

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer  
April 7, 2015  
12:00 pm CT**

Coordinator: The recording has been started.

Lise Fuhr: Grace.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you. Lise Fuhr, are you ready to start? I realize (unintelligible)...

Lise Fuhr: I'm ready.

Grace Abuhamad: ...the recording. Okay. Great.

Lise Fuhr: Yes. Thank you.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you. Okay. So this is the 34th meeting. It's Tuesday, April 07 at 1706 UTC. We will do roll call through the Adobe Connect room. But if you're not in the Adobe Connect room and on audio, you can speak up now and I'll write your name down in the notes.

Okay. Sounds like we have everyone in Adobe Connect. Your Chair today - chairing the call today is Lise. So I'll turn it over to her. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Grace. Yes. My name is Lise Fuhr and I'm one of the two co-Chairs. And I will chair this meeting. Jonathan Robinson, my other co-Chair is excused for this call.

And well, as Grace said, this is our 34th call. And well, we're - we are accelerating the pace of our work and the DTs are meeting regularly in order to meet the deadline we're having on Friday the 10th of April.

That is why Jonathan and I agreed on starting this meeting with just take some timetable and planning in order to give you an overview of what is happening over the next couple of weeks because those are going to be very essential for work.

And I'll give you a quick walkthrough the plan. And as you see in the Adobe room, there's a plan that Brenda sent out in a note on the 2nd of April. And further to this, which is not in this plan, is actually as you well know we received some legal advice, a discussion paper. We're going to talk about this a little bit later.

But the Client Committee is going to have a call with Sidley Austin on this Thursday. We have weekly calls with them. And this Thursday is the day where we're going to discuss this.

Furthermore, as you see, there is the deadline for the design teams are planned on the 10th of April. And to give those design teams a little peace to do the work, we have canceled the meeting we usually have on Thursdays, the 9th of April. And instead the Chairs together with the design teams lead will have a meeting - a planning meeting for the high intensity workdays on Friday.

So we will together with the design team leads review the actual outcome from the different design teams and plan how we can make the best use of the high intensity workdays that is planned on Monday and Tuesday, the 13th and 14th of April.

And regarding this today we're working on a schedule where we're thinking of having three times two-hour session on Monday. And two times two-hour sessions on Tuesday.

And having said that, I'd like to pause and hear if the group is of the opinion that this is enough or you think we need longer work sessions. But we have to keep in mind that we'd like to have some time between the sessions to digest and try and work a little bit forward regarding the next session.

So the plan is to try and start at a time that's around 11:00. I don't know if that's going to be UTC or CET. But we try to accommodate so it's not going to be too early or too late for anyone. But we can't hit a perfect timing for all.

So as I said, the plan is to have the three times two hours sessions on Monday and two times two hours on Tuesday. Any thoughts or questions regarding this? No. Don't see any at the moment. Okay.

Then the plan is that after the 14th we'll do the document drafting and revision between the 15 and 20 of April in order to meet the deadline of having the proposal out for public comment on the 20th of April.

And I see Alan Greenberg is asking has this calendar been distributed. Yes. It was sent to everyone in the group on the 2nd of April by Brenda. So - and I see Cheryl say it would be really handy to have those blocks of time in calendars as - ASAP. Yes. We will try to do that.

And I see Elise might have problems attending all of them. Yes, well, that's understandable. But we hope you can participate as many as possible. Okay. So this is the plan for the next couple of weeks. And it's going to be two very busy weeks from now on.

I know those (light) ones have been busy too. Jonathan and I keep expecting when is this going to have a bit of a quiet time. But it seems that we never get this. But hopefully when we get the public comment period, we will have a bit of a pause but we never know.

I'll just make a quick pause again and see if there's any questions or remarks for this Item Number 1 on the agenda. No. Don't see any. Okay. I'll move on to design team status and discussion.

And the first sub bullet is template structure and that is just to remind you that Marika sent out an email on April the 2nd with an example of the format that we would like the design team to deliver their proposal in.

So for example, we would like you to do as shown on the screen. We'd like you to have a high level summary for inclusion in what we recognize would be the short form proposal. And then we would like to have the details well to the high level summary in form of annexes for inclusion in the long form proposal.

So we've used this escalation mechanism Design Team M as an example. And in order to have - the idea is to have a draft proposal that - a short form so it's easy to comprehend. And if you want to dig in deeper, we have the long draft proposal where all the details and more thorough analysis is placed. Olivier, your hand is up.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you very much Lise. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking. And my question has to do actually bridging somehow between Agenda Item 1 and Agenda Item 2.

We have - all of these design teams some of which are of a Priority 1 and some are labeled as Priority 2. And I was going to ask for clarification as to when the work on Priority 2 items was going to be made.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Yes. Well Jonathan and I will have a look at this and get back to the group. But we haven't had the time to completely assess this. So I - knowing that everyone is busy on Priority 1 - design teams anyway, we didn't see - we didn't see the need of pushing this until at a later stage because as far as we see, we will make an assessment of are these needed in order to have the transition.

If yes, in that we would make an assessment are they taken care of by other groups? If not, and they're needed, we will see that the design team is working on this. So this is the plan for now. And we will get back to the group when we have assessed this. Was that enough answer for your question Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Yes, that's great. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Okay. Right. So this is the plan for now. And I see (Sean) you're asking Priority 2 not required for response to the ICG. And that is what Jonathan and I will assess and see are they needed or not. If they're needed, we need to do them or to check if any other groups are doing it.

Okay. I would like to move on then to design team status. And for this it's important to have those that have an update. If status is the same as in

Istanbul, we don't need an update. But if they have a new status, we would really - it would be good to have it and hear what the progress is.

So I don't know if Paul Kane is on the call. Doesn't seem like he's on the call. Donna, go ahead.

Donna Austin: Hi Lise. Thank you. Donna Austin from the CSC Design Team. So we're hoping to have a call tomorrow. We've made some progress on the chat and also the other document that we provided in Istanbul.

So we're taking into account the feedback that we received in Istanbul with the intent of having final documents for - well, draft final documents ready for the CWG by the end of this week. So that's the plan. Hopefully we'll be able to fulfill that. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you. Very good news. Bernie, you're next in line.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you. Apologies from Paul. He could not make this call. However, we had a DTA call with IANA immediately prior to this call. I think there was a recognition that what has been proposed is of interest but requires some refining with the IANA people.

And we will be working on getting a meeting to start that this week with possible the objective being that if we cannot get detailed SLEs for the group that maybe we can get some design principles in there. And that's my update for Paul. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Bernie. So you had a - I just have a question. You had a call with IANA regarding if they were - if they think they could comply with the SLEs or SLAs and you didn't conclude anything or - I just needed to be more...

Bernie Turcotte: Several members of DTA including Paul Kane and Elise and (Kim) participated in a call immediately before this call to - which was the first occasion (we've) had to chat about the initial document from DTA.

IANA did bring up several questions regarding items that could be difficult to implement. And I think that was general recognition that that could be the case. And as such, Paul, DTA and IANA have agreed to meet again as soon as possible to get working on this.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Thank you. Thank you for the clarification for the slow (gain tonight). Thank you. Alan Greenberg, you're next.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. On DTF the template has not officially been approved but we decided yesterday we needed to start working anyway given that we had three days before the deadline.

And we have started putting together a list of principles, issues, weaknesses. It is - it was the original intent that we come out with a recommended architecture to implement the communication paths for the route zone maintainer.

It is not clear how much of that we're going to get done in the very near future. We will try to have something by the 10th. But we may well need to both extend the timeframe and augment the team to make sure that we have all the right expertise on the group to do this properly.

So we're just hours in to the process right now. We do not have a meeting scheduled yet. And it is - we're having some debate on the group as to how

much we can actually get done in the foreseeable future. So sorry that's not more positive but that's where we are today.

Lise Fuhr: Well thank you Alan. And I think you're actually raising a very important point. And that is how much - if not finished, how much should be finished by our - by the 20th where we're sending out for public comment.

Ideally of course we would have all design teams finished by then. But if not, we'll try and find a way to have some - a frame could give the sense of where the design team or where the proposal is aimed for. So I think hopefully it's all completed but if not, we need to see how to do it otherwise. Milton, you're next.

Milton Mueller: Yes. Can you hear me?

Lise Fuhr: Yes.

Milton Mueller: This is Milton Mueller for the record. I'm on Design Team F and yes, I'm still kind of mystified as to why this team took so long to get started. But I would emphasize perhaps more strongly than Alan was willing to do that you're not going to get anything serious in four days.

And this process is too important and too technical for any, you know, reasonably good work to be done having just started. And I think the main reason I want to comment here is that I think we need to appeal to VeriSign and perhaps one or two other registries to get involved in this group.

The level of direct expertise and experience with the RZM process other than David Conrad is currently not there. So I would concentrate our efforts on getting a few additional people into that team in the next few days.



Lise Fuhr: Okay. Thank you Milton. I see Chuck is in line. But Alan, you go first Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Thank you. I don't disagree at all with what Milton said. And I was trying to be discrete because for whatever reason it didn't get started earlier and it is important that we got to get it right.

But I would be optimistic that closer to the real publication deadline we'll have something to put in, which people can at least comment on even if it isn't a complete detailed architecture tied up with a bow. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Alan. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Lise. I'm not at all clear what the objective of this design team is. We're assuming that NTIA is going to not be there anymore. We get - I get that. And so what is the hope that this design team will accomplish?

We know that the root zone maintainer function itself is not part of our scope of work. And yet what I'm hearing people say it sounds like they're treating it like it is. So what is this design team - ultimately what do we expect out of this design team?

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Chuck. And I see that Alan raised his hand because of your question. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Well, I can attempt to describe what I think we're going to - we should be getting out of it. And there is a little bit of discussion. I don't know whether Design Team F has been updated in the template here or not. Hold on. Well I don't know.

In any case, we are trying to identify how we ensure that we have at least as reliable a root zone published as we have right now with NTIA in the loop except they're going to be out of the loop plus we're identifying - I believe we will be identifying potential problems in the current process and trying to make it more robust than it is right now.

So we're looking for what will the data flow be to get the root zone published on a regular basis given that NTIA is not in the loop. And as has been pointed out this is a really critical part of Internet infrastructure and we need to make sure that it is as robust and failsafe as possible. That's the intent. Whether we get that architecture recommended or not, we're working on it.

Lise Fuhr: Alan, I have a question for you then because what you describe here is more the data flow is the technical part. So what you're going to look at is the technical part and not the contractual part? So it's more a technical relationship?

Alan Greenberg: That's my understanding. The NTIA has said that the relationship between the NTIA and the root zone manager will be handled in a parallel but separate process. That says it's out of our control. And we're not looking at the contractual issues.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Thank you for the clarification. And I think there is some remarks in the chat of people having this discussion in the team first. And but what I heard was that there was a need for more people on the team. So this is - unless I understood Milton's remark - if I didn't understand it correctly. But I think he was saying that he wanted more people on the team and that - well then this is a call for more on the team - (a bit more).

Alan Greenberg: We will be doing that - as I said, we started late last night.

Lise Fuhr: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: We haven't gotten all that far at this point.

Lise Fuhr: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: But clearly we should have someone from the root zone maintainer on the process - in this discussion. And we probably should have someone from IANA in the discussion not to mention there are other parties who may have some insight into potential problems and, you know, and other issues that we could come across. So yes, right now we called for volunteers. We got volunteers.

Lise Fuhr: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: But that group may not be sufficient to actually build what we're looking to build.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Thank you. Okay. I see Chuck, your hand is up again. And Alan, I see that's an old hand. Right? Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Yes. I mean I'll try and help from the root zone maintainer role. I'm spread pretty thin right now. But if nothing else I can probably get someone else who can help if I have too many conflicts.

So I - let me just leave it at that. And you can put me down as - at least to do my best with everything else that's going on. And certainly at a minimum I will make sure you get any answers you need.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Thank you Chuck. And I agree. You have a lot of design teams you're participating in and you're lead on a couple too. So Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Just to be clear without casting dispersion on Chuck, I think we were looking at someone who's actively involved in the current process as opposed to someone who's on the periphery of it. At least that was my perspective. It may not be shared by the others.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck responding Alan. As you know, I'm not actively involved in the process but I am pretty much up to date on what goes on. Not sure that I can get somebody that's directly involved in the process to participate in that. So let's start with me.

And I have obtained a lot of information in terms of the process from our lead person in it. So hopefully I can answer most of your questions. But if not, I can get answers.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I don't think we need to involve the rest of this whole CWG to listen to us negotiating. But I support what you just said.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Good.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Thank you. I just want to get back to a couple of questions in the chat. I saw Elise asking if I was - if Jonathan and I would complete all design team Priority 2 before the public comment.

And well that's what the assessment is about. Do we need to complete all of those as part of the transition? If yes, yes, we will have them completed preferably before the 20th. But that's - and I know it's - that's very tight. So let's see where it ends. And at the moment we're very busy with the actual

design team. I see Elise your hand is up. Alan, is that an old hand or a new hand because - okay.

Elise Lindeberg: Okay.

Lise Fuhr: Elise, go ahead.

Elise Lindeberg: Thank you Lise. And no, I was just wondering if the case is that you want to send out the complete design team list or a complete work on the 20th. And now we still have decided which one of the priority queue is relevant? I think that would be impossible. You know, it's the 7th today.

And we - so I would then like to state that if you don't decide this as whether or not the design team (unintelligible) are relevant like tomorrow or something, then we will just have to send them out after the 20th because we can't have it like what is not in there on the 20th is not in there forever. It's not (the same) process. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. That's a fair point. Yes. But I will discuss it with Jonathan and we will get back to the group. So - and we will do that as soon as possible, so. Okay. Any more statuses from design teams? I see there is a note in - that Design Team L has a new lead, Matthew Shears, since James Gannon has excused himself. And I see Chuck's hand is up. Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Okay. Let me start with Design Team M on escalation mechanisms. We I think are in pretty good shape. We have one more meeting scheduled for Friday morning before the coordinator's meeting.

There's a few remaining issues that we need to reach consensus on. They're not - I don't think they're insurmountable at all. Fortunately (Stephane) who is

co-Chair of Design Team C has been serving as a good liaison between us and the CSC work.

And he in fact is - and may have already done this, I don't know; been checking a few last minute details to make sure that what we're proposing for escalation mechanism is consistent with what the CSC is proposing. And Paul Kane from Design Team A has joined our group as well, which provides a nice interface with the SLE work.

We did in Design Team M involve a member of the IANA team. And that proved very helpful. And so the processes that we will be presenting will have been worked through and incorporate a lot of the process that goes on right now. So our plan is to deliver on time on Friday.

Lise Fuhr: That's good.

Chuck Gomes: And did you want me to go to - I don't know if there's any questions on Design Team M. I'm also leading Design Team O. So when you're ready I can talk about that as well.

Lise Fuhr: Well, we can ask. Any questions on Design Team M? I only have a question on who is on Design Team M because you said there's someone from IANA and I don't see anyone on the - in the template. But...

Chuck Gomes: She wasn't considered a member of the design team but she attended - it's Marilia from the IANA functions team...

Lise Fuhr: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...joined us in our previous two calls, not the most - not the one - I think we had one today. The - so she hasn't been considered part of the design team but she has been a great liaison with the IANA functions team and the processes that they have.

Lise Fuhr: That's good. That's good to hear that IANA is also a part of the design team. Very important. Okay. If there is no questions for Chuck, we move on to your next design team.

Chuck Gomes: Design Team O on the IANA budget. We're I think just about finished. We have one more call scheduled for Thursday. Just a - what we did in our most recent call this week is we had Xavier Clavez, ICANN's CFO join us.

And that was a very productive session. And what we wanted to do - we had already drafted our recommendations and we wanted to test those with Xavier to make sure that what we're recommending is achievable, not unrealistic and so forth and get a feel for timing and so forth.

And so that meeting was very productive. Xavier late yesterday delivered a document to the design team that is a customized analysis of the IANA costs in the fiscal year '15 budget that is still going on. I have received it. I confess I haven't looked through it yet because I just got it this morning.

But and so what the design team is doing is going to review that and come up with a list of questions for Xavier that will - that are supposed to be presented before our meeting on Thursday so that then on Thursday we will go over those questions and discuss them with Xavier on the call on Thursday.

Now that doesn't mean our recommendations will change. We'll decide that after we meet with Xavier. It's probably not too likely they'll change much.

But we should have a lot better feel for what kind of information will be available for the whole CWG as we look at budget information that may be needed for making our final decisions in terms of what solution we select to put forward to the broader community.

The - three of our recommendations actually will be dependent on what solution we choose as a CWG as a whole. And also will depend somewhat on what accountability mechanisms come out of the CCWG that relate to the IANA services.

So I don't think we're going to have any trouble delivering on Friday. In fact we may be done on Thursday after our meeting. So I think things look good there. It's been a very good interaction with Xavier and he's been very helpful. I'll let you be the judge when we present our recommendations. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Chuck. That was a very positive status on Design Team O. Okay. Any other design teams? Actually we're - we haven't heard from Design Team B. (Allan), is that because there's no news or you're waiting? (Allan).

Allan MacGillivray: Well I'll just say very briefly that there isn't much to report. But the final results of our survey this morning I looked at (unintelligible). The one message (unintelligible) very, very (unintelligible). So (unintelligible).

Lise Fuhr: (Allan). (Allan), we can't hear you. You're too vague. It's - you're - it gets (blurred).

Allan MacGillivray: I'm sorry. Better?

Lise Fuhr: A little bit.



Allan MacGillivray: (Unintelligible).

Lise Fuhr: Maybe - that's better.

Allan MacGillivray: I'll type something in the chat.

Lise Fuhr: Yes. That's fine. Okay. (Allan) is going to write it in the chat. I see Paul Kane, your hand is up. Paul.

Paul Kane: I was just going to give a quick briefing on Design Team A, which is service level expectation group. Just before this call we had a 30-minute call with IANA. And we've agreed to meet again. We just need to stand back and look at how IANA would like SLA to be documented going forward.

Lise Fuhr: Yes. Bernie gave a brief update on this. But go ahead if you'd like to echo.

Paul Kane: No. No. I'm sorry. I wasn't aware. And I apologize. I've just joined the call. I'm going off to my evening meeting and so I'm trying to cram stuff in before I go off tomorrow.

Lise Fuhr: Yes. But that was - yes. No worries.

Paul Kane: So the (enriched) version is we just had a quick meeting with IANA and I don't think we're that far apart with respect to the SLE that is described. We just want to make sure that we clearly understand the workflow that IANA is working to and to make sure that the workflow post-transition will meet the registry community's needs.

So it's positive. And I'm very grateful to IANA for making themselves available this evening.

Lise Fuhr: Well thank you. That's good news too. So well, then we have - I don't think we have any more design teams that are - that need to do an update because some are concluded.

And then we're on to Item C, the CCWG stress testing. Cheryl, can you - you kindly agreed to do this. So is there any update on this?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes I can. It's Cheryl for the record. I did kindly agree to do it because I'm leading the stress testing for CCWG and I along with Avri and a few others was also involved when it was back to the (RFP4) section and it's part of the work anyway.

Avri and I still have some action items on this that I can't update with greater detail other than to point everyone to the existing level of CCWG stress testing work. I'm sure Grace can put in the Wiki page link for that for those who want to go and have a troll through there already.

And let you know that the CCWG Stress Testing Work Party will be meeting in about 18 hours' time. So after that I'd certainly be able to give you an update. But things are just out of synch at the moment.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Well thank you Cheryl. And if we have the link we can, well, have a look ourselves too. So thank you.

The next one is the Red Team. And the Red Team as far as I'm concerned will be a mix of (RFP4 Sect 69) and the stress test cross checks. It's to examine whether our issues are meeting the NTIA criteria particularly in respect to security and stability.

So it's - as it says in the template, it's a particular form of stress testing. And I know that staff is preparing a scoping document on this and will send it out soon and we will have a call for volunteers to participate in this Red Team. I see Grace your hand is up. Grace.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi Lise. Yes. So I just wanted to clarify. What we've done is we've put together - there's an outline in the latest version of the draft of what (RFP4) would look like. And the Red Team essentially would be elaborating sort of and building out Section 4.

So we've put together an initial outline that's in the document. And the plan over the next couple of days is to sort of produce iterations of that. We welcome any comments and, you know, anyone who is willing to put in some time and do this.

But we assumed doing this on the main mailing list is probably best. We didn't receive any significant volunteer. We had Matt Shears had volunteered and (Seva) had volunteered but other than that we hadn't received any volunteers.

So we're proceeding with this as a committee as a whole and sort of drafting Section 4 on the main list through, you know, iterations of the draft. If you'd like us to go through and do a separate team, we can do that. But we hadn't gone that direction in the last few days. We can redirect otherwise.

Lise Fuhr: No. I think I might have misunderstood. So I think it's fine to do it as you proposed to the whole group. That's fine with me. And it's a very important part of our work. So the more the merrier to chime in on this. Okay. Any questions for this? No. Doesn't look like it.

Okay. Okay. And let's move on to Item 3, which is the draft Transition Plan 3.0. And Marika, I - there is some small descriptions already in the summary of this meeting. But will you walk through the document or if you Grace, your hand is still up. Is that a new hand or an old hand Grace? Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. So Grace really very helpfully put some of the notes in the - on the right side of the screen that kind of summarize what, you know, the (a result) is the revised version.

But I think as we discussed on the last call, the idea is that for the public comment forum as well, the final proposal there will be a short form proposal. And this would basically have the highlights and high level recommendations that the CWG is putting forward.

And then a long form proposal, which would include all the details that would - that complement those high level recommendations that are in the sort form proposal.

So basically what you see now on the screen and what has been circulated is the kind of combination of those two whereas the first - let me just check how far along we are.

The first 21 pages are the current format for the short form proposal and this is closely modeled on the numbering proposal how they have outlined their proposal, you know, using a similar approach and (heading).

And then, you know, the part that follows from Page 22 onward, those are the annexes that would form the long form proposal and support the information that is provided in the first part in the short form proposal.

And so basically what we did is if you're looking back at the Version 2.2 proposal, we went through the language of that for Sections 1 and 2. And as you may have seen, we've kind of reorganized that. All the text that was originally there is still there I think minus some small changes that we made that were included in redlines.

The way why it looks different is just because we reorganized them and used that similar format as the numbering proposal to make sure there's consistency among our proposal and the way they are laid out and people can find the information; and moved some of the information that we deemed not to be a direct need for the short form proposal to the annexes. So some of that information that was originally captured in those sections is now part of the annexes.

So then for Section 3 of the proposal, you know, which I think was considered the harder proposal, we reorganized that as well; again, looking at the way the numbering proposal has structured their section.

And again, I think we pointed out here as well we've suggested some main headings that - under which the input from the different design teams would be organized.

Of course these are open to your input and as well the eventual output of the design teams to make sure that those headings match the final recommendations of the group as I think it becomes quite clear where we hope that the high level recommendations as, you know, per the template that we circulated would be inserted. And again, you know, some of the detailed information would move to the annexes.

And I think Grace already pointed out as well that in Section 4 there's a proposed outline for that specific section. So staff will be working on that. And then there's of course some work that remains to be done on Sections 5 and 6. But again, there is some work that has already been done in those areas that we hope to benefit from and pull that information in based on previous work that has been undertaken.

So that's where things currently stand. I did see that there were some people that have already suggested some comments and edits so we can already start working on those and incorporating those.

And of course everyone is encouraged to review this version of the document and provide any input either on, you know, structure outline headings or where you believe there's some information missing or a better way of representing some of the information. And I think that's all I have to share at this stage.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Marika. Any questions for this draft transition plan? No. Okay. Let's move on then to status of legal advice. Actually Sidley Austin called it the discussion draft. You know, we all discussed which models that we wanted Sidley Austin to get back to the group with further analysis on. And as agreed, the legal advisors sent us the discussion drafts, which includes the internal accountability hybrid model with two closely related variants.

And one variant is an accountability mechanism with a legal separation. And another variant is accountability mechanism with functional separation. And we haven't discussed this draft with Sidley.

And so I'm - we're not going to get into a discussion on the actual content on this meeting. And we can't answer any questions. But I would like to

encourage you all to send any questions that you have or comments to the CWG list so we can bring these on to the legal advisors on our call to - on our call on Thursday.

Furthermore, this document will have an - will have an impact on where it goes to CCWG. So this has been forwarded to the Chairs. And we thought it was a good idea to inform them as early as possible of what models are being discussed. So this is - has been sent to the CCWG Chairs. And I think they have sent it to the rest of the group.

Furthermore, this actual discussion drafts will be the subject for high intensive working days, either Monday or Tuesday. So we will use - well, we'll try to use maybe half on design teams and half on the legal advice or well, that depends on how much time we need for either. So we will plan this on the meeting on Friday.

But there will be discussions. And I think we will try to have - we'll try to have the lawyers participating on the call that we're having Monday or Tuesday next week.

So I don't want to get into any discussions regarding the content. But any questions, any remarks, please send them to the group and those will be sent to the advisors and discuss with them. And furthermore, we'll have a chance all to discuss it with them on the call Monday or Tuesday.

And I see that Elise this should be discussed on Monday (basic) for the rest of the works. Yes. Well, we will take your point and discuss it with the design team leads on Friday. Any other comment to the process, not the actual content? Do you have any questions? No. Doesn't seem like it. Okay.

Then we have the next - and I see we've put in pending questions on mailing list by say 1300 UTC. Grace, when is the actual time for the call on Thursday? Is that 1300 UTC?

Grace Abuhamad: No. The call is at 1400 Lise.

Lise Fuhr: Oh, okay.

Grace Abuhamad: I just put 1300 because I thought we'd maybe need an hour to collect all the questions, but.

Lise Fuhr: We do. We do. So that's fine. I was worried that we didn't have that hour. That's fine. Thank you. So please be aware of the 1300 UTC timeline for sending in questions for the first round. If not, you'll get a chance to discuss it at a later stage.

Okay. So then we have any other business? I don't know. I have one point regarding the principles but I don't know if any other - if any from the group is having any issues under AOB. Don't see - oh, Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. This is Greg Shatan for the record. One thing that occurs to me we have not touched on much on this call -- I realize it's somewhat of a nebulous topic -- is the linkage or overlap coordination with the CCWG.

So just wondering if there's been any - I think you were having a Chairs conversation. I'm not sure if that was before the last call or after the last call and whether there are any thoughts or points that we need to be considering especially between now and Monday in terms of linkage with the CCWG and what we're expecting them to be considering and producing.



Lise Fuhr: As far as I recall, we had the call with the CCWG Chairs Thursday last week. And that was before our call. So the update that Jonathan gave you on this is still valid. We haven't had any other calls. That was because of Easter we had to move the call until Thursday morning in order to have - to meet the requests from the CCWG Chair and to have - to be able to meet.

So yes. There's no other news than that. And what we did was, as I said, we sent this Sidley Austin draft to them. And the last part of it is actually issues that are interrelated with the CCWG.

And I can see Milton is saying I'm not sure why we don't start discussing it now. And that's because we would like to discuss it with legal advisors first. We haven't had a chance to discuss it with Sidley Austin. So in order to have a more thorough conversation about this, we think it's best to have that discussion with them first and then get back to the group and have a full term discussion with the group next week.

Who is we? That's the Chairs. So that's Jonathan and me who actually thought that would be a good idea. I don't know how to interpret the (mm) from you Milton. But you're still free to send in any comments or questions to the group.

And (Brendan) says can't we have Sidley just brief the group. Well, that's what we're planning on having them doing next week. And Greg is saying they're not on this call.

Okay. So apart from this, any other business on - except from the coordination between CCWG and CWG? Doesn't seem like it. Then I have a point regarding the principle that sent out for finalization and hopefully for Friday.

We have received a couple of comments on this. I've seen some comments from (Urik) from Germany and he had some comments regarding 7.2. And he agreed to not have those comments because they weren't that important for him. And this is actually 7.2 is an issues that's been, well, negotiated between a lot of groups and agreed upon. So this is a compromised - it's a text that's been agreed and a compromise between several parties.

So I think or I don't think. He agreed on not pushing those forward anyway. So I haven't seen any other than minor editorial changes. So I hope to have this document finalized by Friday to close this issue. Okay.

So it's an hour now. And I know this is a two-hour call. And I know that you're asking to have the discussion on this legal document. But that's unfortunately not - well, I'm not going to defer from what I've agreed with Jonathan on this.

So we would like to have that discussion with the legal advisors first and then get back to the group and have you send any questions and you will be able to talk to those on Monday or Tuesday. Okay. Milton, go ahead.

Milton Mueller: Yes. I really don't want to get stuck on these but I'm just completely puzzled by this idea that you - the Chairs have to talk to Sidley before the rest of us can talk about this. I just - I don't understand what you're saying there.

Lise Fuhr: It's not the Chairs.

Milton Mueller: It's...

Lise Fuhr: It's the Client Committee Milton. It's not the Chairs talking to Sidley. We have agreed on having a structure where we have the Client Committee having the dialog with the legal advisors. So this is nothing new. Go ahead.

Milton Mueller: Okay. Well I just - I think there are - I think it's okay for us discussing this on the list assuming that people have read it. And I just didn't understand the idea that there was some - what is it that is - this discussion with the Client Committee is going to do that is not evident in the document? Are you going to change the reports for example?

Lise Fuhr: No. I hope not. Milton, this is an open process. Every Client Committee meeting is recorded. And you are - will be able to send in questions. So what we thought it would - was that it would be good to have their presentations because - before we started to discuss issues that might be interpreted in a different way by the lawyers.

So I don't - it's not to keep anything secretive. And it's just to have a more - not to have wasted time on discussing issues that we might misinterpreted of the document. So I hope that's...

((Crosstalk))

Milton Mueller: ...secrecy or a conspiracy than I just didn't understand turning what seemed to be a one-step process into a two-step process. And so what you're saying is people who could listen into the Client Committee would get a clearer perception of what is in this report than people who didn't and that the subsequent discussion among the whole group would be more accurate and better. Is that what you're saying?

Lise Fuhr: That's what we're hoping for is to have a discussion with the - with issues that where we have the actual explanations from the legal advisors instead of us reading something into their explanations. And we don't have them on the call.

So our plan is to have that Client Committee call, have them for the group Monday or Tuesday. And everything is open and actually everyone can ask questions or comments. And I know Greg has done a long document on this or it's an email that the whole group can see. And anyone are free to do that and we'll bring it on and then we'll try and have that open discussion with the whole team on Monday or Tuesday. Greg, you're next.

Greg Shatan: Thanks Lise. I think you've said much of what I wanted to say. I do want to say that I think that, you know, what we'll be looking to do is I think to have, you know, conversation on the list, comment on the list and to kind of funnel those comments, try to integrate them, discuss them with Sidley so that they can perhaps refine their advice.

I personally think there may well be a 1.1 version of this document. But perhaps not depending upon what comments are made and considered. I personally being a bit of a bomb throwing radical wouldn't object to discussing it on this call since we have the time and some of the people.

But obviously any discussion would not be definitive since we don't have Sidley on the call. So it would just be spitballing. And I think that anything that, you know, was thrashed out if we did discuss it now would be - would need to be reduced to a writing - to an email that could then be forwarded into the Client Committee and then on to Sidley so that it wouldn't get lost.

And I think that's the danger of having a discussion now. Not danger, but the relative lack of - or the potential lack of effect of a conversation now is that we have a conversation and then, you know, to some extent it evaporates except as it is in notes and, you know, something that ultimately makes its way to Sidley.

You know, flow of information is important. And, you know, obviously Lise you're controlling the agenda. But, you know, if there are things that people want to say, you know, we can say it now or we just say it on the list. On the list, you know, there's, you know, more of an opportunity for it to be captured and ultimately may make its way to Sidley. But that's my two cents on the subject. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Greg. So what you're proposing is to have the questions here now because for me it's fine but it's actually better if people could send them the list to capture the way they want it instead of having a lot of discussion if the summary is done in the correct way.

So for me it makes it much easier to - if people send it in because if we're not going to discuss the actual content, we can sit and throw questions, so.

Greg Shatan: I think the discussion - the suggestion was to discuss the content if there isn't much else to discuss about it. But papers - whatever I printed out on - they typeface is a little small. But there's content.

Lise Fuhr: Yes.

Greg Shatan: But I do agree, as I said before, anything we discuss now is, you know, ultimately needs to be captured and best done in an email. You know, one potential value to having some discussion of it now is that some people who

have questions might be able to refine their questions or comments through discussion. But ultimately it's a matter of what gets captured.

Lise Fuhr: Yes. Well, I think or not think. I'm not - I will not open the discussion on the content because agreed with Jonathan that we will wait on this. And I see (Andrew) saying that there seems to indicate a slight lack of urgency.

For me I think we got a document from Sidley Austin. We got it during some holidays. And I'd really like people to have time to read it, time to send in questions. We get the time to discuss it with the legal advisors and then we'll discuss it on Monday or Tuesday within the whole group.

I don't think that's too late in the process. I think that was - I mean we need that time. And even though we still have time, I guess that people could use that time to do some more work on the design teams. We are still very much in need of having those to be accomplished, so.

Unless there's any other remarks or questions and any other business and the legal advice, I will close this meeting and say thank you for participating and I hope that you will all send in questions and remarks and have a discussion on the list. It is very valuable for all of us. But I really think we need the time and we need to have the discussion with the lawyers and then we will have a full term discussion on Monday or Tuesday.

Thank you for participating and I hope you'll use the time wisely to do more work on design teams. Bye all. Bye.

END