

---

BECKY BURR: Hello everyone on the line, we are gathering here in Los Angeles and we'll be with you in just about two minutes.

GREG SHATAN: Hi, it's Greg Shatan. I'm on audio only for the moment.

BECKY BURR: Thanks, Greg. We're gathering here in Los Angeles and we'll be with the group in a minute.

GREG SHATAN: Sounds good. I'm going to go on mute until such time, [inaudible] thing to do otherwise.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Hi, everyone, this is Bernie, it will be a few minutes. I would like to remind everyone, if you're not speaking, can you please go on mute? Thank you.

BECKY BURR: Okay, everybody, Becky Burr here, thanks for joining us this evening. We've had another full day in LA on bylaw drafting. As we discussed yesterday, the focus of our work today is going to be on the CWG questions that were circulated yesterday. When we get through those, we have a couple of issues that we wanted to talk through related to

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

reconsideration. I am going to start I think by turning this over to Cherine. Is that correct, Holly? Cherine, is that who I'm turning this over to for the questions from yesterday?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I believe Cherine is on. You're turning it over to Cherine.

BECKY BURR: Okay, I am turning this over to Cherine. Cherine, can you hear me?

CHERINE CHALABY: I can. Thanks, Becky.

BECKY BURR: Thank you, very good. Take it away.

CHERINE CHALABY: Yesterday, we went through the list of questions that had come out of the discussion in LA on CWG related bylaws, and I think the purpose of this part of the call would be to get feedback from CWG or from the coordinating group rather as to some of those questions. Is there anyone on the call who is able to speak to feedback on the questions that were discussed last night and circulated on the list last night?

BECKY BURR: Cherine, we may need to just go through them one by one and ask for reactions.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay, but I guess the threshold question was do we have people on who can respond on this? I'm happy to do that, I just don't know, do we have the right people on?

BECKY BURR: Yes, there are some people on. Greg is on, although he's not in the Adobe room. He is on and others who are on CWG are here also. Cherine, as I recall, there were some recommendations that the Sidley/Adler had on how to handle some of these, so you might push those forward as well as you're going through them.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay, let me go through the questions again and I'll recap where we were and then people can respond with their feedback. The first question – Brenda has posted it up here in the Adobe chat room – the first question was on if you have a matter coming out of the IFR, special IFR or SCWG, that is subject to Board approval, if the Board adopts the recommendations coming out of those review teams just as they are, is that the end of the process? So if the Board accepts all the recommendations, is that the end or does it still need to go to the empowered community, or does it only go to the empowered community if the Board rejects the recommendations?

We had said – yesterday [Sidley] had said that we thought separation should be different and that it seemed in the proposal, separation was

---

meant to be different, but for the other three pieces, IFR, special IFR, SCWG, it's an open question. So any feedback on that first point?

BECKY BURR:

Not seeing anything here. Silence is usually [ascent]

CHERINE CHALABY:

Approval? Okay, so the recommendation would be that if the Board adopts the recommendations in full, then there is no need to go to the community. However, in the case of a separation, that is a separate empowered community approval.

Number two is on PTI governance. This is not one that we talked about yesterday, so let me just go over it and then ask if there's feedback. The questionnaire relates to the two independent directors of the PTI Board, and we wanted to confirm that the ICANN nominating committee will be used to make that appointment, and then also ask the question of what group is going to be responsible for providing qualification needs to the nominating committee.

Lastly, [inaudible] that CWG will run a process to identify interim directors to fill those two independent PTI Board member spots until the nominating committee process is up and running. Any input on that?

I don't see any hands on that, so I think we just need to skip that one.

Number three is on the IANA functions contract, and the question that was raised was if there is a material amendment or a waiver to the IANA

---

functions contract that is initiated by ICANN, would the process to approve that amendment reside with a registry/customer group, or would it reside with the empowered community? As it currently stands, the proposal is silent on this point, and as currently drafted in the bylaws, there would be a public comment period, there would be a ccNSO and a GNSO approval and then Board approval. We simply have flagged should it also not be rejected by the empowered community, and the question is whether that's the right forum or whether it should instead be a registry/customer group.

We thought that seemed okay if it were a customer group, and I made the point yesterday that that's not dissimilar to where the power resides in the CWG proposal to initiate amendments coming out of the community, because it's the CSC and the IFR who would have the power to recommend amendments, so there's some logic in having one or both of those groups receive amendments coming from ICANN. Any objections to having that be something that is done by CSC or another customer group?

GREG SHATAN: This is Greg, if I could get in the queue, or if I am the queue I'll just –

CHERINE CHALABY: You are the queue.

BECKY BURR: You are the queue, go.

GREG SHATAN: Okay. If I recall correctly – it's been a while – the idea was that the ccNSO and the GNSO were providing those approvals and there wasn't a need for another layer. Since the ccNSO by definition is all registries and the GNSO is in part customers, I thought that was intended to be the gating factor. I don't think adding the empowered community was intended, nor was it intended that the customers alone are going to get their own kind of approval rejection process. That's part of a larger discussion that we had about to what extent is this a multi-stakeholder exercise and to what extent is this a customer exercise, and we actually I think did try to strike balances, and I think this was the balance that was struck in this case. I don't think there's anything missing.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thanks, Greg. What I hear you saying is the fact that the current draft bylaws propose that you have got ccNSO and GNSO approving, that that's sufficient and that there's no need to go, and nor was there an intent to go to the empowered community.

GREG SHATAN: Correct, neither to go larger than that to the empowered community or slower than that to customers only.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay, and I see Cheryl supporting that in the chat room. If no one objects, then we would strike reference to the empowered community

---

here and instead rely on the references to ccNSO and GNSO. Okay, good.

The next item is CSC number four on the list, is currently in the draft bylaws, the CSC charter is subject to amendment by the community, and the request was made by ICANN that the Board – not have an approval right over amendments to the CSC charter, but have an opportunity to be consulted on those amendments. We thought that seemed okay. Any objections to that? Okay, I don't see any.

GREG SHATAN:

If I could just chime in, I guess the question is whether this is like a working group, which the Board doesn't get to kind of comment on the charter – although I guess I don't think there really is an opportunity for that – or if this is something [inaudible] where there should be right of consultation. I think, again, we were thinking of this as being kind of just like a standing working group that was chartered by the community, so in theory I don't have a problem with the consultation right and I understand the kind of balance that's being struck by that. [inaudible] I do kind of bring that point up, but I don't think that's what was intended. This may be a comment from others if it's put in. Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Andrew raised the question in the chat room, which is "What does consulted mean?" A question maybe for Sam or someone else on the ICANN side. Is there already a concept of Board consultation in the bylaws that could be borrowed for this purpose?

SAMANTHA EISNER: There is a process that we use for example on the GNSO stakeholder group charters where there's a loop for the Board to weigh in. That actually probably is a heavier process than what we'd imagined for changes to the CSC charter. The reason that we raised the CSC charter consultation issue is because the powers of the CSC have the ability to impact ICANN's relationship with PTI, so we wanted to make sure that changes to the CSC charter – that we had an opportunity to do them within ICANN to confirm our understanding that they'll remain within the – or understand how those would impact ICANN and PTI.

Again, going back to the history of having complications, we do have places where we have the consultation right. We wouldn't recommend that there be a whole place where the ICANN Board would have to approve something going out for public comment, so it's a lightweight process, but I think that it would just have to make sure that it gets a reasonable level of Board consideration and the Board not being fully separate from the process.

CHERINE CHALABY: Andrew has his hand up. Andrew?

ANDREW SULLIVAN: The reason I ask this is because of the point that I think Greg made just at the end of his remarks, which is that this does sound precariously close to a substantive change to the proposal, that the original thing was the CSC is charted in a certain way, and this sounds a little like the



---

Board gets to weigh in in some way that is short of approving those things. So I guess given the somewhat high degree of concern about some of the feelings that people seemed to have had about the Board stepping in in some of these processes, I'm just concerned that this could raise some worries.

So maybe instead of saying the Board has the opportunity to consult, you could just say the Board will be provided the proposed changes for comment, and those comments may or may not be taken into consideration by whatever the – I forget the details of how the amendments are made, but by the people who make the amendments. That way, consultation sounds remarkably like there's going to be a back and forth with the Board, so the Board is going to have some control over how this change happens. I think that that could well raise some eyebrows. That was really what I was concerned about.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Andrew, let me respond on that, and to one of the questions in the chat, which is under the current proposal, how is the CSC charter amended? It's through simple majority of each of the ccNSO and GNSO. In looking at it, it also does contemplate a prior public comment period, so maybe we already have that opportunity. Maybe that is sufficient, what the proposal provides, which is public comments, and that would allow the Board to provide comments during that process.

ANDREW SULLIVAN:

Yes, that's a good point. I actually quite like that, because I think that way it doesn't change the way that the proposal is put together, and I

---

think that that has the nice effect that – you know, the fewer things that we change, the less we're likely to run into people saying we didn't agree to that, we did something else. We could really seriously derail this right now, so I'm trying to be ultra-conservative.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Okay, if there are no objections to that approach, which is to leave it with the public comment period, we could move on. Okay, I'm hearing none. I'm going to keep going then.

Number five on the list is the reference to the remedial action plan in the bylaws, and the remedial action plan is still to be drafted. This is just a mechanical question, it's just confirmation that that plan will be included in the IANA functions contract. If no objections, we would clarify that in the bylaws. Okay. Now we're moving into questions relating to IFR, and there are a number of questions on this topic. Number six –

AKRAM ATALLAH:

Excuse me, I just wanted to go back to the CSC for a second. How do we make sure that the CSC charter does not create a conflict between what the PTI can do and what the charter asks them to do? How is that guarded against?

CHERINE CHALABY:

I think it's guarded against by virtue of ccNSO and GNSO needing to approve those amendments, and there would be no incentive to create

---

a conflict. I don't see any conflict, CSC's role relative to PTI is a monitoring role, it's not an operational role.

AKRAM ATALLAH: No, but it gives them the authority to change SLAs and do certain things that will actually end up being in the contract between ICANN and PTI. If there's a conflict there, how do we settle that conflict?

CHERINE CHALABY: CSC doesn't have the power to amend the contract, CSC only can recommend changes. Amendment has to go through an approval process, so through that approval process is where issues that create conflicts would be raised.

AKRAM ATALLAH: Okay, thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay. Moving on to IFR number six, timeframe for the periodic IFRs and the special IFRs. The point was raised yesterday that in the AOC context, there is an articulated one-year timeframe for reviews. The CWG proposal refers to periodic IFRs being expected to take nine months, but there's nothing definitive there. The question is whether we can provide for some outside date for the IFR to be completed, and whether that would be nine months or 12 months. The other question is whether the special IFR should have a shorter timeframe, because theoretically it is

---

coming up because there's something that is pressing, that can't wait for a periodic review. Does that mean it should go faster?

I think the proposal on periodic IFRs is to put a timeline no longer than one year. Any objections to that? Okay. On the special IFRs, should those be on a shorter timeframe? Can anyone weigh in on that question?

GREG SHATAN: If I could just weigh in quickly, I think the answer is yes, but this not only is addressing an emergent problem, but it's also addressing a specific problem. Whereas the periodic IFR is supposed to be total review, the special IFR at least potential is a review only of the emergent problem.

CHERINE CHALABY: Greg, did you have a recommendation on timeframe?

GREG SHATAN: I would say six months. Even that feels a little long, but I think given the multi-stakeholder process, half of the year instead of the whole year is probably a fair aim [inaudible].

CHERINE CHALABY: Does anyone have a perspective on that? So the proposal is six months for special IFRs, one year for periodic IFRs, and those would be outside dates, it would take no longer than... Okay, so why don't we go with

---

that? I'm hearing no objections, we'll go with those timeframes and people can react when they see the next draft.

Number seven is a question about the potential for periodic IFRs and special IFRs to overlap, and ensuring that we don't have a situation where we've got two IFRs happening at the same time. The CWG proposal recognized that possibility and did provide that there could be a delay of a periodic IFR if there was already a special IFR in process. I think the request is to be a little clearer on that, to be more specific and to provide that if a special IFR were in process, that the periodic IFR would be postponed, let's say for a year, so that you don't have resources being used again and again to conduct IFRs that are all happening kind of in the same time frame.

That's one concept, and then the other concept is if there were a periodic IFR happening already on its schedule and an issue came up that required a special IFR, could the special IFR essentially have priority and take over the periodic IFR, and would it then manage the process, and potentially focusing on the particular issue that has created the need for the special IFR? Any thoughts on that? I think on the first piece, the proposal would be that if a special IFR were taking place, that a periodic IFR would occur no sooner than one year following the special IFR so that there weren't two reviews right on top of the other.

The second would be that if a need for a special IFR arose while a periodic IFR were ongoing, that the periodic IFR could become a special IFR in order to address the issue being raised in the special IFR.

---

BECKY BURR:

[inaudible] [Maarten] has raised a question in the chat.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Oh, why would we decide this now, as it may depend on the circumstances? I think the reason people were asking – this was a point raised by Sam – is just if we don't say anything now, then the process would just take over and it will just be automatic, that there is a requirement. Let's say there's a special IFR, but the five years is up and there needs to be – under the bylaws, it requires an IFR to occur every five years, so you'll be constrained. You won't be able to say we don't need it, we're fine, because the bylaws will require it, so your hands will be tied.

GREG SHATAN:

Maybe we should build some discretion into this, because it sounds like we're going from one automatic position to another one. What you've said should be put in there, but there should be some level of discretion, because for instance a special IFR may only deal with a single topic, and waiting a year for the periodic IFR that's going to address the whole gamut may not make sense at the time, especially depending on the topic. So I think these go in the right direction, but I think pinning them down now may remove some flexibility later, so I think we should split the difference here and have a recommendation that allows for some discretion at the time, but an indication that this is not just a juggernaut either way. Thanks.

---

CHERINE CHALABY: Thanks, Greg, that seems like a sensible solution. If we're creating discretion, I think it begs the question of whose discretion. Would this be something that would go for example to ccNSO and GNSO to decide whether having a delay is the appropriate outcome? Any thoughts on that?

GREG SHATAN: If they're the ones kind of convening the IFRs, then I think yes, that's probably the right place for it to be.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay, so let's go with that. We'll go with that there's discretion to delay, rather than just an automatic delay that discretion will reside with ccNSO and GNSO. It could be the same threshold that's needed to initiate the special IFR, and I think that's super majority. And then if they decide it's okay to delay, then it would get delayed. Okay.

BECKY BURR: Cherine, I'm sorry, we need to be mindful of time because we have to get through this in our allotted time.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay. Number nine, there's a question about clarifying what is meant by oversight structure. There's a reference in the IFR process of what the IFR is required to review, and it's supposed to review and evaluate the openness and transparency of "oversight structures," and we thought there what that was probably refer to is CSC and the empowered

---

community, as it relates to the functioning of the naming services. So if no objections, we wanted to clarify that language. Okay, not seeing any objections so let's keep going.

Number ten, one of the requirements of the IFR is to evaluate the relative performance of the IANA functions pre- and post-transition according to established service levels. What that would mean as drafted is that forever into time, you would always be comparing your current service against the pre-transition, let's say 2016 service period. The suggestion was that that might not make sense going forward, so instead, should the reference point always be to the prior period. That means it's got to always be getting better, but you're not referencing back to a period when it may no longer be a relevant period.

That was a question. The proposal itself says pre- and post- transition, so to be literal, that would be referencing the pre-transition 2016 period, but the question was whether that really was going to make sense into perpetuity. I see Cheryl saying the prior period makes sense. Any other thoughts on that? Okay, and Andrew says he thinks that's what was intended. Okay, very good. All right, we'll clarify that then.

Okay, number 11 is reference to the reports that the IFRT will be reviewing as it's doing its review process, and the language refers to review of the reports provided by PTI on a regular basis, and then gives a list of examples. The suggestion was there rather than trying to hardcode examples in the bylaws, instead to reference to the reports required to be delivered under the contract, and we thought that made sense. Any thoughts on that? Okay.



---

The other request was to craft some kind of exception for reports where there is a compelling reason to exclude the report from being made public. For example, there were security issues or government concerns, and then if those reports were held back, they would be presented in redacted form if possible. Any thoughts on that? Okay, seeing none, I'll keep moving.

Number 12, very technical point, just confirmation that where we refer to not making recommendations in the face of opposition of a GNSO member on a gTLD issue, that that really should have referred to opposition of the registry stakeholder group representative on the IFRT, since there technically is no GNSO member, there are these subcategories. We think that's a clarifying point.

Number 13 is also we think a clarifying point, that the IFR is allowed to recommend amendments to the SOW, but that doesn't actually say the entire IANA functions contract, and we thought it was probably meant to be the entire contract, not just the SOW, so we wanted to make that clarification, unless anyone thinks the intention was otherwise. Okay.

Number 14 is if there is an amendment to the contract, that the timelines under the proposal says the timelines for implementing amendments are agreed to by PTI and the IFRT. Their request was that since ICANN is a party to that contract, didn't it make sense that ICANN should also have a say in what those timelines are for the effectiveness of the amendment? The request was to also refer to ICANN as having a seat at the table for deciding on the timeframe. Any concerns with that? Okay.

---

Number 15 is a question about who makes appointments to the IFRT. There's reference in the proposal to the numbers and protocols operational communities, and the request was can we be more specific on what exactly that means? I don't know if there's someone on this call who could give us that, or if that's something we could get through follow-up. Yes, Becky is asking.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I can comment on this, at least for protocol parameters. All appointees from the IETF to outside organizations are made by the IEB, so this would be the same way. There is no promise, however, that we will in fact appoint this person. That was a person that the IEB said several times, that it was not clear that they would want to make such an appointment. So if there was an appointment, it would come from the IEB, but there's no promise that it will be filled.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Okay, all right, we can clarify that. I see Becky is typing, but I'm going to keep going and I'll come back if there's something still on this point. Becky is asking John if you can weigh in for the numbers community.

JOHN:

Yes, can you hear me?

CHERINE CHALABY:

Yes.

---

JOHN: Good, I want to make sure my mic was [right]. For the numbers community, the ASO, which was the NRO served all the functions and purposes of the ASO per agreement with ICANN. The NRO would make the determination how appointments were made. In general, we tend to take appointments and ask that the community elected advisory council do that. That's how ICANN Board appointments are made, for example. On the other hand, because the question hasn't yet been sent to the NRO, I don't know what the process will be for making appointments. I also don't know whether or not the NRO will take the same options of the IAB, which is they may not make one at all. So for purposes of bylaws, it should be identified that appointments will be made by the ASO.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay, thank you. Question number 16 is should there be a diversity requirement or goal in the IFRT membership? It's currently silent. There is such a requirement for CSC. Anyone have any thoughts on what was intended there? Okay, what I would suggest is we can add it into the language since it is in other places, and then if there are any concern – Andrew is saying he doesn't recall it being discussed. Okay, so let's put it in. It probably was just something that wasn't discussed and was not intentionally omitted, so we'll add it.

Number 17, question about – should we have a clarification of when, at what point in time the IFR team is dissolved. It is not a standing body, which is part of what the proposal provides. It is not a standing body, so

---

should it – after delivery of the final report, should it then dissolve? That seems to make sense to us that there should be some moment in time where it's clear that that body is no longer operating. Okay, so we'll put in language that provides that after delivery of the final report, that the team is no longer standing.

Another question is whether – this is number 18 – whether there would be a quorum requirement on the operation of IFRT. There is nothing in the proposal itself that speaks of quorum requirement, and the group is acting by consensus, so we can just delete reference to quorum, it's not part of the proposal. Do people agree we would just delete reference to a quorum requirement? John, is that an old hand? Okay. I don't hear any feedback on that, so we will delete reference to quorum, since that was not part of CWG proposal itself.

Number 19 on this list – I think everybody has scrolling function – relates to special IFRs, and there are two questions there. One is at the initiation of a special IFR to clarify that there will be a public comment period. There was some language in the proposal that wasn't entirely clear, and the response back wasn't entirely clear, references the empowered community mechanism and discussion forum, but we think that really is meant to just refer to a traditional public comment period, so we would clarify that.

Number 20 is we have no public comment period relating to recommendations coming out of a special IFR before the Board acts, so again, the thought was that probably was not intended, so we should add reference to a public comment period in there as well.

---

Okay, so moving on to the last category, SCWG and separation process, there are a handful of questions there. The first question, number 21 relates to when SCWG is running an RSP process, ICANN has suggested that SCWG work within the then existing RSP guidelines that ICANN has. We would clarify that those have to be the ones in place before the SCWG was created, so it wouldn't be a moving target, it wouldn't be that they were changing while the SCWG was trying to function, but that ICANN felt that its RSP guidelines are in place to be compliant with laws and for other reasons, and they want to make sure that those guidelines are followed. Any concerns with that? Okay.

Number 22, there is reference in the CWG proposal that if there are costs associated with SCWG recommendations, that ICANN can't cover those costs by raising fees on TLD operators, and question or clarification is that that is intended to address the cost of the transition, not the cost of a new operator. For example, if a new operator has a cost structure that just is more expensive, that that could be reflected in fees, but the transition cost itself wouldn't be passed through. Does anyone have any thoughts on that, or whether that was something that was expressly discussed?

Okay, why don't we go with that language, and if there are any concerns, people can raise them. I see there is some discussion back on 21 about the RSP guidelines from Jordan saying that he doesn't know what the guidelines are, and Sam is responding. Sam, I don't know if you want to chime in here.

---

SAMANTHA EISNER: I'll post a link to the publicly available guidelines, I just had the wrong link. I'll get it in there in a second.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay, great. Number 23, I think we got an answer there, we got that answer from Andrew and John, so we'll just do the same for 23, which is just two points for numbers protocols. 24, at what point in time does the SCWG team dissolve? We'll do something similar, which is just to clarify when the work is done, the team is dissolved, and then on 25, quorum requirements. The CWG proposal did not impose any quorum requirements, so we would just delete that and be silent on that point.

That goes through all of the questions that came up during yesterday's meeting. We still have the punch list that was circulated last Friday, I don't know that we have time. I don't know if the intention, Becky, is to try and go through that as well.

BECKY BURR: No, I think we need to go to the issues, the questions that we have with respect to the reconsideration requests [inaudible]

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay, thank you.

BECKY BURR: Thanks, and Holly, are you going to lead that discussion?

---

HOLLY GREGORY:

Yes, happy to. We went through the reconsideration request, and we have four issues to raise with you and will be sending you shortly a list of these issues. This is for – we're just on a preview with them with you now, and then for consideration and discussion tomorrow. The first one relates to the timing for the Board Governance Committee to make a recommendation to the Board. The proposal included a draft bylaw text that – Hi, is this better? Okay. The proposal included a draft bylaw text that said that the committee's final recommendation to the Board shall be made within 90 days of receipt of the request.

The draft bylaws that we've been looking at use – instead of the "shall be made," uses language of "endeavor to produce the final recommendation to the Board within 90 days of the receipt of the request." We want to confirm with you that the word endeavor can be included, given that in any case, the Board's final decision is required to be made within 135 days of the committee's initial receipt of the request, so there could be some flexibility around that 90-day period. That's the first issue.

The second issue is that the proposal contemplates an opportunity for rebuttal of committee recommendations, but there was no description of whether there would be a limit on the length of the rebuttal, and if so, what that limit should be. We would recommend including a limit of, for example, ten pages, double spaced with a 12-point font, and we know in that regard that the bylaws currently provide that requesters shall not provide more than 25 pages, double spaced and 12 point, for the initial argument, so we thought a ten-page rebuttal was reasonable, but we seek your feedback on that.

---

The third issue relates to the proposal that at the option of the requester, recordings and transcripts should be posted of the substantive Board discussions around the reconsideration, and given that requiring the posting of such recordings and transcripts could chill the Board's full and frank discussion of the request, we wanted to raise with you whether such recordings and transcripts will really be required to be posted. We think from a governance perspective, there is a legitimate concern around how that could chill discussions. I understand that typically the Board would consider these kinds of materials to be subject to an attorney-client privilege, so that's another issue to look at.

Finally, the fourth issue relates to the scope of permissible requests and whether it should be – annex A currently provides that it should be expanded to include reconciling conflicting and inconsistent expert opinions and expert panel opinions. We know that this issue was discussed at length in our discussions related to the IRP, and ultimately the CCWG decided that the dispute resolution mechanisms would not be used for this purpose. That change appeared in the IRP section, but it was not made in the request for reconsideration section, and we recommend and would like authority to make a conforming change to remove it from the reconsideration section.

Those are the four issues from our discussion of the reconsideration bylaws today. I think they're relatively straightforward, and we will send this to you in writing very shortly for your consideration, so we can discuss tomorrow on our call. Thank you.



---

BECKY BURR:

Okay, that's our list of issues to discuss. We also did – just bringing you up to speed – get through a revised look at the mission statement and the IRP, and probably will have some questions coming out on that tomorrow. Any other input around the room here? In the Adobe Connect room? All right, we are done. Thank you very much, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]