

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
April 1, 2015
2:45 pm CT**

Coordinator: And excuse me this call is now being recorded.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much. As just indicated to us this call is being recorded. Welcome to the Legal Sub Team Call Number 9 which was just a couple hours later than our call this morning evening or night depends on the part of the world you're in.

And I'd like to kick off and first by kindly ask you to keep this as short as possible because we need to do a hard stop at 55 minutes past the hour so the staff can clean up the room for the next meeting which is for Work Party 1. So let's try to keep this as short as possible.

And with regards to the first point of the agenda which is working with counsel I'd like to listen to the various thoughts that of course you may have in the group.

I think that the mail that you sent David was excellent and also some points raised by Greg Shatan were also very good in this.

I know I promised to send the compiled document with all the questions before our call but I wasn't just able to locate all of the questions that I have received so far.

So I apologize for that. And you will have this document later today so we can begin taking a look at those questions.

And of course I assumed we would then be prioritizing these questions and classifying them so we then can in turn assigned them to the lawyers.

But I'd like to open floor for comments on how we should work with counsel. My initial approach to this was of course to find all the questions raised to the lawyers via a memorandum that would formally get them working into the questions.

And so far this has kind of worked in some ways. But I feel that we need to provide of course more details and more context to the lawyers so they can better advise us.

I see David McAuley's is up. David could you please take the floor?

David McAuley: Thank you Leon. And I think that the memo that you sent was absolutely fine.

My comments and my suggestion that we put on the agenda a discussion about how we work with counsel really stems from the overnight mail traffic and this morning's discussion.

And I just think it's difficult to work with two law firms whether in a co - whether in an equal relationship.

And I've seen the mail from (Holly) and (Rosemary) in the interim after they've have seen my agenda item and I understand all that.

And I also have seen Greg's mail. And I personally come down on the side of thinking however that we should give the lead to one of the firms. And I would suggest Sidley for the reasons I stated.

And I think that the call was a little bit more difficult than it needed to be this morning just for that reason.

And while I understand that the counsel can work well together collaboratively among themselves I think that we're - we should be in charge and we should look to one of them to sort of, you know, be the part that we speak to principally.

And this is no criticism whatsoever as I said in my mail following the call. This is no criticism at all of anybody on the call. It's just the way I think that might be a better way to organize it.

And then finally for the transcript this was David McAuley speaking. So thanks Leon. That's my comment.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much for this David. This is very useful. And I do agree that the call today was a little bit chaotic. And we should definitely avoid that since we are very short in time on all of our calls.

And I would agree if you asked me to assign Sidley as the lead firm here. But I would like to of course have a larger audience ask this question so they could agree on this.

I mean I don't want to give the impression that the executive team is in charge of things and is bypassing the larger community which of course is not the intent.

So I do agree that Sidley has the advantage as I said in the email that I replied to you that they are working with the CWG as well. And I think this would favor a more holistic view of the needs from both working groups and how they can fit into each other's work.

So I wouldn't see a problem on having Sidley leading the efforts from both law firms. My only concern would be maybe time duplication. I wouldn't want to risk duplicating time.

So we would of course need to iron out those details with the firms so we are very careful how they coordinate amongst themselves so we don't get duplicated hours in our bill.

And I see Athina has her hand up. Athina can you please take the floor?

Athina Fragkouli: Yes. Can you hear me? This is Athina.

Leon Sanchez: We do.

Athina Fragkouli: So I thank you. So I agree with both points made.

It - I think for the sake of my time and our - in order for us to have, you know, a smooth communication and cooperation and so on it is important that we have - we have - that we get one voice from the law firms and not having them disagreeing on a mailing list.

I think our not having them, you know, resolving some internal, you know, some issues between themselves in the courts.

And I think it makes sense to have Sidley leading this effort. They have a better understanding of course of the situation.

So I don't think that if we asked them to have view, one voice we will minimize the input from the - from both legal firms. It will - it would just make things easier in terms of communication. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Athina. So if I'm okay what I'm hearing is or what I'm listening is that we should try to have a single voice from the legal advice.

But this of course goes the other way our original intent of having two law firms and having Adler having the primary source for California law advice and Sidley being the secondary source for this and of course primary for all other concerns.

So maybe a hybrid approach would be asking Sidley to lead the efforts and of course having an open door so we could ask a very specific questions the views or the particular views of Adler so we could have of cores some way of comparing the views between each law firm or maybe when Sidley or Adler don't come to an agreement and any of the law firms feels that it would be of use for us to know that there are dissenting views with regards to one answer maybe then should - they should come forward and just tell us that they are dissenting in the way they are approaching the answer to anyone question and they should state that in their reply.

So I think this would also work. I see Greg Shatan's hand is up. Greg please take the floor.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Leon. I think we're going in the right direction here. I think we may be overthinking things a bit in the sense.

I think that we should give the law firms who have worked together in the past flexibility to present to us.

I think that it makes good sense especially given the CWG role that Sidley is playing and the fact that they've, you know, been a little further ahead for them to take the lead. But I don't think that means that, you know, that we're not going to hear from Adler.

I think that they do need to harmonize but not necessarily homogenize their thinking where there is some nuance.

And, you know, harmony sometimes involves interesting chords and not just unisons.

So I think we can try to get the best from both by letting them each do what they do best and not worry too much about whether we have, you know, a single unison voice versus a harmonize voice versus, you know, hearing from one firm versus the other. You know, having us dictate how they're coming back to us.

The only thing that I think, you know, both firms know is that we want this to be cost effective and we want it to be time sensitive.

So I think that avoiding artificial circumstances will meet both of those objectives.

The, you know, the good thing here is that we are being organic. We're being flexible. We're evolving in how we do this and that the firms are partnering with us completely in doing so.

So as I say we're on the right track but let's just not overthink the situation too much. Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Greg. Next in the queue is David McAuley. David could you please take the floor?

David McAuley: Thank you Leon. It's David McAuley. I think I agree with much of what Greg just said. And but I disagree a little bit with what is being said in the chat.

And I'll just say this and I recognize this is just one person's perspective but I would like to dictate one thing to the law firms. And that is to dictate to (Holly) that her firm is in the lead.

She should coordinate the legal advice, get particular California advice from the - from (Rosemary) and Greg is needed and let us know if there's a problem.

I'm not so sure that a difference in perspective as Robin put it is what we're in here for. I think it would confuse us frankly.

I would - I - my preference would be that we have them speak back to us with one voice although that voice can be voice by number of different partners.
Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks David. Yes just to be clear we're not trying to cross examine any of the firms. What we tried to do here is that as we have said in our initial calls

what we would be doing is when we have reasonable doubt to maybe or we find some answer not enough clear to us or someone has the feeling that there might be another way then we could also go to the second law firm to just confirm or get another point of view on the answer given or on the question raised so we could reach our views and take the best positions for the good of the group of course. Okay?

And yes I know Jordan Carter is stating in the chat wouldn't we want to know if there were different views? And I agree.

I think if there were different views it would be important for us to know that. And that's why I think the approach of having Sidley and I'm - and I'm just thinking out loud here and I want to know what you think.

Having Sidley lead the efforts from law firms going back to Adler of course with regards to California law and having a single voice would work but it would be useful to know when there is a dissenting view from any of the law firms they would need to specify that there are dissenting views and of course elaborate on the reasons for those dissenting views.

Would everyone be okay with this approach?

Okay I see Jordan it's okay. Could we please signal with our green ticks and see whether we have an agreement of this so we can move forward and we have this as an agreement of working with counsel?

Woman: (Unintelligible) there.

Leon Sanchez: Okay. I see David dropped. So David just a brief update that we're taking agreement on having Sidley as the lead firm with a single voice from the

lawyers -- so we don't confused -- but also having them apply to provide us with information whenever dissenting views arise.

So if there are dissenting views the law firms should tell us that they have dissenting views and of course give us the reasoning or the rationale for these dissenting views so we can be aware of them.

And I see Robin is - she doesn't like the terms of a voice. Well maybe a unified voice would work.

I think it's - I don't see this as a major problem unless you want to please elaborate on the reasons why you see this problematic. Robin could you please expand a little bit on your thoughts?

Robin Gross: Can you hear me?

Leon Sanchez: Yes we can.

Robin Gross: Okay. No, I sort of was in agreement with what I was hearing from Greg about how having two different voices, maybe one being a baritone and one being a soprano could actually lead to a much richer understanding of the overall issue, the harmony analogy that Greg had.

So I mean I'm not opposed to having sort of a lead firm. But I'm just kind of sort of weary of the term single voice like it means, you know, everybody's got to get in line and maybe not view or excuse me not air their concern because it's in opposition with what the single voice has decided is to be the answer.

So it just seems a little bit like it's a little too discouraging of other opinions but it's really just a term I guess. I don't know, that's my view.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Robin. And you're right. I mean the term might seem troublesome but I think the right word would be harmonized as Greg just said.

And as I see it it would be an exercise of having the law firms work in a collaborative way between them to provide us with the advice they come up to.

And where there were dissenting views they will be obliged to tell us that there are dissenting views and of course elaborate on the rationale that they have for dissenting other views is that right?

I see Greg's hand is up again. Is that an old hand or a new hand Greg?

Greg Shatan: Hi. It's Greg again. It's Greg Shatan. I do I think we're, you know, again kind of overthinking things.

I think the law firm will work this out in terms of first off I think the term, you know, lead firm which is a good thing but it's really that's a procedural lead in terms of just keeping things running.

It's not the matter that if the two firms have a difference of views that they'll just say we're the lead firm and you, you know, you can stop talking now. I don't think that's what this is about. I don't think that's what the law firms would think it's about.

So I think primary terms are complementary to each other. So I don't think it's a matter of kind of hearing from one firm and then going to the other firm

for a second opinion on the same thing. I don't think that's what we're looking to do.

But I do think that, you know, given the complementary nature of their experience and the ways in which, you know, Adler & Colvin's incredible depth and fluency in California non-for-profit law and working with so many California-based nonprofits over the years of, you know, with various issues, you know, is complemented by, you know, (Holly)'s overall governance, expertise and all the experience of and (Sharon)'s and everybody else's, you know, broad based experience.

And I think what we'll get is a richer version of the advice because we're going to be able to, you know, triangulate depth and breadth across, you know, a whole variety of experiences.

And again I think if we, I think that the discussion is becoming kind of academic. I'd actually like to, you know, see, you know, it would be nice to know what the law firm themselves thought.

Obviously we don't have them here but I think they'll be able to do just fine. And while I think that we're going to, you know, it's kind of like speculating about, you know, how kids are going to run around on a playground. They tend to organize themselves a lot better than the parents organize them.

It's a terrible analogy but I think it's still a matter that we're - I think we're getting the right sense of all this/ And I don't care if it's a coordinating firm or leading a firm or lead firm.

But I think it's understood between the firms probably better than we can ever articulate it ourselves how they should work together, what each of them

brings to the table that will get us timely sophisticated creative useful compelling advice. Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Greg. And just to add what you just said I think that Sidley is de facto leading these efforts at the present time.

I mean they have been very proactive and we have then very into what we're doing. So I think they are already running this. It's just that we haven't had an agreement in the team. And but they're already doing this.

So I think as said we all seem to have the same sense on this. And well then the next step could be of course to let the law firms know about what we just discussed here and have them - let - coordinate between themselves as they see fit.

And of course with the conditions that we just stated here that whatever there were dissenting views they should let us know and of course put forward the rationales.

Okay, so yes now we just need to get out of the way exactly. Exactly.

So well on the next agenda item dealing with questions, dealing with questions, okay so the proposed working method so far is to gather questions from the larger community, either the general mailing list or the chat or the calls or the meetings and of course compile them into a single document.

The document is so far the legal scoping document. And then we should go through the different questions just to double check that first they are in the scope of our charter and second that there is no duplicate question added to the document.

So at this point I see David McAuley's hand is up. David could you please take the floor??

David McAuley: Thank you again Leon. It's David McAuley. I'm - that's another thing that I put on the agenda or asked to be put on the agenda.

And my thinking was I think I'm in alignment with Greg on this because I saw his mail later is it's not - is to put the questions in one place where they're sort of discreetly able to be seen as the questions that exist.

And it's not so much to pepper the lawyers with questions but to know that we gathered the questions that the community has put forward.

And I think it would be helpful to us to, you know, see themes that are popping up among these questions and help us hone our thinking on it.

And then when we asked the lawyers if they do a holistic approach or whatever they do we could say be aware of the questions the community has but don't answer any specific questions unless we ask you to answer specific questions. That was my thinking and that's my comment. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks David which I think it was kind of pretty much what I said to (Holly) today in the chat that unless we formally assigned any questions to them via the memorandum they shouldn't be answering any other questions but rather just be conscious that those questions were being raised inside the community. Greg I see your hand up. Please take the floor.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. I'm going to take the liberty of combining the questions and the holistic approach together. Because I think what we need to think about is our

overall, the overall reason that - reasons that we need legal advice here and the priority in which we need to prioritize the kind of work and what the law firms are doing for us.

I think the number one priority is working I think with the working parties work teams to try to make sure that we are putting a legally viable proposal together and that we understand the pros and cons of a particular approaches and that we get help in refining how those approaches work, you know, from the legal point of view.

You know, we of course will need to help them with some of the historical nuances and facts of how ICANN works and why it works that way and to some extent how it used to work without getting bogged down in history.

It seems to me that some of the questions that are being asked are very much on point with that sort of thing.

Others of the questions tend to feel to me that they are - that they need to be answered in order to quiet the discomforts or to dispose of certain repeated but essentially non-substantial concerns that get raised.

And in the sense - in the end all of those are legitimate. And we need to think about how to deal with that.

But I think that questions that are being asked by people who are not really participating in the process of preparing their proposal and who are kind of just sitting in the stands and complaining about - well complaining's too negative of a word, commenting or expressing concerns that those questions are important but they're not as important as the questions being asked by

those who are in drafting the proposal day to day and who need guidance and affirmation and/or correction of what they're doing.

So I think we need to watch out for the kind of FAQ nature of dealing with the disquiet of some people with what's happening or the lack of or understanding. And in the end those needs to be satisfied.

But, you know, the primary purpose is to get to the point where we have a proposal. Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Greg. This is very useful. And next in queue is (Athena Patrice). Athina can you please take the floor?

Athina Fragkouli: Yes this is Athina. I will follow Greg's example and I will combine the two agenda items as well.

I really - I pretty much like (Holly)'s suggestion earlier today of, you know, having a complete - of putting a concrete suggestion for mechanisms for review.

And from my understanding we have let's say two issues here. We have the mechanism and the powers, community empowerment and we have the different structures that are also proposed that would provide this empowerment in different ways.

So I think right now we should move on and ask them about this mechanism, how it's structure that is proposed could better give this empowerment every time that we talk about.

And what - and also we can indicate some aspects we are looking into. For example what - whether would be - whether a mechanism or a structure would require less changes or more changes, how long this proposal would take to be done and so on.

I think this is - this should be let's say the next step. Of course there are many other questions that might not be right now asked directly to the lawyers.

And I pretty much agree with the suggestion of having a (unintelligible) and keep track of these questions and note that we keep - right now we are dealing with the bigger picture these questions will be taken into account and are taken into account they're not ignored.

Only they're a little bit separated. They will be looked in into a bit later. That was my suggestion. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Athina. So while we can - I think we can move forward saying that we will do this exercise with regards to the question not only compiling them but also prioritizing them and trying to fit them into the different proposals that are now put on the table so we can provide richer context to the lawyers and we can build into this holistic view and this holistic approach from them to us so we can better guide our Working Party 1, Working Party 2 and working party on the stress test as to whether what we're doing or what they're doing is legally viable.

I see Greg Shatan's hand is up again. Greg is that an old hand or a new hand? Oh that's an old hand.

So I see we have with us Cheryl Langdon-Orr. And I see we have also Jordan Carter.

And well I would just like to remind our rapporteurs and I think Steve DelBianco is also here.

I would like to remind our rapporteurs two please provide us with the legal needs that you're working party is envisioning at this point so we can of course turn this into questions that can then be answered or at least some narrative that we can provide to the lawyers so they can provide us with their legal expertise on whether we are going on the right track or we should make any adjustments to either the mechanisms for the powers that we're looking to fit into our proposal.

So are there any other comments with regards to dealing with questions and considering the holistic approach which resulting to merging two points of the agenda?

Okay so with that we would go into the fourth and final point of the agenda which is the timeline.

I don't know if we can display the latest version of our timeline here in the Adobe Connect room.

I see and upload is in progress and I see Greg Shatan's hand is up. So please Greg could you please take the floor?

Greg Shatan: Sure. This is actually I raised my hand before we switched to the timeline so I'll go back to kind of end of the previous conversation if you'll indulge me.

Leon Sanchez: Yes of course. I'm sorry. I just, you know, I slighted the participants...

Greg Shatan: That's okay. I am used to being ignored and marginalized.

Leon Sanchez: Yes, not at all, not at all.

Greg Shatan: I'm usually so quiet that it happens naturally.

In any case the point I was going to make is that we need to stop thinking about questions so much and more about advice, more about I think the questions tend to intermediate between the lawyers and the work.

The work is - it's important to the people who are doing the work put voice to their questions. But I think that giving the lawyers the questions without the underlying documentation where the questions from which the questions are arising is to remove context and to take away nuance and the ability to really help us craft our answers.

You know, I don't think the lawyers are agnostic to what we come up with. They have no axes to grind. So they're just going to help us do what we want to do better.

And I think that, you know, we should not just be presenting them with questions. That's why I said in the chat that the rapporteurs are in a sense the next link in the lawyer client chain.

In a sense the rapporteurs are the clients of this legal sub team or kind of the lead clients if you will or the coordinating clients if we want, you know worry the - some words which of course we do.

So they need to feel like they are getting like they are not working in a vacuum and that it isn't just a matter of mailing questions into the lawyers and

getting questions back - getting answers back that sometimes seem to be off the mark because the lawyers aren't steeped in the actual work that we're doing.

So we need to disintermediate the lawyers and really get them in. I think there may be even times when it would be important to have the lawyers be on some of the working party calls -- not on all of them.

A, we can't afford that. B, that takes away their time to actually, you know, produce their work product. But I think there are times and we should think - have the rapporteurs think about that.

When would it be good to have the lawyers on those calls. Because I think having them on the whole CCWG calls are fine.

But the actual, you know, where the work is being done where, you know, particular issues are being debated when things are really right for the lawyers to come in and kind of clear things up they could be doing it right there and not with, you know, a bunch of written questions.

You know, this is lawyers don't generally work, you know, primarily by written questions.

Clearly there has to be - there's a lot of writing going on. I've got an office full of paper. But at the same time it's a collaborative exercise and it's working at the tip of the spear where the ideas are being fashioned. That's important.

So we need to figure out how to get the lawyers on the ground cost effectively and at the right times. Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Greg. I couldn't agree more with you. I think I think as you said the next link in this exercise are our rapporteurs.

And while I agree that it might not be the best use to have the lawyers (email) of their out calls I really support the idea of having our rapporteurs thinking on calls or a couple of calls maybe as they see fit

Having the lawyers would then just to iron out those details that they would need to of course not only field but in fact know that they are doing something that's legally viable and that will be implemented correctly when the time comes.

So I don't know if there's anyone that wants to comment further on this issue? No? Okay so we...

Man: Berry's hand is up.

Leon Sanchez: I'm sorry. Okay Berry could you please take the floor?

Berry Cobb: This is in regards to the timeline, just some introductory comments when you're ready to (unintelligible).

Excellent, please go ahead Greg.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Leon, Berry Cobb for the record. So I just want to make a couple of quick statements as it relates to the discussion about the timeline for the legal subcommittee call.

I believe just about all of you were on the CCWG call about 48 hours ago or less or so. And this was presented during that call.

There's been a couple of small adjustments to this timeline. I'll draw your attention to the month of June.

That previous version had a white block in there leading up to Buenos Aires where we would deliver a draft proposal to the SOs and ACs.

And there was discussion on that call that likely wouldn't be the case. I think Jordan had mentioned that it would be more about summarizing public comments and other materials to facilitate discussions with the SOs and ACs during Buenos Aires.

So I'll just mention that what is certain about this timeline are the events and the times minus the intensive work weekend leading up to Buenos Aires in regards to Workstream 1 effort and the draft proposal that will be developed through there.

Anything beyond Buenos Aires the what and when is still not set in stone. There will - I do believe it's pretty certain there will be a secondary public comment period. But when that kicks off and the duration is still in play as well as the eventual delivery of the Workstream 1 proposal.

The version that you saw the other night I believe had going to all the way through to Dublin but there are implications to that. Primarily first and foremost is the CWG. They are committing to the dates that we have listed here in the timeline.

This extended delivery from Workstream 1 does have implications to this and I don't believe the CWG chairs have fully digested the adjustment to the CCWG timeline.

There is a call tomorrow, a co-chair - a CWG, CCWG chairs call tomorrow where this will be discussed.

And then of course a secondary implication on this when the Workstream 1 proposal is delivered to the board and then subsequently to the NTIA there are some implications that need to be worked out there as well.

So the short take away here is in terms of the timeline and how the legal subcommittee and the law firms will be working as most of that discussion kind of just be focused around leading up to and shortly thereafter Buenos Aires until we have a bit more clarity about what's exactly going to be happening post Buenos Aires. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much for this introduction Berry. And I would like to ask staff to enable scrolling on timeline if that's possible. So thank you very much.

So okay so we are now here at the beginning of April of course. And as you see our timeline with regards to legal input goes from middle of February to mid-September.

So this would be of course the time in which we would be providing or working with the lawyers to provide the legal advice of the working group needs.

And what is the essence at this point is of course to have the initial viability of the different proposals that are being worked by Working Party 1, Working Party 2 and the stress test working party of course for our first draft proposal which would be released by April 20. So we can have the public comments starting at April 21.

But this doesn't mean or I wouldn't think that beginning the public comment period would be a time for us to pause the work we're doing with the lawyers.

On the contrary I would think that this is where our parallel timeline begins. And this is a time that we can see as an opportunity to of course follow in real-time what the public is commenting to the draft proposal in order to work with the lawyers as fast as possible so when the public comment period closes we can at least have some heads up to the group on how the lawyers and of course legal group have been following the comments and how we can propose the adjustments or address the different comments that have been raised through the public comment period.

So I would think of course that we would make a pass at this stage but rather to intensify our work during the public comment period.

And of course we need to let the lawyers know that while the first draft proposal has a really aggressive timeline for them to accomplish as well as for us we will be having more time ahead of us to iron out the different details and needs that the legal advice implicates.

I see Greg Shatan's hand is up. And I will ask you to please take the floor. We are ten minutes away from closing this call so I would like to please call for making short any interventions.

Greg Shatan: Sure. This is primarily a point of clarification since I'm still digesting this timeline. This must have been finalized during the 3:00 to 4:00 AM part of the call for me of the CCWG because it's kind of news to me.

So just to clarify, the public comment period that's starting on the 21st of April for the work of the CCWG that is going to be for a very rough draft of the draft proposal on all things in Workstream 1?

Leon Sanchez: I'm sorry my audio broke. Could you please repeat Greg?

Greg Shatan: Sure. I was asking whether the public comment period for the CCWG in - on - starting on April 21 is for a rough draft of the draft proposal for all of Workstream 1?

Leon Sanchez: That is correct. As far as I understand that is correct. The public comment period that (unintelligible) would deal with the rough draft proposal with regards to Workstream 1.

Greg Shatan: And I assume it would probably or hopefully emphasize dependencies that the CWG needs to actually be able to use in order to - for its proposal to make sense.

But I guess that's what I would hope for and it would hopefully inform the work that we do with the lawyers and the coordination with the CWG.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Greg. Any...

Greg Shatan: Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: ...other comments with regards to this point? No? Okay I see Robin is asking and I have seen a couple more attendees asking for the timeline.

Berry has been updating this timeline so it can be distributed. And I think he has already answered to the question of whether we can have some work.

And yes I think it will be distributed tomorrow after our coordination call. And it would be available for all to of course take a deep dive into details.

And well now we're just eight minutes away from closing this call.

And just to recap and see what we're going to do next I would like to just make a recap here.

I see David McAuley's hand is up. David could you please take the floor?

David McAuley: Thank you Leon. It's David McAuley. And I can actually take my hand down because I wanted to get to the recap and what's next. So thanks very much.

Leon Sanchez: Okay, thanks David. So the recap would be that we will be telling Sidley that they will be the coordinating firm or the leading firm if you want to call it that way.

And we will be having them pass the lead firm in these efforts. And of course they will have to coordinate and work in a collaboratively manner with Adler Colvin. And this is like the first agreement that we made in this call.

The second agreement is that we will be not only compiling the questions in a single document as we have just discussed but we will also prioritize, classify them and build complex contextual documents that we can approach the

lawyers so they can provide us with better legal advice. That would be the second conclusion here I think.

And the third conclusion is that we will be focusing on the work that is being done by the working parties at this stage.

By this I mean both the mechanisms and the powers for the community. So as I stated on our call earlier today I will be handing the lawyers the different templates that have been drafted by our working parties so they can begin to have a look at them.

And of course this will require further coordination with our rapporteurs from each working party. And I see David McAuley's hand is up at this point. David can you please take the floor?

David McAuley: Thank you Leon, David McAuley here. It's just a further thought on this. And that is what will we have instruct the lawyers coming out of this call? And I think they may be between two possible alternatives.

One is that we asked them for a holistic approach once we tell them that Sidley's going to be the sort of coordinating counsel.

And the other is just continue on with questions or but I don't think either of those is yet agreed.

So my question is do we know what we're going to instruct the lawyers because they're expecting something from I believe today? Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks David. I think and I'm - this is a question for wider group. I think that we - what we can instruct the lawyers to do is to review the different

templates that have been drafted by the working parties so they can - we can begin this series of interactions with of course questions and answers so we provide the sense to the working parties on whether they are going on the right track or if they need to make adjustments.

Would this be a reasonable agreement so we can instruct the lawyers to do this? I see Athina's hand is up. Athina could you please take the floor?

Athina Fragkouli: Yes thank you Leon. This is Athina. So I think that it's - it is indeed very important that they review the template and so on.

But I think it would be also useful because in the templates in the templates we describe possible mechanisms. These mechanisms when it comes to community empowerment could be work under different structures.

And I think it would be useful to know how it's - this mechanism would be implemented under this - under each of the different structures. I would like - I think this analysis would be interesting for our workflow. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Athina. I see Greg Shatan's hand is up and I see a discussion going on in the chat with regards to the timeline. So Greg could you please take the floor?

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Greg Shatan here. I think that we give them the templates. We give them access to the, you know, a better understanding of what our work parties are doing.

I think the questions kind of naturally apply by and large to aspects of the work and can be used to aid in advising on the models and templates there and documents that are being worked on.

So I don't think we have to make a choice between templates and questions. But I think that the questions and the abstract are not going to be nuanced and coherent enough.

The questions like leaves off a tree where the branches and the trunk are our proposal and the various pieces being worked on will be - is to what to my mind the model.

So they shouldn't ignore the questions. But again and I think that will self-prioritize the questions. The questions that help us get to the answer of what our proposal is will be the ones that get, you know, primary focus.

And the ones that help the uncomfortable be comforted or help those with axes to grind to holster their acts will kind of come second. Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Greg. I see Robin's hand is up. I please ask you to keep it short Robin. We have one minute ago and we need to make a hard stop.

Robin Gross: Thank you. Yes I just think it's important that the attorneys see the specific templates that we've prepared for some of these mechanisms so they can really get and understand what it is that we're talking about and we can really get good advice on what it is that we have in mind.

And I say this as somebody who drafted the template for what we're calling the community veto process.

And so it within that template there is step one, step two, step three. There's this check, this that check. There's the board have the final approval at the end.

It is in going through the template and understanding what it is that we've envisioned that they can tell us if that complies with California law or if we're way off base or if one part of it is not right or whatnot.

So and I think this is - that's probably going to be true for the other mechanisms that have been drafted as well is that it will help them to understand specifically what we mean and what is it that we have in mind when we say a veto process.

And maybe we need to tweak that what it is that we have in mind. But the - I think they need to understand where we're coming from first.

And, you know, I mean they're only like a one-page document. It's not like they're going to be overloaded with information.

But it is precisely the details and information that I think they need to to give us the kind of advice that we're asking them to give us. Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Robin. We need to do a hard stop now. The staff needs to prepare this room for another call.

I thank you everyone for your attendance. Of course we will send out the notes and recordings and action items will be activated as it should.

And I'll talk to you everyone soon. Have a great afternoon, evening or night depending on which part of the world you are. Thank you very much.

Woman: Thanks Leon.

Woman: Thanks bye.

Woman: Thank you (unintelligible).

Woman: Thanks all, bye-bye.

END