better – if we were designing an initial contract between two entities, one is the service provider and one is the customer. Both organizations have the opportunity or multiple organizations a lot of the time have the opportunity to do redlines and to make changes so that there's an agreement on both sides.

So, the GWG is functionally composed of the customers. Who is in it? It's the stakeholders. It's the people that actually have buy-in in the game that need to make sure that we're performing the service according to how they want.

So, a lot of times contract negotiation occurs long before even SLAs. So, we have this step kind of process. And the way the ICANN community works is that it's not ... In the business world, it takes off in a couple of weeks to turn around redlines – sometimes worse, sometimes faster. In the ICANN community world, it's months if not years.

JEFF OSBORN:

If there is no more, I'm wondering if I don't want to yield the remainder of my time because ... Anyway, I hope I'm really not as contentious as I feel like I am sometimes. This is important. I am worried about this. I think I come at this with a different outlook

---

and I hope that's more positive than negative, and if it isn't, then I apologize.

But I'd love to figure out what we think is best to do going forward other than waiting for the metrics to firm up, if anything, if there's anything that would be useful. If we have several days, if anybody thinks of it, let me know. I have copious notes on all of this.

[WES HARDAKER]:

Jeff, I'd be happy to ... You and I have had a large number of I think positive discussions over lunch and stuff that have solidified a lot of concepts and come up with a forward path. I'd be happy to sit down with you at lunch today or some other time to see what's next and see if can find alignment.

RUSS MUNDY:

One of the things I was going to suggest, Jeff, is I think you have at least the beginnings of what could become a policy statement in terms of what was in the slides for being, acquiring additional service or incorporating additional services. Then the other instance would be to bring existing RSO operations in the up-to-snuff or improved. So, it's sort of adding new things in and bringing existing ones up to a higher service level. And if there was any thoughts about what the Ts and Cs might be or what the statements might be appropriate to include in those cases, just

---

as a draft for something that can be worked on at this point in time.

**BRAD VERD:** That seems like something that would be useful and beneficial and plug into what the GWG would need. The final model as such and here's our funding. The things that you saw were lacking in 037 we want to get into the GWG so that they have it in the final model. Part of that is if somebody is under served, they should be given the funding to get up to snuff and we've got to make that in a statement. Whatever those different funding bullets are, let's talk about it. Let's document it and create a draft.

**FRED BAKER:** Discussion now. It is kind of the obvious next step. However, we have in the Metrics Working Group only those that are physically present. I don't assume that they're online. Would it be more productive to move to the discussion that we're having this afternoon to the governance question that we're discussing this afternoon?

**RUSS MUNDY:** I'm looking at the agenda and what's the next thing on the agenda.

---

BRAD VERD: Is there something we could talk about now?

CARLOS REYES: It sounds like I should probably go over the concept and the work plan.

BRAD VERD: Actually, that might be helpful.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. That might be worthwhile.

BRAD VERD: So, Carlos is going to just once again run through the GWG, the plan, the timeline for comments and constituting the group and all that roadmap right now if that would be beneficial, so we can hear it again and have it fresh in our head.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just a note. I've read it twice in the last three minutes. It's really, really terse, so it's probably worth bringing up.

BRAD VERD: Okay.

CARLOS REYES:

Alright. I have the work plan which was shared in March and this is currently out for public comment. If you recall, in the concept paper, there are two tracks. One that is working on the structural elements of 037 and the administrative track is really all the work that ICANN Org has to do in terms of bylaws and budgeting.

So, assuming the public comment proceeding ends in August and we've put together the report, the BTC reviews the report and it goes to the board, we're targeting September for the GWG to convene and they start working on developing the final model.

So, they'll review 037, they'll review the concept paper and the public comment feedback. That's basically between when they convene and the meeting in Montreal, the Annual General Meeting, ICANN 66.

After that, there was a request from RSSAC which we incorporated to review any conflicts of interest between ICANN Org performing any of the functions and its role as an RSO. So that would happen toward November into the ICANN 67 meeting in Cancun, that conflict of interest report.

After that, ICANN Org would present that report to the GWG. That's in March. And the GWG at this point starts to develop the initial set of SLEs. Now, here we keep the terminology from 037,

---

which is SLEs. That was just to be consistent. So, roughly this time next year, June 2020, most of that work would be done.

In parallel, the organization is working on the cost estimates for all of this. So, I'll stop here because that's roughly a year out from now.

JEFF OSBORN: GWG basically about the formation ... The commentary ends in August and then that group is actually meeting the very next month because it's reviewing documents. So, who chose the members?

CARLOS REYES: If we go back to the composition of the GWG, Brad mentioned that – excuse me, Fred did. Let me pull that up.

JEFF OSBORN: It's stated clearly in the document. It just doesn't say who chooses them.

CARLOS REYES: Well, those groups would choose them. So, the Registry Stakeholder Group would choose their two people.



---

JEFF OSBORN: So, we'll pick three root server operators.

CARLOS REYES: Correct.

JEFF OSBORN: It doesn't say that somewhere. Is that oversight or is that just I'm not used to reading these?

CARLOS REYES: Yeah. It's standard practice. For example, if you think about the NomCom, RSSAC sends its person to the NomCom.

JEFF OSBORN: Oh, okay.

RUSS MUNDY: Jeff, the common way – meaning, in ICANN – is each group chooses it using their own processes, whatever those processes may be.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Darts.

---

CARLOS REYES:                   Should we keep going or is that enough? I think that lays out the work for the next year. I don't know how much we want to get ahead of ourselves. Yes, Russ?

RUSS MUNDY:                    Thanks, Carlos. Has this been mailed out to the list? I don't remember seeing it and can't find it.

CARLOS REYES:                 Yes. We shared it in February when the BTC presented it. It's also out for public comment, so this has already been published.

RUSS MUNDY:                    Thanks.

BRAD VERD:                     So, does that alleviate some of your fears of giving control away or whatnot as far as the process goes?

JEFF OSBORN:                 No, we're working on consensus. I don't have to agree with everything.

---

BRAD VERD: No, I'm not asking you to. You stated very clearly that we were going to give away control to this group. This group has no control. They're creating that final plan and we will have influence into that group.

JEFF OSBORN: Duly noted.

BRAD VERD: And then you'll also be able to approve what comes out of that group.

JEFF OSBORN: Duly noted.

CARLOS REYES: So, to that, if we go beyond a year from now, the GWG would start finalizing the charters for any new groups that are created. All of the work of the GWG would be presented to the stakeholders of the RSS as identified by RSSAC and those are the IETF, IAB, the RSOs and then RSSAC as well. That was the edit that we made in Kobe. So, all those different people would receive the output of the GWG for consideration. Yes, Ryan?

---

RYAN STEPHENSON: This will probably be for Fred. Sorry, Brad, though you might be the vice chair. I'm just kind of curious – and again, this is pretty far out there. I kind of recall something at the workshop maybe where the chair and maybe even the vice chair would go out to the different RSOs and maybe brief the final governing working group model. Would maybe that fit into the plan again somewhere? Not for this GWG itself but maybe just for RSSAC. That would be an RSSAC work item, basically.

FRED BAKER: So you would like me or me and Brad or me and somebody to go visit your boss.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Pretty much. But maybe for all the RSOs, kind of like what Brad and Tripti did. I don't know if that would be just something to think about. If not, it's all good, too.

JEFF OSBORN: I'm trying to wrap my head around the multiple ICANNs thing and I'm presuming that something between the structural track and the administrative track has to do with some dual role something. Are you the administrative track?

---

CARLOS REYES: ICANN Org, yes. ICANN Org tends to lead the administrative track because that's all the administrative work related to redlining the bylaws, drafting budgets, etc.

A good way to think of the distinction, Jeff, the structural track is community led. So, the different community groups, whether it's RSSAC, IETF, IAB, and then the Board where decisions have to be made that impact the budget and bylaws that the ICANN Org proposes.

JEFF OSBORN: So, what inputs are you going to be using when you propose the methodology for cost estimates?

CARLOS REYES: That's actually something that we're working on internally now. Brad and Fred alluded to the goal that Goran has from the board to work on that. I haven't seen anything more concrete beyond Goran has received the goal and at some point he'll probably read out to the CFO, etc., to start working on that. I'm pretty sure that we would go back to the RSSAC advice and the RSSAC recommendation as a starting point but that's not defined yet.

---

BRAD VERD: So, if I may, the RSSAC advice was comprised of two basically action items. One was to go finalize the model with the community and the second piece was to come up with the cost estimate. That was from us. We sent that to the board.

JEFF OSBORN: In 037?

BRAD VERD: 038. But in the actual advice. Remember, it was a package 038 was the advice that referenced 037. In the advice, we said you need to go figure out what these costs are and that is – the board has given Goran a goal that he has to accomplish that by the end of this year.

JEFF OSBORN: If I recall correctly, the budgets we requested in 037 and 038 consisted of about 15 ICANN employees full time on an annual cost of \$3.5 million.

BRAD VERD: I would not get hung up on what's in there because they have to go figure it out. It's a guideline. I understand your argument and I agree with it. They have to go figure this out as to what the costs are.

---

CARLOS REYES: Jeff, the other thing to keep in mind is, concurrently, the GWG is finalizing the model. So, it may look different than the advice that RSSAC provided in terms of that particular section of staffing.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay.

BRAD VERD: As you've stated, with probably got that wrong.

JEFF OSBORN: Yes. I believe so.

BRAD VERD: Right. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: And again, the model needs to be finalized, so we don't know that ICANN Org is going to pay for all of this. Finding out the cost is one thing. Finding the money is a different one. Or are we talking about the cost for the actual working group?

---

BRAD VERD: If we need to pull up 038 I'm happy to pull up 038 and read it, but I think you guys can all pull it up yourselves and go read it. Jeff, what is your concern?

JEFF OSBORN: I'm just like ... Four years of working on this all that we're coming to is we're going to hire a bunch of ICANN staff. That's ...

BRAD VERD: No, no. Where are you getting that?

JEFF OSBORN: Right there. The cost estimates for the current RSS. That's what was in 037 and 038 and it's basically a bunch of admin people. That's the only thing we asked for money for in 037 and 038 was for admin people.

BRAD VERD: That's not what this cost is. We talked to Cherine this morning. The cost is how much it is to operate the root server system. Goran has to go figure that out. Then there's a separate cost on how much it is to implement whatever the final model is.



---

JEFF OSBORN: Okay. That's the first I heard that because this is where I asked him, "Where are you getting that input from?" And if the answer is 037 and 038, those only refer to ICANN staff. That's the only costs in there.

FRED BAKER: Well, it doesn't actually refer to ICANN staff. They refer to staff. The concept paper says maybe ICANN could step in and do that.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Reading recommendation two from RSSAC 038, it says the RSSAC recommends that the ICANN board refers to RSSAC 037, section 553, to estimate the cost of the RSS and developing the model. So, it refers to these two separately, the cost of RSS and developing the model. Initially first should focus on developing a timeline for costing this. The RSSAC estimates, the suggested costing [effort] should not take more than six months. That's our statement to the board in RSSAC 038.

JEFF OSBORN: That six months has long since past, you'll note.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, it hasn't yet.

JEFF OSBORN: Yes. That was starting a while ago. That was starting last year.

BRAD VERD: Actual time six months has past but the actual work on estimating it has not. It was our guess that it would take no more than six months to come up with a cost estimate. I don't know what we're arguing about, I guess.

JEFF OSBORN: I'm trying to say I'm done with what I've got and I don't have to agree with everything for us to move on.

BRAD VERD: Okay. I hope we can talk further about this and try to figure out what your concerns are and try to address them.

JEFF OSBORN: That would be great. I don't—

BRAD VERD: If you don't want to it here, let's do it elsewhere.

---

JEFF OSBORN: It doesn't seem it's worth holding up the whole meeting if only one person doesn't get it.

BRAD VERD: Well, my concern is if one person doesn't get it there are others maybe. That's all. So, are there any other questions around the plan forward? Concerns?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's more a question and it might be out of scope, but my understanding from the Kobe meeting we had with the board was that including some voting members that are not part of the AC/SO might come into a problem. That was a point raised by I think Goran. He said when we have this CWG with non-ICANN SO/AC with [the right] to decide something out of for the community on the behalf of the community [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think that was pre concept paper, so I think in concept paper all of that is addressed [inaudible] concept paper already takes care of all of it, so I don't think that's an issue anymore.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay, so it has been clarified. Okay.

