
KOBE – RSSAC Work Session (7 of 8)
Tuesday, March 12, 2019 – 15:15 to 16:45 JST
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

BRAD VERD: Alright. Sorry to our guests. Let’s get started, guys. Sorry. We’re starting a little late. Our last session ran long. So, apologies to those of you here for our work session seven, which I think we are starting with NomCom. So, please, come on up and join the fun.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: An esteemed table to sit at. How are you?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Good to see you.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Well, thank you very much. For those of you that do not know me, my name is Damon Ashcraft. I'm the chair of the Nominating Committee, or NomCom. I just wanted to come and speak with you today to let you know about the positions that we’re filling this year to ask your help for recruitment for those positions, and also to continue to make the NomCom available and open to any of the questions that you had. And one last thing, to thank you for sending back Alejandro. As usual, he's doing a great job, and he's

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.

a pleasure to work with. So, thank you so much for sending him along.

If you wouldn't mind, on the slide deck, I have a whole presentation. I don't think I need to go through all of it and bore you at this meeting, but there's a couple slides that I did want to go over with you. They're slides four and five, so if we could just go to slide four. There we go. Perfect.

So, what are the positions that we're filling this year on the NomCom? Three board of director seats, two seats on the GNSO, and one of those is a voting seat for the noncontracted party house. We also have a voting seat on the contracted party house. Three ALAC seats, and those are each to a specific geographic region. One for Asia, Australia [and Pacific,] one for Africa, one for Latin America and the Caribbean islands, one seat on the ccNSO council, and then also, one seat on the PTI board of directors.

We don't always fill to the PTI board every single year. We did two years ago. We skipped last year because there was not a seat open, and we're filling again this year. So let's go on to the next slide.

One interesting situation that we have this year – it doesn't always happen – is that we have a particular region which we will likely not be able to select candidates from, and that's North America. This is just for the board seats.

If you do not know, under the ICANN bylaws, geographic diversity is actually written in and it's mandated. You have to have at least one, and no more than five directors for each geographic region, and that includes the entire board, both NomCom appointees and appointees that come from the community.

What that basically means, this year we have five directors from North America. So North America, barring any extraneous circumstances, we likely can't fill a seat with a North American.

Europe has four, so we could certainly fill one of the three seats with a European. Asia, Australia, Pacific has two, Africa, two, and Latin America, Caribbean, two.

So we are focused mainly on those regions of the world, and to help us recruit qualified directors, we have enlisted the services of two professional recruitment firms in addition to the traditional recruitment firm that we've always used.

So we've got three separate recruitment firms. One is doing sort of a worldwide search, one is focusing specifically on Asia, Australia, Pacific, and one is focusing specifically on Africa.

Our deadline for all these applications closes on March 22nd, so if you know of any candidates, please encourage them to apply. Please feel free to utilize myself and other members of the Nominating Committee to talk to those candidates about the

positions. We have lots of resources on our website and lots of different things we could share with them about joining the ICANN board or taking another leadership position. And we really want to establish a partnership with you and other members in the community.

As far as a prepared presentation, that's pretty much what I have, but I wanted to. But I wanted to come today, I wanted to thank you for your time and also open it up, see if you had any questions for me.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Damon. Any questions for Damon regarding the NomCom or their activities this year? [Ryan?]

[RYAN STEPHENSON:] Just a quick question for education purposes. Why is it five for North America, two for Latin America, Africa and so forth? Why not just distribute it evenly to each region?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Yeah, those are actually the existing board members, so those aren't limits. The minimum is one, maximum is five. So that's what we currently have on the board.

BRAD VERD: Any other questions? Thank you, Damon. Appreciate it. Thanks for making the time and coming by. Alright, moving on, I'm going to hand this to you, Fred, run the RSO independence since you drafted most of the document.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, here's the situation –

BRAD VERD: May I just – for those of you who don't know Alejandro, raise your hand. No? he's our NomCom representative for RSSAC, in case you didn't know that.

FRED BAKER: And he's not from North America. Okay, so Brad and I had a meeting on the 26th of January. We had received the concept paper, I believe, a couple of days before, and almost immediately, Göran contacted us, and within half an hour of receiving the paper, “What do you think, guys?”

“Okay, I've received it, thank you.” Then he flew across the country and I drove down to Marina Del Rey and we attended the board workshop for – basically, we had lunch with Cherine and with Göran. David Conrad was in the room, but he didn't say very

much. David Olive was there, Tripti, couple of other board members. People.

We were kind of talking about the way that ICANN might want to go forward and what's this RSSAC 37 thing and the concept paper, and quite a variety of different issues in the course of a conversation around lunch.

And one of the questions that Göran asked, one of the comments that he made was that he really did not want to step on RSO independence. He didn't want to create a problem around independence. And could we please tell him what it meant for the RSOs to be independent?

Brad and I kind of took that as an action. There is a legal question here, which is that the RSSAC produces advice for the board, and this is not the board. The CEO is asking a question. So, what are we supposed to do with that?

I decided – unilaterally – that we would eventually decide what we wanted to do with that. It would probably include writing a paper of some kind, and it will probably make sense to do some research.

So, what I did – and you've seen me do this before, this is what I often do – is I went through the things that we've already written, RSSAC, I think starting with 21 and actually, well, 1 and 2, and

then 21 and onward from there, and looked for the word “independence” or “independent” or that kind of thing, what have we said about that?

Actually, it turns out we've said a number of things. We said at least one thing that isn't technically speaking independence, but I think is a linked concept, which is diversity among the RSOs. So I wound up choosing to interpret that as independence and [rammed] it in there.

So, what I've done – and so now we actually have a request from the board technical committee, BTC, those folks, that they'd like to know what we mean by RSO independence. So, fine.

I have hacked together a paper, went through all those different documents and tried to copy out, sometimes [verbatim,] sometimes in summary form, but copy out what they had to say about independence. And then in the third section of this paper, tried to summarize that into some useful form.

I guarantee every word I have in there is wrong, unless it's written by somebody else. If you want to change them, change them. And Wes, you specifically, “Fred, get it right” kind of comments. And that's great, let's get it right. So, that's what we're looking at here.

And I'm not going to try to edit this in real time, but I would appreciate any comments that you have on it, and I'd appreciate

it if you guys would look at it offline and comment on it. Write in other text if we need other text, whatever that is.

Make this document make sense so that we can publish it as advice about RSO independence. Is that something you guys are willing to take on?

BRAD VERD:

I'll add – and you guys were all there, I think, but in the meeting with the BTC, that there was kind of a sense that maybe this needed to be done before the BTC voted on the concept paper, which is sometime early May. So, should we choose to take this on and take it on as a document, I think we should strive to achieve that.

WES HARDAKER:

My recollection is this was a potential topic for the workshop too. Is that correct?

FRED BAKER:

Possibly. I suspect that most of what needs to be done can be done offline with us hammering away on the thing, and we can ratify it at the workshop, say that we're done. But if we're actually going to sit down and spend a whole lot of time on this at the

workshop, I think we might subvert their assessed metrics discussion, which is what I think we're really going for.

WES HARDAKER:

Yeah, I don't have an answer to that. In my opinion, we have to do this. It's not really a question. It's needed, period. I think some parts of the document are easy. I think the hardest thing that we have struggled with is putting into good words about why it's critical.

We can say, "Here's how we are independent," but accurately stating the importance of that being a continuing factor for the future is the harder thing to articulate well.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

I support the idea of doing this offline and trying to ratify it during the workshop. That would work for me. And I would like to say that, to me, it's quite obvious that we give advice not only to the board, because it says in the bylaws, to the ICANN community and the board. So that's a nonissue for me.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

So, two quick things. Based on the reaction yesterday from BTC – and I think that would be the same reaction from the board – they would expect this before they move with a resolution, just as a

pointer. I think it's fair to expect that if we don't have this, they would delay putting a resolution for concept paper before they have this, as Göran mentioned.

So they see that it's important to have this statement before taking any action. That's, at least, what we heard from Göran, and I think most of the board believes in that, to have this statement ready before they move. Yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

If we agree to continue to work on this – and I support that – I also think this is a very important piece, and I agree it's difficult. If there is any free time here, I suggest that we look for a few volunteers that are willing to try to push this forward and they try to find some time here, and with some luck, a major part of that group might appear in Prague, and there's a fair chance to find some time in Prague, because I find that sitting in a group, working on a document, can actually advance it pretty quickly.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

And I had another point.

JEFF OSBORN:

I'll be in Prague and I'd volunteer if you want to do that, if you want to start today, tomorrow or whatever and continue.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

I had another point to what Wes said. I think it's important to put why also in the document, but to be honest, today, that's also my question, because I would understand it before the root zone was signed, but now, I think it's actually good, if we think about this correctly and try to figure it out and document it, because the documentation that I don't think RSSAC has, but the documentation that's around about independence of root server, which is the material which [Daniel] had on [ISOC] side, they all refer to reasons which are not reasons anymore after root zone being signed.

WES HARDAKER:

Whilst you're right that having the root signed prevents some of the things that I think were possibly the original reasons, but the other ones, there are still political reasons, there are other technical reasons such as diversity of implementation and serving it and things like that. We talked about that a lot so that one particular artifact, the diversity of the operators and why they're doing it, I've always argued, is important. I'll stop there because I could go off about that for a long time.

KAVEH RANJBAR: And I'm not denying that, I'm just saying we haven't documented that as far as I remember, these reasons, without referring back to that original cause, which has now changed. That's all I'm saying.

FRED BAKER: Section 3.2 of this document has a title, "Why?"

WES HARDAKER: Agreed. Yeah. The document already has –

FRED BAKER: Feel free to add to it. I know Patrik Fallström came up to me and said that he has a legal problem, and I think you have the same legal problem or a related one. So, that's obviously part of what needs to be addressed here. Okay. Terry.

TERRY MANDERSON: I'm certainly willing to contribute to the document, although I'll defer to all of you if you want me to contribute, given my lack of independence from ICANN itself as an RSO, although I am certainly independent from every other root server operator.

BRAD VERD: I think it's important that you contribute, especially given Göran's stance on this. Göran stated the independence of the RSOs is important, and he also stated going towards the evolution of L, it's due to that independence.

KAVEH RANJBAR: And in my view, ICANN is a full-fledged root operator like all of us, so I think you should.

TERRY MANDERSON: Cool. Does that mean I can take my floaties off now?

FRED BAKER: Okay, so I think I've heard Liman, Terry, Jeff and Wes had volunteered to work on this. Am I correct on that? Yeah. Okay. So, anybody else? Okay, so please feel free to do that.

Given that I really don't think it's going to be productive to sit down and let's just all stare at the document changing in real time, I'd suggest we actually close this meeting and give you guys some free time, if you want to do that right now. DO we have anything else on the agenda?

BRAD VERD: [inaudible].

FRED BAKER: People pointing at each other. Somebody speak.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Following the BTC meeting yesterday, Kaveh and the chairs asked me to develop a revised slide for the meeting with the board tomorrow. I have that now. I think it's probably good for everyone to review it so that it captures [inaudible].

FRED BAKER: Okay. Fine. Let's go to that slide.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So give me two minutes to upload it.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Then I won't adjourn the meeting just yet. But yeah, so I think we have a pretty short agenda at this point, and my intention is to close the meeting.

BRAD VERD: Do we, as a group, commit to kind of trying to get this done before the BTC board in May? Did I hear that? I just want to make sure that I heard we're going to try to commit that. Otherwise, it's going to put things on hold.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I thought we were committing to getting it done by the workshop, which precedes it.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: A draft version. A good draft version, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] if that's sufficient.

BRAD VERD: I'm sorry. Again, I'm not trying to split hairs, but a draft version for then a vote at the workshop to approve, or something else?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm trying to do the math working backwards from when we need to have what done. And we do have a meeting. Maybe we don't. Will we have a meeting early in May, a telephone conference. Given that we have the workshop in April, that sounds [kind of unlikely.]

BRAD VERD: We haven't made that call yet.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Alright.

BRAD VERD: But you see what I'm getting at.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah, sure. And I'm trying to do the math to be able to give you a good answer. Seven weeks is –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It's six weeks out, isn't it?

FRED BAKER: I'm sorry?

KAVEH RANJBAR: I think we already have mentioned multiple times that for us, the due process and proper – so we shouldn't rush stuff anyways. Of course, all of us –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

KAVEH RANJBAR: I know. I'm just trying to align us. So of course, all of us will [do to] deliver as soon as possible, and maybe board is also willing to move forward even if that's not ready. So we'll try our best, but I think the message is we should try to deliver it as soon as possible. But I don't think we should compromise.

Sol I think if you agree that there is an understanding that it should have priority and do our best to get to an approved document as soon as possible, everybody else will also try to make things happen within the best possible time.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Exactly when is the board retreat? Which part of May?

KAVEH RANJBAR: I think 1st to 4th.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: So the very first days of may.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, 1 to 3, I think, or 2, 3, 4, something like that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Alright, so this is the only slide I changed. Everything else will be the same. But rather than going through the redline version of the document, I tried to capture everything here. The two major areas were accountability, so we inserted a line on periodic review of new groups and functions. We inserted that it's about separation of functions and the proposed ICANN Org roles, and then included RSSAC and all RSS stakeholders in the implementation phase.

And then the edits regarding finance were the consideration of RSO responsibilities and root service, and then the same service requirements for RSOs that accept and forego funding, and then funding for existing capital asset services and ongoing operations. And then the third point is acknowledging the evolution of RSSAC and RSASC caucus. Does that capture discussions? Is everyone comfortable with that characterization?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can't decide whether you're incredibly clever with wordplay or changed the meaning, because it was consideration for, and consideration of is an entirely different word, but it's really clever. Since you, in the third bullet, mentioned exactly what it meant, it's probably fine where it is.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That was, in the context of a sentence, it makes sense.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: As a bullet, it didn't.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm happy to copy and paste it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think the third bullet clarifies it a lot. It's fine.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It was less clear in the document than it is in your bullet points.
So, well done.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. Sure.

KAVEH RANJBAR: So, the way I envisioned running the session – and again, please give me feedback – is basically, first of all, I will, again, for the full board, whoever is attending, explain the process that the penholders are the org and this is a BTC decision, there is no commitment but how we are collaborating, and then after BTC approves, it will come to RSSAC, the usual story.

After that, I would ask, I guess, Fred, as I did at the BTC meeting, to explain a bit, elaborate a bit on accountability, and then, of course, we go to the three bullets, and possibly – Brad, yes.

BRAD VERD: So you went through that really quick, and I know why you went through it really quick, because we all have heard it dozens of times. But we had – the other thing we should do is, Fred and I met with Cherine last night, so we should give you a recap of that. But in that, it's clear that all the board members are not clear as to what the process is with 37. So I hope that we're careful and diligent as we walk through that kind of timeline and not blow through it. That's all.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay. Yes so we will show this. Okay, good point. Yes, so we'll do the clarification of the process, and we will show this timeline

after, which I think makes sense, and make sure that everybody is aligned on that. Yes, you're right.

And then I pass, I guess, the first one, accountability, to Fred, and the second one, possibly to you, Brad, to elaborate on the points. And of course, we expect discussion, and that's basically the only subject we have.

Board also went through the questions – of course, they had three questions, we said we had no specific answer, which is fine. They are aware of that. And I don't think they have any questions for us. At least there's nothing that I'm aware of. So, I guess that's basically our sole agenda item. And we'll focus on these two slides mainly, this and –

BRAD VERD: We'll start with the timeline slide, or the –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, yeah, happy to make that call now. I think maybe an overview of the whole timeline, and then focus on the current phase, and then go into the feedback.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes. That's great.

BRAD VERD: And I would end with that timeline again.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sure.

BRAD VERD: We ended up doing that with the BTC where we went back to the timeline and went through it again, and it was, I think, helpful for the board members there.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Does this help as well? Do you want to link that back for the board?

KAVEH RANJBAR: I think it's good to have it if the conversation comes, because then when we talk about functions, we might want to show. But I don't think they're going to directly talk to it. I guess you will have a full deck; correct?

TERRY MANDERSON: So if the question is asked about how the concept paper was received, can we please actually be really transparent on that? It is actually important for the board to know that there really were contentious issues there.

You may have noticed that I essentially recused myself from most of the discussions, because I saw it as a conflict because it raises questions about finance, etc., and all those sorts of things that I'm incumbent, being in ICANN itself.

But I think it is important that that is clearly described in terms of some of the issues and the effort that actually went into this discussion in this room is communicated to the board.

BRAD VERD:

Yeah. I think I'm happy to convey that message, and I will even go so far to say that we rearranged our schedule and allotted a second session to it because it was so contentious and passionate, let's say.

TERRY MANDERSON:

Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

And Terry, let me ask you a question. I appreciate you being very careful about conflict of interest and so on and so forth. That said, you agree with where we came out.

TERRY MANDERSON:

My personal opinion is it's in a better place than what the original concept paper was, and I think it has room for ongoing

discussion. And I think that is going to be the most important thing, is I think it is not done yet. I think there'll be more. Way more. But as a starting point, coming out for the BTC to review, accept and then pass back to RSSAC is a clear message of RSSAC towards this process. is that clear?

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, I'll echo that. This is not baked. This is the beginning.

KAVEH RANJBAR: One logistical question I have about the room. Are we in the big room? The problem is the table on top, I think, has, I don't know, like 10, 12 or something. For sure, we won't fit all, because there will be some board members. I know they had challenges the whole week with constituencies.

BRAD VERD: I'm happy to defer.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay. Just so you know, please, that's the arrangement. If you're not sitting on the table on top, please sit in the first row, because

the microphone will be passed. So if you're not sitting there, please sit in the first row so you have a chance. And even for the roll call, maybe, you will get a microphone. If you're sparse, it's a big room, it will be really hard to get everyone.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes.

BRAD VERD: Can you share those slides?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'll send those now.

BRAD VERD: Next after this is a meeting with ALAC. Is that with all of us, or is it just Fred and myself?

FRED BAKER: Well, the only person who [inaudible] I choose to go.

BRAD VERD: Okay. So again, ALAC asked us to come present to them, and it was an interesting set of questions that they had, and we kind of turned the questions on their head and said, “Why don’t we come with this?” Which is a little bit of tutorial, a little bit of 37. It was kind of a grab bag.

This is much like last in Barcelona, I went and presented 37 to the ALAC. You guys were not there. I think you’re welcome to come, it’s an open session, but later today, Fred and I will be in the ALAC room. I don’t know what it is off the top of my head. And Andrew is presenting the slides, but Fred and I will be there adding commentary.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can I ask what's the topic for work session eight? Because I have a conflict that I may want to go to instead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We were thinking of early planning for the workshop, to sort of summarize what's happened this week.

BRAD VERD: Well, [not if] the workshop is all about your work party.

FRED BAKER: Turn on the mic. Meeting adjourned.

BRAD VERD: We still have [inaudible]. There was a question to –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, but it was –

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Well, so last I heard, we were going to just go in the hallway and be on the [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's what I'm going to do. [inaudible].

FRED BAKER: Okay. Let's do that. Yeah.

BRAD VERD: So, really quickly, as you guys are aware, every ICANN meeting, we, the chairs, try to meet with Cherine. That's been ongoing for as long as I can remember.

This meeting, it was exceptionally difficult to get on Cherine's calendar, so as of yesterday, there was still nothing scheduled. I actually bumped into Cherine and Theresa [inaudible] in the

hallway, and they asked me, “Can we meet right now?” And the answer was no, there was other meetings happening.

So I was texting back and forth with Theresa [inaudible] who was his assistant, and she asked if we would be available 8:45 in the lobby of the hotel. Talked to Fred, “Yes, we’ll make that happen.” So we met him at 8:45, Cherine came in, asked if we’d eaten. Neither of us had eaten, so we walked upstairs and got dinner together.

And the conversation was essentially around the concept – it broke into two parts. First part, concept paper, and 37, which, again, goes to what I was saying earlier. We spent a lot of time kind of explaining the timelines to him and the inputs and whatnot, which I think put him at ease.

And then the second part, Cherine asked if he could switch gears and not talk RSSAC. We talked how to improve the community, if that’s a fair assessment, and kind of the processes that are in place and how a lot of this stuff costs money, and trying to figure out how to become more efficient to enable to work within the box that ICANN has as far as the money box and still try to get all this stuff done.

So, Fred, you want to add to that?

FRED BAKER:

Well, okay. So, the big issue that he's trying to figure out is that ICANN has, for the last 20 years, been on an increasing, “We have more money than we know how to spend, let’s figure out a way to spend it,” and off they go.

And shock of shocks, money is not infinite. Can you imagine living in a world where money is not infinite? So he was struggling in this kind of an organization. If he was in a corporation, even if a nonprofit corporation, he would know how to handle a budget. He's handled a lot of budgets.

But now he's trying to figure out in an organization that is essentially composed of volunteers and has the community coming up and kind of randomly, without knowing what the numbers are, saying, “Please go do this. And we don’t know what it'll cost, but do it,” and needing to somehow push back and say, “It would be really nice to know what it costs” and find a way to prioritize work items that go on here, and allocate the money in a fair way and be able to say no some percentage of the time when they need to.

So we discussed various modes of that. Turns out that the IETF has some aspects of that problem, and over time, has done parts of that. For example in the IETF, we charge people to attend, and we use that money in part to pay for [meetings and RFC editor]

and all that kind of thing. We also get support from ISOC and so on, but a good part of that comes from meeting fees.

And we have ways to develop, to parcel work among the people that are there, and figure out when we can use a volunteer or whatever. So we kind of talked through the IETF experience with that and commiserated with him about, “Yeah, you’ve got this crazy organization and you need to go figure out how to say no,” but confirmed to him at the same time, “Okay, you need to be able to say no,” and to say no in a manner that probably have the community prioritizing things and so on.

Part of that is figuring out when somebody comes up with something like RSSAC 37, being able to say, “Oh, by the way, there's some money associated with that and we need to figure out what that number would look like.” So that was a big part of the conversation last night.

BRAD VERD:

If I can add, just to echo that, is he described kind of the community process, which is, let’s say there's a PDP that would come up with an N number of recommendations, that’s then handed off to ICANN Org, ICANN Org evaluates it, kind of comes up with the plan forward, so to speak. Based upon the recommendations given to the board, the board approves it, and then ICANN implements it.

Historically, that’s all been done without any notion of how much does it cost. And the reason I say this, the reason I reiterate it, I think we were the first, with 37, saying, “How much does it cost?”

So that’s starting to happen in other reviews, and I think maybe that’s some of the feedback we saw in the public forum yesterday, and I assume we’ll see in the public forum later in the week, is this notion asking up front, or giving the notion up front that you need to understand and plan for how much it costs rather than just throw it over the fence and think it’s going to happen.

Is that a fair assessment?

FRED BAKER:

And Jeff, do you want to stick a word in here?

JEFF OSBORN:

I was just going to say I think it’s a really positive development. The problem is when nothing has a price, nothing has a value, and everything is infinitely good. All children are worth saving, all research is worth doing, and it’s a dumb way to run the world.

So this is a fabulous step forward, and I’m looking forward to them figuring out that what comes after this is triage, prioritization, budgeting and all that stuff that makes a geek like me happy. So I think it’s good for us, because I think we’re a

tremendous value for the dollar when you put it in that sense, and it's about time they start doing it, because otherwise, which is better? Kumbaya, love, or a massage? And you just have nothing to grab on to.

BRAD VERD:

I think this just leads into Cherine's meeting and his call for everybody to – it was the ICANN board governance session that he's having with the community to talk about that. So he encouraged us to come, he encouraged everybody to come, and they're looking for solutions on how to do this. And I think you've got a community that's been in place long enough that it's going to be really hard to change. Not hard, it's going to be painful. Let's just say it's going to be painful to switch that mode, and I think we'll witness that.

JEFF OSBORN:

It's not pretty when they start saying no at the methadone clinic.

FRED BAKER:

Yeah, well, this next year might not be pretty.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Based on that, I think it might come up during the board session tomorrow, basically, that, have you thought about – not exactly

that, but in relation to concept paper and 37, I just want to – if we can have an answer, like for example, “We are aware of that and we are going to do some work in that [session]” or something.

BRAD VERD:

Well, yeah. Cherine asked us when we were talking about 37. He asked us numerous times how much. I was like I think I shared the same message I've been sharing all along here, which is we're doing our metrics work party, which is the technical accountability. That will define what “good” looks like. 37 would be the overall governance, and then if you overlaid roots over that, what “good” looks like, you might identify some roots that were below what “good” looks like, and therefore, they would have time to remediate and be given funds to remediate, and that would be the beginning of kind of the initial costs. And then there's the ongoing costs and whatnot.

So I think having that discussion kind of helped him. He was like, “Oh, okay.” So it's not a lump sum up front of X hundred million type of thing. So it was a good conversation. I was pretty candid about it. But yeah, so that question came up yesterday.

FRED BAKER: Well, and of course, the lady that was sitting behind me from the U.S. government was kind of wondering how many dollars [there were, and he's] not the only one asking the question.

So, do we have any other topics? I think we're done.

BRAD VERD: [inaudible].

FRED BAKER: Okay. Quick. Run out of the room before we think of another topic.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]