BARCELONA – RSSAC Work Session 3
Saturday, October 20, 2018 – 13:30 to 15:00 CEST
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: …. Investigation regardless of 37 or whatever because that might turn out to be a very good measure for us even internally operating, or at least to understand the system as a whole better. So one of the things we can explore with the caucus and the concept [resolved], I think that that's already a good candidate. Very technical but something that we just came up as an idea. But I don't think there is any real implementation, real comparison, things like that. So yeah, we already have some good candidates.

RUSS MUNDY: That's a good idea. The other one that we consistently tabled was diversity. How do we measure diversity? How do we decide what components should be different even if they don't measure up in some other ways? What's the benefit in having a wide diversity of implementation or of organizations? And we tabled that because it was our problem and way too early and that's something that I think the caucus could greatly help on contributing towards.

BRAD VERD: We're talking money and I know Jeff has something to say, wants to.

GEOFF HUSTON: We're a really, really polite organization and being the new guy, that's nice so thank you all.

BRAD VERD: You've been here for more than two years now. You can't say new guy anymore. I'm just saying you can't do it.

GEOFF HUSTON: I have been here for one year.

BRAD VERD: There's no way.

GEOFF HUSTON: One year. I guest visited in January in Johannesburg and then I started whatever the hell a year ago right now was. One year.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

GEOFF HUSTON: Thank you.

BRAD VERD: So it's more than a year.

GEOFF HUSTON: Well, it's one year. It's if you're making a fence poster, it's a year, a year and a day.

BRAD VERD: No, I disagree. You're not a newbie, so just stop that.

GEOFF HUSTON: I'll drop it. Fine. But for instance, the how tall you must be to ride this ride one, the problem is this is kind of like which of the Brady Bunch children are you going to kill. Once you say it's the smallest one, Bobby's going to get upset and when you say it's the pretty one, Marsha's going to get upset. I mean, we have a range of capabilities and so where do you start?

So if we must be this tall, does that mean then we better start at an inch shorter than the shortest person? And how slow must you be, does that mean we start at a millisecond slower than the slowest provider? And how diverse must you be? Is it one instance? Do you know what I'm saying? Like this gets arbitrarily personal immediately or else it's so lax that anybody could do it.

BRAD VERD: If I may, and again, I'm not disagreeing with you, I'm not trying to – how do I say this? I'm trying to facilitate the discussion. So I think my view on this is that, yeah, it gets personal if it's just us 12 having the discussion. But it's not us 12. It's the caucus and everybody else, so it's not up to us to decide that anymore.

So I think maybe we define what all those are right now. You know, everybody's … I forgot the examples you just used, your actual terms but if the shortest person is—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BRAD: Yeah. If everybody is this tall – right? – If the shortest person is this tall, is that acceptable? I don't know. Let's take it to the caucus. What do they think? What do they think the bar should be, up or down, or whatnot? And have an open discussion around it versus having a personal discussion saying, "Well, that's going to affect me."

That's hard. It's going to be hard for everybody. But that's why we're here – right? – To have those discussions, at least I think. I feel that way.

GEOFF HUSTON: Everyone has to exceed seven. I'm putting a stake in the ground.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What's seven? Sorry.

GEOFF HUSTON: That's your job. I just, I picked a number.

BRAD VERD: No, but what's seven? Oh, seven what?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: He's pulling your leg.

GEOFF HUSTON: You pick a metric. I picked a number.

RUSS MUNDY: It should be 42.

GEOFF HUSTON: Or [40]—

BRAD VERD: Okay, well, there's a stake in the ground. Sure. Okay. But yeah, I mean, that's—

GEOFF HUSTON: Because seriously… This is like negotiating where whoever names a number loses. This is arbitrary. If we're going to do something arbitrary, let's just do something arbitrary. You have to have a gig of throughput through the whole system and your latency can't exceed one second.

RUSS MUNDY: So, to start it out of should we go [Rev 001] and I think that still is the right thing to do. In terms of how much teeth gets put into it, you're right, Geoff. It gets very personal very quickly, speaking from somebody who will be affected by it.

That doesn't mean we shouldn't do it and it doesn't mean that… There will be hard discussions in terms of what's today's minimum requirements. It has changed since both 001 and the corresponding RFC have been written and we have to go back and re-update that on a frequent basis. Can we even define something reasonable, especially if we're trying to hit diversity? Right? That's why I threw that one in there because measuring seven BPQ actually may be discarding somebody that has a very positive attribute in X, right? But if we don't think about it, we'll never answer it.

GEOFF HUSTON: And if we don't stop thinking about it, we'll never do it. I was just coming up with the let's pick something and then destroy it as a horrible straw man and then the second one will be better, the third one will be better and maybe the tenth one will work. I just would like to get started because we've talked about starting and we haven't started. So that's why I started with the worst possible one, seven. Great. We've moved on. We've now had several more iterations. They're getting better.

BRAD VERD: Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sorry. I see a parallel thing here to something that you're probably not aware of. There is ongoing work in Sweden to try to define Internet service and the idea is to support the end users to have a tool, a logic

tool or even a software tool to help determine whether they receive good service from their ISP.

And in trying to define what to measure and how to measure, the ISPs are involved in this to a high degree and it seems that they seem to agree on what to measure and how to measure but not on setting the actual levels. So they want this to be maybe a tool to compare ISPs rather than set a bar that you have to meet. So with that—

BRAD VERD: There's a stake in the ground.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: So we could start by trying to define what to measure and how to measure it and then we can haggle about the actual numbers as an approach to move forward in some direction, at least.

RUSS MUNDY: Well, coming back to RSSAC 1, I would just about bet that there are some things in there that somebody that tried to measure them would scratch their head for a long time and there are some things in there that, fine, we can report on whatever's going on using the statistics that we have, but changing them, doubling them, having them, whatever the statistic is actually has little impact on the service.

It seems like it would be worthwhile to commission some kind of an effort – maybe this is in the caucus – to go through RSSAC 1 and basically say, "How do I measure it and who cares?"

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: And to build on that, what should remain in there and what needs to go and what can we add?

RUSS MUNDY: Well, what remains in there, what needs to go, what needs to be clarified and if we find something that actually makes a difference, well, okay now let's talk about how to use that to compare services.

BRAD VERD: If I may, in an effort to try not to let our favorite habit of over-engineering things happen, I love everything I just heard. Love it. What I would say was maybe have to just go through current RSSAC 001, what's good, what's bad, what should stay, just like a checkbox. Should it stay? Should it go? Is it measurable? Is it not measurable? And then come back, let everybody kind of digest that because I'm going to pick on Jeff for a minute. Rather than you start the discussion and immediately go, "Well, how much does that cost?" like, "I don't know how much it costs because we have to find all these things yet, so let's do the little things."

And so the little thing would be does RSSAC current 001 work? Kind of identify that, then going to what you said, Liman. Now we've got this. This is what's left out of 001. What should we add? Start adding that and try to build what that catalog is and in those discussions, you're invariably going to, because it's what engineers do, they're going to be like, "At what level am I measuring?" That means something.

But you're going to have to kind of coral those discussions and just kind of like, "Okay, we should be measuring this. I don't know what that is yet. We don't know what good looks like, but we feel we should be measuring it." And maybe in practice, when you get down to it, I think anybody here who's done operations, you implement ten things and after a little while, you're like, "Okay, I didn't need these four. These are kind of ridiculous. Let's get rid of them or change them into something entirely different." And I think that would happen once you started working through it and making stuff or creating that catalog that people are reporting on, which then, that's like Step 7, right? We're on Step 2, just identifying what needs to be added to 001. Step 7 is like, "Okay guys, we need to go start measuring," right? And we aren't even there yet, which is really, in my eyes, not good.

RUSS MUNDY: So do you know [Oli Yacobsen]?

BRAD VERD: Yes.

RUSS MUNDY: [Oli] likes to say that the definition of an engineer is someone that doesn't know the meaning of the word "approximate".

BRAD VERD: Look, I fall in that category. It's really hard on me. So we've got Ryan and Liman. Liman first and then Ryan. Ryan, hold on. Liman, then Ryan.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. I'm fully with you over that [inaudible] four. But I think for optical reasons, you need to be very up front from the beginning saying that we will probably remove four of these because they will turn, so that people who don't really –

BRAD VERD: We should be up front.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. Didn't I say that?

BRAD VERD: You said "you".

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sorry. "You" as in "one needs to". So, because there will be people out there who don't really understand the technical consequences of the measurements and the values and so on, and we need to explain or think already beforehand that when we do these measurements, some of them will turn out to be less useful and they will probably be removed in a future. But yet, we don't know which ones yet. Thanks.

EN

[RYAN STEPHENSON]:	So, then I guess go on to step 12 with these measurements, then we would, of course, update RSSAC 002 to include those measurements. Okay.
BRAD VERD:	Maybe. Maybe that's Step 12, maybe not. I think one of the things going back to the engineer comments and what you were just saying, I think we need to be careful because when we did 002, there was a lot of researchers who stepped in and said, "It'd be really nice to have this," but that wasn't an operational metric and there was a lot of debates. I wish Duane was here because he managed a lot of those. There was a lot of discussion around "Why not this?" and "Why not that?" and things had to be pulled out because it wasn't directly related to the operation. It was more a "nice to have".
	Now should they have stayed or not? I don't know, but it took us a long time to enact 002. I can't imagine what it would have been with all the other stuff. Russ?
[RYAN STEPHENSON]:	I was going to try and trump the conversation because this was supposed to be developing a list of topics that we wanted, not solving the topics, and so I would argue that we've agreed that 001 and a measurement framework is sort of something on the topic list and we should move on because all of these discussion items are great, but the reality is that the caucus needs to be involved and even documenting what the problem is. So I would say—

BRAD VERD: I don't disagree. I think this is still fruitful conversation. I hope we're taking notes, Carlos, on the different things that are coming up that should or could be addressed.

[RYAN STEPHENSON]: Yeah, I'm worried that we won't come up with other topics because we'll spend the entire time on this one.

BRAD VERD: That's fair.

RUSS MUNDY: Just one real quick comment in terms of looking at what may be useful or not useful or helping determine that. LARS-JOHAN LIMAN may have some useful input from his work as a CSC liaison because I believe you've talked about how things had to be revised because they didn't make sense now that we're into the actual structure of doing things in a new way and then reporting back how they're done. So that's just a thing to crank into the mill when we get to looking at this.

BRAD VERD: That certainly validates what was being said, so yeah, absolutely.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thanks, Russ. I think the two things I can bring to the table with CSC are, one, there must be a reasonably flexible and lightweight process for changing the metrics as time progresses because things will change with time and the entire system needs to be able to be adaptable to that and some things can have a heavier process if it's very fundamental. Some things should have a more lightweight process if it's just minor adjustments.

RUSS MUNDY: Can I follow on with a question? So do you consider the RSSAC ability to update our documents like we would do with 001, a lightweight, medium weight, or heavyweight process?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Medium, I'd say. Heavy is to change actual contracts between parties involving legal discussions and so on. Lightweight is a quick decision in a meeting. So I would argue that ours is medium and that might suffice for many things.

The other one is that measurements need to be aligned with procedures and various tools used. What we've seen in the PTI case is that there are tools working a certain way, which means that we see repeated, for want of a better word, offenses to some limits and we all know that it's because the tool works in this specific way and it really doesn't influence the result for the end user.

So what PTI does now is they're working on changing the tool to adapt to the measurement, but it wasn't aligned from the start. So that's

ICANN ANNUAL GENERAL **63**
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

something to take into consideration when you do measurements. How does the measurement tool work? And that should align with the actual numbers that you set for whatever property you are measuring.

BRAD VERD: Any other thoughts? I mean, so if I think through the model the PMMF is implementing the recommendations and the SAPF, so they're measuring what the SAPF is handing out as a Visa, so 001 would be kind of the output, just in this analogy. 001 would be the output and then PMMF would be implementing those monitors.

And then, obviously, there's yet another discussion about what is, at what level, what does good look like, right? So are there other things that…?

The obvious one to me was another document that we already have out there, which is what does a good new candidate look like? So that's already done. I don't know if it needs to be revised or looked at, but I kind of want to make a list of everything that, to me, would stand on its own and do we need to redo, much like 001? We have a 001, but it needs to be updated. I'm not sure the other one needs to be updated, but I'm just kind of walking through what the model in my head, things that we could do ahead of time. And a lot of them are technical in nature versus policy in nature.

[RYAN STEPHENSON]: So, it sounds like maybe it's worth going through the list of our RSSAC publications and highlighting which ones may need to be updated.

BRAD VERD: I don't know. What does everybody think?

RUSS MUNDY: I kind of like that idea. An occasional review of "Are all of these still true?" is probably a good thing to do and we should do that with our laws more, certainly, in every country I know.

BRAD VERD: Certainly. Liman and then Geoff.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think if it might be worthwhile, if we use it to find various metrics that we need to work with or various things that we need to put into this. [inaudible] we can identify things that we can work on beforehand, but evaluating whether they need to be updated or not is, to me, a rather large undertaking because you actually need to read them again.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Well, some of them would be easy to dismiss. For example, workshop reports, we're not going to update those. So maybe staff can do the initial filtering.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

RYAN STEPHENSON: Right, yeah.

BRAD VERD: What else? Anything? Geoff you were next.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yeah. I just because we referred to it, I went back to 001 and it's kind of interesting in the light of everything that's happened since this was published to sort of re-look at it because you could use it as a first pass on how tall must you be.

I think it was written with the intention that it could be used as a first pass at how tall must you be. But well, that's what it was written for. It might be a good start.

I think a couple of things could be added to it, certainly. But if that's something we're going to have to come up with and it's hard, why not start with what we already have? I mean, you could literally imagine a document 001b that was sort of made up of the implicit rules for how tall you must be based on 001 as a response to something later. We'd look consistent. I mean, just a thought because going through it, it felt very much like, "Oh, we did a bunch of the hard things earlier. Let's at least build on them."

RUSS MUNDY: I was going to say, I thought actually we'd do 001v2. It's not like an entirely new document. It would likely be a restructuring. At least, it might be that and something else like that. I don't know if you could

measure diversity and put it in there because that's about the system, not the individual.

BRAD VERD: Well, the other obvious one is ethos, right? We talked about ethos a ton of times, but how do you measure that? I don't know but we need to start having that discussion, right? And we could have that now.

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah, or it's not even necessarily measuring it. It's what do we want? We can't measure something until you know you want it.

GEOFF HUSTON: Simply putting it in there would be a start.

BRAD VERD: How do I say this? I think we could easily have a workshop just on 001. Easily. Just a thought.

GEOFF HUSTON: With the intention of ending up with a v2 that ended with an appendix of "These are the rules," "As pulled from the text, these are the in bold and the original requirements".

BRAD VERD: Yeah, I think there's a bunch of prep work just like we said where some group goes off, identifies what's worth keeping. Some group takes that,

comes up with maybe what we need to add just in generic terms and then you sit down and say, "Okay guys, let's really talk through this and put rubber to the pavement and see if this is with everybody."

GEOFF HUSTON: We would end up with a deliverable of an answer to the three or four-year old question of how tall must you be version something at least. That seems like a valuable output.

BRAD VERD: A stake in the ground.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yes.

WES HARDAKER: So I just wrote up my version of what we're talking about here as, essentially, a statement of work and thinking in terms of the caucus doing it but maybe it's a workshop. I don't know. So I just posted it to the RSSAC and this is something we could have as a thread to kind of revise and refine and figure out the right thing to do.

BRAD VERD: Thank you for doing that. I think that's very helpful for somebody just to document their thoughts and what their interpretation was. It's a starting point and that's very, very helpful.

So what else? We identified ethos. We identified, what was the one that you mentioned, Wes, just a minute ago? I want to make sure we get notes on it.

WES HARDAKER: Diversity.

BRAD VERD: Diversity. There was another one, though, when I said just like ethos. What was it? You were just talking about it. Okay.

WES HARDAKER: It's 3:00 A.M. at home.

BRAD VERD: Yes, I'm aware. So if we just talk through some of the, are you all right, Geoff? All right. I have 37 pulled up in front of me. I'm just going to walk through kind of the … I think I'm doing the same thing that Carlos has which is the table of contents.

So there was the designate feature. I don't think that's more actions. Again, everything goes back to me with the strategic architecture policy function, all those outputs, I think … Not all of them, but all the technical outputs, I think we could work ahead of time on and I don't remember what all of them were, but I have to go back to some of the notes or spend some more time on that. I apologize. I haven't done that.

Designation of rule function, that to me is more policy-driven. There's the technical stuff that you're either – how do I say it? You could spend the discussion time on what is after you've spent the time on what we should be monitoring and measuring and we've agreed on that is what does bad look like. We've just defined what good looks like. Let's define what bad looks like, which is that leads to your, you could plug that in to your designation and removal function. I know that one, I think, will get very personal, right? So we need to be careful with that one, but it's a tough discussion that needs to happen, right?

There's a lot of template stuff that, to me, is just kind of, I don't want to say "noise" because it's important but there's a lot of things that we talk about in here and people will be notified and whatnot, resignation process and this and that. All of that could be defined today and worked on today. I'm not saying it would be hugely beneficial as these other things, I think.

I think these other ones take higher priority or higher importance, I should say, in my opinion, but there are things that we could put together as far as like if you're going to resign, here's what your template looks like. These are all things we talked about going through this.

Defining what bad looks like I think is important. You've got that. Yeah, those are the ones that I can think of off the top of my head. There's obviously the finance discussion and I think if we start with the BPQ stuff, we as a group need to figure out how to have that discussion and come up with what that template is. Does that look like this is what it

costs today or this is what new world order looks like, or what that all looks like? Please.

[WES HARDAKER]: Yeah. I don't think we've even had the discussion of what "it" is where at a very basic level, one of the things I always get asked when I go back to my board – I won't speak for Fred, but the rest – is sort of are they trying to tell you what to do, and if so, what are they paying for it? The idea being that ICANN doesn't have the standing to tell us what to do, but if they're interested in doing it, there's a mechanism. The mechanism would probably involve money because moral suasion and watery tarts handing out swords in lakes doesn't seem to do it.

BRAD VERD: Can I ask a question?

[WES HARDAKER]: Sure.

BRAD VERD: Because we've been down this road a couple times. We keep coming back to ICANN with a check, so on the flip side, you say having the discussion about what do we take the shortest person and go in slower and say that's what the bar is? Or do we define what good looks like? And I'm kind of putting words in your mouth. Why can't you define what good looks like and then that's with money? Because now you've tied

together your two things. Without doing that, to me, you're kind of arguing both sides of the point. Does that make sense?

You're arguing that you want to tell me what to do. That's fine. Write me a check. But I don't want to have a discussion of what I'm supposed to do because it might not be good for some of us.

[WES HARDAKER]: The whole issue of what is the right thing to do, the problem is this organization is ICANN, so "it", "us", who are we to tell us to do this, is the problem. So right off the bat, if you want to say you weren't good enough, my direction comes who the hell are they? So it's a very beginning point and if you don't stick with it, then one day, you realize the camel lives in your house and your sleeping on the porch. That's the concern I come to address because I have to represent. This is my opinion. Well, it is my opinion but I'm representing the opinion of my boss.

[RYAN STEPHENSON]: Okay, so different from Geoff. We were talking about diversity and ethos, and of course, those are the guiding principles in RSSAC 0037. Maybe just diving deeper into the 11 principles that were discussed in general versus just selecting ethos and diversity, but kind of going deeper into those 11 principles might be something for a workshop item.

[WES HARDAKER]: One of the other things that we deliberately didn't get into in great depth in 37 was, essentially, the membership of each of the different bodies because that was A) a hard problem, B) we needed external discussion of who's interested and determining which bodies around the IACANN community, who would be interested in designation, removal or SAPF or all of those. That's something that we could start researching now, that regardless of whether or not it actually turned into bodies within 37, we'd know a list of people that would want to be consulted for individual topics, be it designation removal or strategic architectural things.

[RUSS MUNDY]: I would expect at least part of that to come from the GAC.

BRAD VERD: That's a perfect answer that displays my concern right off the get-go. While I don't disagree with you, I think these are policy and procedure things that we're going to need help from the community on. It's going to be outside of RSSAC and the caucus. That's going to be "What does the Board see? What does the community feel?" While we can go out and ask today like, "Hey, would you be interested?" I don't know if that would be valuable depending on what the Board directs us to do or directs the community to do. I think it's a little premature. Let's put it that way.

I think it's definitely going to be answered. It has to be answered. Let's put it that way. I just don't know if it's something that is cut and dry,

"Yeah, we could do that today and figure that out," and it would just plug in to the model.

[WES HARDAKER]: Yeah, and I've actually been thinking about it for a half an hour and finally concluded in my head as to why we might want it anyway, that you started off the day with, "Would things be useful even if nothing happens out of 37?" And my conclusion from that was that would be useful because if 37 doesn't come to pass, there are still things that have to be answered and that would be useful information to have.

BRAD VERD: Yes. Trust me. I'm not trying to do anything here that would hinder or undermine 37. 37, as our organization is our recommendation to go forward. All I'm trying to do here are what are simple things that we can pull out? I'm assuming 37 is going to happen, but in the worst case scenario, something else happens where it's changed or evolves into something different, these things that I wanted to talk about here were things that could just drop in to almost anything, that what good looks like is what good looks like. What bad looks like is what bad looks like and that should come from the technical experts and those are people right here. Whether or not you can afford it or pay for it or whatnot is a directly-related discussion, but it is a separate discussion. Is that fair to say?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

BRAD VERD: I mean, it is one that has to happen and it's hard. We do it as engineers. We do it as businesspeople with finances, everything. Just it all comes down to how much it costs, right? You said that. I think the Board said it to us when we shared this with them. But it's that I'm not trying to give the, what did you say that the engineer giving the approximate answer? It's an iterative approach. You've got to put a stake in the ground and you start moving towards wherever we move towards.

[WES HARDAKER]: For levity, I think that we missed a great opportunity. If we had written five more documents, it would have been 42 instead of 37 and with the number of times 37 has been said today, I would have just loved to have been 42.

BRAD VERD: Start a drinking game on 37. Is that it? None of us will walk out of the room. All right, anything else?

[WES HARDAKER]: Did we want to discuss page 28? I'm trying to remember the title of the section. One second. The estimating the costs. The group was pretty specific.

BRAD VERD: I think we talked about it. I don't know if we need to spend more time on it today. I think maybe the best approach for us is to add the BPQ discussion and start there. Start with the framework costs, try to find out if we could find somebody in the industry who's done it, maybe try to apply it, see if we can then validate it and start coming up with what that looks like and then expand on it. Again, baby steps. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: With apologies in advance to whoever wrote it, is it just me or does page 28 strike you as something that was thrown together while somebody ran to the copy machine? This had almost zero forethought.

[WES HARDAKER}: This discussion was the last day of the final workshop.

GEOFF HUSTON: I just mean the part that's got "head count, how many product managers per unit does it take?" I remember going by in a flash as kind of like, "Wait a minute, wait a minute. We built an empire of people, all of a sudden, as our first touch of money was people."

BRAD VERD: Okay. I don't know if we need to have that discussion right now. But yes, I think the BPQ discussion should be added on the list. It sounds like we could spend a considerable time of, push another workshop, talking about that.

All right, anything else? If not, I'll give time back. I just, it's what we're here, to start a discussion. We'll document the list. We'll send it out. People can, and we'll send it out to the full caucus. People can add to it, tear it apart and we'll start building this and then we will merge it with the current work list and then reprioritize just so you guys understand all the different steps, that we'll get to the point. Maybe when we reprioritize, RSSAC 001 becomes the next thing we do. I don't know, but those are things that we need to put forward to the group as a whole and see what the group wants to do.

[WES HARDAKER]:   I would definitely put emphasis on "Please add to this" when you write to the caucus. That's an important distinction they need to know.

BRAD VERD: Absolutely. Yes. If nothing else … Carlos, anything else? If nothing else, I'll give a half-hour back to you. Is that right? Before I let everybody leave, let me just pull up the schedule real quick.

So the How It Works session is at 3:15 in 114 and going back to the original question we had this morning, is anybody that's in this room not going to be in that room? You won't be, Russ. Okay. All right, that' looks good. All right, Carlos, are you okay? Nothing else, right?

CARLOS REYES: It's actually 127. I'll change the room.

BRAD VERD: Oh, thank you. So it's the tutorial is in 127. Thank you. We all would have been in the wrong room. I know I would have been.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So I heard from Cathy Peterson who's worked with Tanzanica to coordinate and they can coordinate scheduling for that, that the only room they were able to get has about 50 chairs so I know that's likely going to be not enough, but I wanted to warn everybody in advance and Cathy has tried very hard and the venue is saying there are absolutely no more chairs available whatsoever. So we just wanted to let you know we've tried very hard to deal with it, but …

BRAD VERD: This complex is huge.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: There are no chairs. There are no chairs.

BRAD VERD: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What part about "no chairs" don't you understand? It's completely clear to me.

BRAD VERD: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It doesn't matter because there aren't any.

BRAD VERD: Okay. So, with that, may I ask all of you to please let attendees use the chairs? We can sit in the back, or stand in the back, stand on the sides and make it more kind of like a town hall if there are questions and whatnot versus sitting in the audience.

FRED BAKER: [inaudible]

BRAD VERD: No because then the people in this room won't have chairs.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: At your peril, Fred. At your peril.

BRAD VERD: If you have one of the stadium fold-up chairs that pops out of your bag, you'll be good. All right, so again, room number 127. All right, thank you. We're adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]