**Standing Committee on GNSO Improvements Implementation (SCI)
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 03 May 2012 at 19:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Standing Committee on GNSO Improvements Implementation on 03 May 2012, at 19:00 UTC Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-sci-20120503-en.mp3 on page
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may

Attendees
Ron Andruff - Commercial and Business Users Constituency - Primary
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISPCP – Primary – Chair
Avri Doria – Non Commercial SG – Primary
James Bladel – Registrar SG – Alternate
Krista Papac – Registrar SG Primary
Anne Aikman-Scalese – IPC Alternate
Mary Wong – NCUC – Primary
Angie Graves - Commercial and Business Users Constituency - Alternate

Apology:
Carlos Aguirre – Nominating Committee Appointee
Jonathan Robinson – Registry SG Alternate

Staff:
Marika Konings
Margie Milam
Nathalie Peregrine
.

Coordinator: Excuse me, I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you very much. So hello and welcome to the SCI call today on Thursday the 3rd of May, 2012. And I may ask, Glen to roll call just now. Is Glen available?

Nathalie Peregrine: This is Nathalie...

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: ...I will begin the roll call for today.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. So could anybody else do that? So - I don't have the list, you know, for all participants. Has anybody - anyone the list of our members?

Marika Konings: Nathalie will take care of the roll call.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, Nathalie, please.

Nathalie Peregrine: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. On the SCI call today we have Wolf-Knoben, Avri Doria, James Bladel, Angie Graves, Anne Aikman-Scalese, Ron Andruff and Krista Papac. We have one apology from Carlos Aguirre. And from staff we have Marika Konings, Margie Milam, Glen de Saint Géry and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you and over to you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you, Nathalie. And welcome all again. And let's look to the agenda of today just the next point would be if there is any - anybody has something to disclose with regards to statements of interest, may I ask you to disclose that? I hear nothing.

So may I ask you if you are satisfied with the agenda or is there any amendment - any comment to the agenda of today?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Wolf, this is Anne Aikman-Scalese. And the only thing I had to add was I did have two very small comments on the GNSO Council voting results table that Marika had sent to us; it's very minor.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Do we have that incorporated in our agenda...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...in any point of that - the threshold rules? Although isn't that - oh it's at a different point. Not to forget...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, oh I'm sorry it is threshold rules, yes, sorry.

Marika Konings: No - this is Marika. That's actually a different item because the threshold rules specifically relate to delaying a PDP while what Anne is referring to is the voting thresholds table...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Oh the table, yes .

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, okay, okay I understand.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So I just would like to see where we could insert that. If you agree then let's put it after the threshold rules and talk about that, not forget that point, yes?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Any more comment? No so thank you very much. So then let's go just to the next point on the agenda Point 3 be with regards to - I called it work teams. So from our last call we were asking people as volunteering for the different items we have to cover. And Marika put together the list of items and the volunteers to each item.

My question is - first question would be is everybody - does everybody see her or himself in the right group? Or is there any comment to that? Not yet.

The other question was to me is the coverage of each item in each group is that balanced in the meaning? That means that we have people enough, let me say, to cover that point. So I see for example in - under Point F just Anne as always, let me say that - that way and Point B as well, J. Scott Evans.

So the question came to me is that enough? And - well I would like to ask you for comments on that. Avri please.

Avri Doria: Yes, this is Avri. I think leaving one person as the sole stuckie on something is not good. I think though between, you know, for example I could always volunteer as vice chair to participate on consent agenda. As for the update for the GNSO Council voting results table I would assume that staff was also on that one since they're already producing the table or perhaps I misunderstand.

And on some of them it looks like we have a very rich spread. So, you know, I'm willing to add myself to the consent agenda just to keep it from being a single person. But, you know, otherwise some of them do seem to have a lot of people. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thank you, Avri. And, Ron, please.

Ron Andruff: Good afternoon, evening everyone. Ron Andruff. Thanks, Chair. I - my feeling on this is certainly echoing Avri's. I think we're - if you look at deferral of motions you see a large number of people will contribute to that. But when it comes to either consent agenda or voting thresholds or, you know, proxy voting procedure those all need a little bit more beefing up in my view. And certainly F, update of GNSO Council voting.

So we have enough people in this working group that we should be able to apportion everyone. The whole point is these are just teams to break down and actually summarize what the general thinking on the topic is and bring it to the SCI.

So it really, you know, if we had three or four people on each team that would be very helpful as opposed to having an overload on one and something - this is a very - as I always thought about it it was a lightweight working group - working team to gather data about that topic and bring that to the perspective of the entire SCI so that we all didn't have to go out and try to, you know, figure out what we knew, what we didn't know about the various topics, we would just have teams gather that up.

So this should be a quick, you know, bunch of straw men put forward that then the SCI will look at and make determinations against. So that was my...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you very much, Ron. So there was also some - some let me say email exchange in advance with regard to question whether we might have, you know, if you look to the table of the agenda items that's - there might be, let me say, different - how do you say that - they may need different time consumption, well, to cover those items.

So maybe some of them are more lightweight than the others are. So - and that could be reflected also in the number of people. But on the other hand - so I also - I wouldn't like to see that somebody is, let me say, a soloist and alone, you know, and looking on. Every time it's better, well, to have a discussion within a group at least with two or three people and talking about the items.

So on this perspective, well, I would like to ask for comments. And I see Marika as well. Please, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just to comment I think Avri made the question on the GNSO Council voting results table and I think it also comes back to the point that Wolf made because indeed that's the document that staff put forward and basically what we developed on the adopted recommendations.

So that is an item where indeed we're looking to the SCI to just make sure that, you know, we didn't miss anything or it's in line with what was adopted. And, you know, we believe it is because of course we looked through all those recommendations.

So that's more a kind of verification task where I guess some of the other items, you know, might require, you know, writing up new language, new reviewing information, for example, in deferral of motions looking at past experiences. So there might indeed be a need to balance certain groups more. But I think, you know, the group might also want to take into account indeed the workload that's associated with some of these items.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you. So I could - if I can parallel the number of people joining the different groups we have the Groups C and D, they are - well let me say, equipped with people. And if that would be necessary so - and I could also - let me move from one group to another, let me say, from C - from deferral of motions to, you know, to join N and the - with regard to that item, update of GNSO Council voting results table.

So then at least with this group has also two people as right now the B - Group B has one - other two with Avri. May I add one point is it comes to my mind that in between we have been approached with regards to an item regarding the statement of interest. Who else - the Council set for itself.

It came from outside the Council so - Evan Leibovitch - so he was dealing - he was asked, well, to disclose some statement of interest and he used our statement form of interest. Maybe the ALAC doesn't have one or - so I don't know exactly why.

But then he came back with a question whether he could simplify to some extent the statement of interest form and the questions related to that. So that might be a point which we could deal with. We have to (answer) first one question is because since it came from Evan and he's a person and he's not an entity or an ICANN body so which according to our rules we would have to come up with an item.

So we have to clarify whether we accept such an item coming from one person or whether we ask him, okay, try, well, to get back to ALAC and then come back through ALAC to - we will have question or how to deal with that. So that's more a formal question; we have to answer in that respect. And then we can talk about that.

Ron please.

Ron Andruff: Chair, I'm confused. I'm not sure where we are. We were talking about the volunteers on the various elements and now we're talking about Mr. Leibovitch so I'm confused.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No, no I'm sorry.

Ron Andruff: You know, I'm just wondering where did we leave off? We were in the middle...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, okay no I was only...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I was only trying, well, to add another item.

Ron Andruff: Oh.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: And so - or a potential - to talk about a potential item - additional item which is SOI, statement of interest.

Ron Andruff: Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: And I just tried to explain where it came from so that was the only thing so you are right, so we are talking about the - the items we have on our agenda and the way how we can work on those items and we should - I shouldn't confuse you and should talk about additional items later on.

Ron Andruff: Thank you very much. No, just for clarification because I'm trying to keep an eye on this and I'm also...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ron Andruff: ...with reading - various things going on so I just - it went sideways on me and I missed it. No problem.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: So does that now go under Agenda Item Number 5 or...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Agenda Item Number 5 is what - is (AOB) what? Okay. Yes, let's talk about it at this agenda item.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I'm sorry, this was Anne talking.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, okay thank you, Anne. So my last suggestion was for myself, well, to move my name to the Group Number F. And so then we have in addition the - no then we have covered. Is it - am I in line? We have covered all the working groups, don't we or did I miss something? No, why not put - okay Ron is asking why not put a reminder to the group and see who joins.

Well we could do that. And it could put into the reminder, let me say, the groups they are at the time being and asking for additional volunteers that's my suggestion.

Okay so after this I would go into some details and start with the consent agenda. On that - and I saw that already Ron has been working on that together with Marika. And I would like to ask one of you - well, just to share with us, you know, your thoughts about that and then start a discussion on that. Marika, you have that on the screen? Yes, I see that. Who is going to...

Ron Andruff: Well this is Ron.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, Ron please.

Ron Andruff: I'll take the lead and then I'll hand off to Marika...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, please.

Ron Andruff: Just to put this in clear context I was not very informed on this topic so I went to support staff and basically asked a couple of questions so I could understand what were we talking about and what was the rationale for the, you know, behind this initiative.

And so she came back to me with some information so I could be better informed and in fact provided some good ideas to go forward so I could

inform myself. But the nice part about it is that that work is coming out to the group as a whole. And - because I think back to the working group lists; I wasn't on the consent agenda list, I was really trying to inform myself.

But - so as - we've discussed it. Marika came forward with the documentation that we had. And I asked what improvements we would need, what would you think that we would need to put forward to move this ball forward, to come to some logical conclusions. And so I think that's what we're looking at now. But I'll hand this off to Marika from there to explain what we've done. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, Marika, could you please continue?

Marika Konings: Yes. Yes so this is Marika. So looking at the comparison that we did based on the, you know, the Board procedure, the interim procedure used by the GNSO Council and the one suggested by J. Scott there were a lot of similarities. I think, you know, the biggest - most had in common that, you know, the chair or the leadership that, you know, sets the agenda and recommends what items should be under consent agenda is the same procedure that anyone can remove an item from the consent agenda for, you know, any reason they wanted; there doesn't need to be an explanation or a vote associated with that.

I think the only difference between some of them was I think the procedure that the Council is currently using excludes items that are - that have a specific - have a motion associated with them which is different from the Board or the procedure that was proposed by J. Scott.

So what we actually - what I actually did here and looking, as well, at some of the other elements that are, you know, specific to the GNSO council is, for example, the recommendation to actually exclude elements that are subject to absentee voting to make sure that there's not a situation where something would be adopted through the consent agenda but then through the absentee vote someone would suddenly say oh but I don't agree.

So just as a, you know, formality take that away. And just noting as well that as it's the Council leadership that, you know, proposes the consent agenda if there's a strong feeling that, you know, items that have emotion associated with it shouldn't be part of the consent agenda they have that flexibility to not include those items if they want to.

Another difference between the procedure that was proposed by J. Scott and this is the fact of the vote. I think in the one that J. Scott proposed it was a - the chair would just read out or say are there no more objections? If not then this is adopted. While I think the ICANN bylaws actually call for an affirmative vote. So the idea here as well that a vote is registered at the end of the consent items if, you know, the ones that are remaining.

And also a small difference is in relation to preparing the minutes to make sure that those include a statement regarding the composition or threshold that approved the consent agenda so that's part of the records of the minutes. That's also an item that's a bit more specific than was proposed in the language, I think, that J. Scott put forward.

And I think that's basically - I think for the rest it basically follows what was in the different procedures that we shared.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you, Marika. So I think that's a good start - starting point, well, for discussion on that and I call for comments. And I see Avri, please.

Avri Doria: Yes, I got one which I think is just a pedantic one. I'm not sure if we've actually defined Council leadership anywhere as a specific subgroup. So you may want to say chairs or vice chairs or whatever. If we have defined Council leadership that entity has sort of been a new emerging, evolving entity then fine. But otherwise we may want to be specific.

I think also - I think there need to be some called out exclusions. I think one way of doing it that Marika mentioned is - possibly works but anything that has absentee vote with it it can't be on the consent agenda I think is good.

I think it may be even appropriate though to sort of single out several things that could, for example, anything related to a PDP. Now I think most of those do have absentee so that goes. But I think also, for example, anything that involves sending a recommendation to the Board we may or may want to exclude period. I don't know but I'd like to put those things on the list as things to be considered in terms of exclusion. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thank you. With regards to - let me just comment - with regard to Council leadership I think we could make it more clear, yes. So we have in mind chair and vice chairs so - because they are preparing the agenda. So leadership is - maybe too general so - we don't know what's going to happen in the future, okay.

So with regards to the content, Marika, please.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. On the terminology I can have a look at the operating procedures to see what is used in other parts of the operating procedures to make sure, indeed, that it's aligned whether, you know, leadership is used or chair or vice chair. And then I can report back on that for the next meeting.

On the item that Avri raised I'm actually curious why you would want to exclude specific items on the topic basis. I mean, I don't have a specific (position), you know, for or against but if you look, for example, at the Board they just I think include items where they see there is consensus and no need to further discuss.

It doesn't mean that, you know, that certain voting thresholds are not met or not recorded but they also adopt, for example, PDP recommendation as a part of the consensus agenda, you know, if and when appropriate.

And also with the, you know, caveat in this case that, you know, anyone can move - remove any item from the consent agenda at any point, you know, before a vote is taken. So I'm wondering why you want to exclude certain items while there might be circumstances where, you know, for efficiency or, you know, for example, an item that has been deferred a couple of times and has been discussed to such a great extent that at the end there is broad consensus that still want to have it as a separate item.

I'm just - you know, out of curiosity why would you want to exclude, you know, up front certain items from inclusion in a consent agenda.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, Avri, please.

Avri Doria: Yes, okay, without raising my hand. I guess because I think that some of the things like initiating a PDP - and as I say it goes very well with your - not to exclude anything that's got an absentee ballot; I think those two are actually quite similar to each other. It's just one is doing it on an artifact versus one is doing it on the kind of thing.

And the other one that involves formal recommendations to the Board I think that in some things those are the main tasks of the GNSO that I think other parts of the GNSO from bylaws and rules that require the face to face discussion of things prior to taking votes face to face or, you know, the voice to voice, I think that those things fall in a basket that as the prime thing that they should not be done purely in a way that could be expeditious.

I think when we first brought up the consent agenda it was indeed referred to for things that were sort of more trivial, more standard, more practiced, more how to get things done or, you know, where we're going to meet for our, you know, us-only dinner and things like that.

But I think for the prime duties of the Council those things should remain within the barriers of - decisions are made in a face to face, voice to voice environment. And I don't think that being expeditious is something we should do in those particular cases so that's why I suggested it. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Yes, okay, understood. Now I see Mary, please, Mary.

Mary Wong: Yes, thanks, Wolf and hello everybody. Just to follow up on Avri's point - and I guess the question would be how do we capture that besides the absentee voting requirement because those would cover all the PDP.

I guess what I'm thinking of might be a situation, as Ron said, clearly, you know, anybody can ask for it to be removed but if it's removed from the consent agenda it doesn't automatically go into the agenda for that meeting, I don't think - unless time permits otherwise it becomes an agenda item for the next meeting.

So there may be some issues that require discussion and the opinion of an SG, of a councilor. But I'm not sure that there's a way for them to say, look, it needs to be discussed at this meeting rather than be on the consent agenda or be discussed at the next meeting. That was one of the possible scenarios I had in mind.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, Mary, thank you. Just to correctly understand so you might see a situation where an item which is going to be removed from the consent agenda may - there may be an issue we have to discuss it at that meeting where the consent agenda is valid for. Is that the understanding?

Mary Wong: Yes, and, you know, honestly I'm not sure that that would happen very often. But let's say, you know, at the time there's a lot of things going on and councilors pretty much take their instruction from their membership. So the agenda comes out, you know, and it's published.

And, you know, somebody in one of our constituencies says hey wait a minute, this is really important for the following reasons and it can't wait for the next Council meeting. Is there a way to move it from the consent agenda to be a discussion item at this meeting?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Mary Wong: And the way that we have it now I don't think there is.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Well I saw that covered in the second paragraph, the last sentence. But maybe we should - should make - be made more clearly. So it's written so they wish, for example, to discuss the item, to query the item, to discuss the item, leave it open at what time it should be discussed. So maybe it could be added something to explain it clearly.

Mary Wong: And I guess, Wolf, this would be a question for you and Jeff and Stéphane I suppose as in is the expectation that when we do this in the second paragraph that it's possible to then have it in this meeting or is it, you know, usually by rule deferred to the next meeting for discussion.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No, no I think - Mary, so if we - if the group here is of the opinion it should be open, you know, to - offered for discussion - or a potentially a discussion at the present meeting then we should say that. And then should write it down and make a proposal for that and bring it up to the Council then for decision, yes.

Mary Wong: Thanks. I mean, I just wasn't sure that that was something that we had considered or that should be made (unintelligible). I had another question or comment. Should I say it now? I see that Ron has his hand up. It's about a different point .

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Just - well - asking so, Ron, do you have an additional point or just to that point?

Ron Andruff: Yes if I could - yes, do you hear me now?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay you could - and, Mary, I come back to you after Ron, yes?

Mary Wong: No problem. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Mary. I think that the comments you make are certainly valid. They need some consideration but I started to post and got ham-handed on the Adobe Connect but basically I think that if a, you know, this is really where the two elements of consent agenda and deferral motions both intertwine in terms of the work items on our list.

This could almost be used as a deferral tactic. So we have to make sure we don't let that happen. But I think it would be fair if we say that, you know, there can be a discussion as - following along Wolf's view of what was written there if we allow a discussion of that topic just in general for people to have an understanding of why is it being deferred, what seems to be the issue? Why are you taking it out of this consent agenda?

Then it - and it's placed on the next agenda - next meeting agenda. That, you know, that would be one way. I mean, that's an off the top of my head kind of thought. But it's one way to make sure that this topic will be discussed within a certain period of time. And it'll give them - the constituents - constituencies, you know, whoever part of the community is being affected by this time to really discuss it and come back with their cogent thinking.

So I'm thinking that, you know, I'm not disagreeing with the principle at all but I think that we should allow this kind of an item. It's Paragraph Number 2

really capitalizes on all of the things we want in so much that allows that free reign for anyone to say no this can't go forward but we put rules on it. So I'll stop talking there. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thank you very much, Ron. So I come back to Mary right now - and you had additional comments? Mary.

Mary Wong: Yes and I said it's on a slightly different point. It's - the - going back to the first paragraph in terms of making the list and supporting documents available in sufficient time. My assumption would be that that's a usual eight-day deadline or whenever it is that we have the agenda out.

Because it doesn't seem to make sense to have a different timeline for this nor is it practical. So I just raise that as a point of clarification. Is that what we understand? And should there be a difference or should there be an exception?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So that was my understanding. So just saying that my opinion. So - and my question is why shouldn't we just say according to the rules? So we have set out in all the agenda timeline in the rules of operations and we should follow that with regards to the consent agenda as well.

Mary Wong: Yes, and I would prefer that, Wolf, if that is the agreement and the understanding just to make sure that there's no misunderstanding by anyone else reading this after us.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. I don't see any other comment on that. So, Marika, did you get that?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I'm trying to take notes on the right side of the screen...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Marika Konings: So if I'm missing anything there, you know, just let me know but I think I captured what Mary was trying to say.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. So it's just about, you know, the timeline of the - for the Council agenda, which is laid down in the rules actually so that we can refer to the rules with regard to the time we need before the Council meeting to provide for the consent agenda. Okay, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, and this is Marika. Something we could consider of course as well is that, you know, the idea is that this would get integrated into the GNSO operating procedures. We might just refer here to the specific section that talks about, you know, when documents need to be made available so we don't actually have to repeat it but we just refer to the section.

So should at any point in time that specific section changed, you know, we don't need to change it in different places so that might be another option to deal with it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, okay. Mary, do you wanted to continue with other comments or...

Mary Wong: No I'm good for now, thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thank you very much. So I personally have another question regarding the taking - or registering votes and taking votes. So in the third paragraph then the chair calls for a vote. So we should be clear what kind of vote we are looking for, is it a kind of just simple majority vote or whatever. So any thought on that?

My feeling would be okay it should be a simple majority vote but if there is any comment or different opinion on that please. Avri, yes.

Avri Doria: Yes, that's actually a really good question. I guess that everything would have to be a majority vote issue if you were going to do majority vote consent. I

think it would get right confusing if we start mixing consent agenda with the other item on our list, the threshold rules needed. So I think that majority vote...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...makes sense as long as everything is a majority vote - would be a majority vote if it was pulled off.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. I see right now more clear I think it should be consensus isn't it? Because...

Avri Doria: Oh that's right - well...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Because, you know, it is, you know, the case for calling for a vote after items have already been removed.

Avri Doria: Yes then it's - wait a second, I'm totally confused. I think I can ignore what I just said.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So that's what - how I read it right now. So...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...one person is enough to take it off the list.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So it's written though when there are no more items to remove, so meaning, okay there have been already removed some items. Then the chair reads out the number of the remaining consent items and then the chairs calls for a vote. And this vote clearly - obviously should be a consensus vote. Otherwise there might be one item which somebody is against, you know, and then it should be removed according to the other paragraphs.

Avri Doria: Margie has her hand up. I bet you she can clarify.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Oh yes, please. Margie, please.

Margie Milam: Yes, actually I've been puzzled with this issue as you've been discussing it. If something is on a consent agenda and it gets voted on doe the vote have to be unanimous? I mean, I don't necessary think it has to. And then what is the result of a vote on a consent agenda? Is it - does it mean that we have consensus? We can say that it's a consensus position?

You know, I mean, I don't think it's implied that just because you don't take an item off the consent agenda that it has to be 100% unanimous. But you still need to have some threshold. Anyways as you can see I'm struggling with this trying to figure out what it all means when there is a vote on something that is on the consent agenda.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Ron, what is your opinion please?

Ron Andruff: Thank you. I'm confused why we're even having this conversation. It seems to me that there is - are existing structures for voting that happens whenever the Council takes a vote now. And whatever this would be would be exactly the same. It's a standard voting - it's a vote that you would do one by one so this is a vote that's by consent.

So what changed there that we're not using the same principles or same procedure that we use for every other vote in the GNSO? That's what I don't understand.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Maybe I've confused you because my understanding is, you know, we - the Council leadership, so the chair and vice chair, they bring up a consent - come up with a consent agenda. So this is brought before the Council and then the Council is discussing and somebody says oh on the Item Number 5,

no I don't like to see that on the consent agenda so it's going to be removed then afterwards.

And the - then it will leave four other items which nobody is asking for removal of one of them. And then we go for a vote and asking, well, to vote on the consent agenda. Then my understanding is it must be unanimous. So because that's my logic or is that...

Ron Andruff: If I might respond?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes please, Ron.

Ron Andruff: Yes, no this is - the whole point - let's just step back from this. What is the purpose of a consent agenda? Consent agenda, in my simple understanding, is to expedite administrative matters. You know, that may be an understatement but if you understand it from that perspective it's just to expedite this activity so we can get on with bigger and better things, more important things that we need to discuss or things that need discussion.

These don't need discussion so they're on the consent agenda. It's just an expedition process. And if that's the case then what seems to be the problem? I don't understand it. I don't see why all the sudden now we're looking for consensus. And you know how ICANN devolves in a heartbeat into divided camps. And so...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Ron Andruff: ...why would we even look to have consensus to expedite - all we're doing there is making things twice as long to shorten something up; it makes no sense.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ron Andruff: I'm confused by that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Ron Andruff: And tell me, someone, if I'm really off the - off base in terms of my simple
                   understanding of what we're doing here with consent agenda.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Sorry to...

Ron Andruff: I'm quite sincere.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Sorry to confuse you. So...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...maybe the ladies can help us, you know.

Ron Andruff: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Let's ask. I don't know who was first, Marika or Avri.

Avri Doria: Let Marika go first.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, Marika, please.

Avri Doria: She has something authoritative and clear to say.

Marika Konings: Well I'm not sure about that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. But I mean, I think, you know, agreeing with Ron's point, I mean, the Council leadership, you know, decides on the consent agenda and the idea is indeed that items end up there that don't require a discussion, that are not controversial, that everyone agrees upon. And, you know, if discussion is needed then items are immediately taken off, you know, by just the first person that asks for it.

On the voting itself if you look, for example, at the Board consent agenda I think normally, you know, as it's basically written up in their minutes it basically says like well, you know, these resolutions were approved in a single voice vote, you know, 14 Board members voted in favor of the resolution.

And then in notes, for example, people that were unable to vote on the resolution or that abstained, you know, conflict of interest reasons or for whatever reason.

So that's basically how it's done in the Board context. So I think in that sense, you know, as we're already talking about possibly, you know, items that are related to a PDP so that might - an easy way around that, you know, instead of having to try to define what that means is saying well any item that has a specific voting threshold associated with it that is not a simple majority - so then you basically catch all those items that are also called out in that voting threshold table, you know, are not eligible for consent items.

So then you really do away with any kind of concerns there might be on, you know, is a different voting threshold needed or does it apply. So maybe that's a way of, you know, combining those two of getting those items out that people feel shouldn't be part or should never be part of a consent agenda and making sure that there's no confusion over which voting threshold applies.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thank you, Marika. And now Avri please.

Avri Doria: Yes. I mean, I think that - I think I'm close to agreeing with so I might not have much to say. I think that taking it to a unanimous consent agenda does make it too hard. The notion of a consent agenda is a bunch of things that are voted up or down together; one vote, no debate, no amendment.

You know, again anybody could have taken something out but I think you could be against everything in the consent agenda and vote against it. And therefore it should be the Council's normal voting threshold that counts. But because we've got all these varied voting thresholds I don't think anything can be included that isn't a majority vote item.

But I think as long as they're all majority vote items a majority vote, however we define it, should be sufficient.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Good. So I'm - I tend to understand and I think I confused myself a bit. So any further comment to that? I lost Adobe Connect so if there are any hands up...

Avri Doria: No hands are up at the moment./

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No hands up. So okay then the suggestion would be a voting as usual that means majority voting. Okay. That's - the next question is there any further comment - additional comment to other points regarding this item, the consent agenda?

I'm sorry I have - I lost Adobe Connect so...

Ron Andruff: Oh I'm sorry, Chair, then this is Ron.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ron Andruff: So no what - the only thought that I would add to what you've just said is the fact that I think we as the SCI have more or less checked the box number of the work teams, number one, consent agenda. I think we've pretty well covered all the discussion and the groundwork on this.

There may be - we may want to bring it back in front of the whole group to see if there's any more items but I think we might be able to move two people off of those work teams onto others.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ron Andruff: I'm quite serious about that. I think that we've done...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ron Andruff: ...very good work on this consent agenda.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ron Andruff: We've got very good information there so we probably only...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes okay so if I may ask, you know, the small group on the consent agenda well to take care of what we have discussed, well, to put it into and to put it on the list so we can, let me say, discuss on the list further on the new draft, let me say on that, yes?

Ron Andruff: Well I'm saying even there's no sense of a work team anymore. I don't know what you and one other person would do in the...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No, no the...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...I would ask - let me - the best - Marika to...

Ron Andruff: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...to put that into - the opinion into the right wording, let me say. And maybe, Marika, you could also maybe suggestion into what part of the rules of procedure it should be incorporated so in which part of or which part of that.

And then just send it to the list and - until the next time we can amend if - and put questions on it and then talk about again and maybe decide for next time.

Ron Andruff: Chair, Marika has her hand up. This is Ron just...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, Marika, please.

Ron Andruff: No, if I may, just to finish off responding to what you've just said? I think that's exactly right that we can get this thing prepared and turned around very quickly. And I think this is - we can kind of work in this manner on all of these various elements I think we'll cover...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: ...very quickly. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ron Andruff: Marika.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Marika.

Mk: Yes, this is Marika. So, yes, so what I can do indeed I have taken a note and circulated it to the list and, you know, prepare a redline version based on the things, you know, the items where we have agreement on making changes to this.

                 With regards to where to put this in the operating procedures, you know, having looked at it my suggestion would be either in Chapter 3 on GNSO Council meetings or Chapter 4 on voting of the GNSO operating procedures. But again, you know, I'm happy there to take any other suggestions that people might have on where it best fits.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay good. Thank you. So then it's okay for this point. The next item we have on the agenda is what? I'm still not connected to Adobe Connect.

Avri Doria: The next item you have is deferral of motions.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Deferral of motions.

Avri Doria: And I'll ring out on hands up until you get yourself back on Adobe.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. So I just got back.

Avri Doria: Oh okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So okay that is deferral of motion. So I don't know did we - was there already a start of that - working start of that point? So because on the one hand we have many volunteers on that. On the other hand so the question is what do we have on the table at the time being? Marika, please.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. What we already have on the table is the research that Glen and Nathalie and Gisella did on the history of deferral of motions.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I see.

Marika Konings: And I think there were some further questions that Avri asked on that. And I think Glen came back with some further responses on that. So the basic research has been done so I guess it's now up to the sub team to look at that - that data and see what, you know, the group can derive from that on basing a future model or whether indeed there's a need for a formal procedure or not...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...to address that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. So the question is who takes a lead in this group? So not saying that to you, Ron, but you are raising your hand to comment on that please?

Ron Andruff: Thank you. Thank you, Wolf. Angie Graves and I are members of the BC and we've both put ourselves on this list. And so we would be happy to, you know, if Angie will assist me kind of take the lead on kind of taking the pen, if you will.

Regarding this and just in terms of a quick summary of where I think we left it there were about 105 motions that we're discussing here. Twenty-two were deferrals over a two and a half year period. Of those four motions were deferred a second time and one was a third time.

So effectively 1 out of 100, you know, 1%, is getting - asking to be deferred a third time and, you know, 4% are a second time. So it looks like we've got a very good track record of these things. So I'm not sure how much we want to kind of get in the middle of this.

So - but what I do know is there were some elements that were brought up in the last call which I think were very prescient. And if I'm not mistaken it was Glen - or someone from staff - brought up the notion of socializing the motion. It may have been Marika.

In any case this idea of socializing the motions within the Council before the motions are made; this is a very helpful thing. So when a deferral - so there would be a situation where it would cause less deferrals if in fact these things might get brought into the discussion stream earlier on in the process.

So I thought that idea of socializing motions was very important then this idea - because it does remove the shock of the motions appearing surprisingly and sending shock waves through the various constituencies that they impact.

So those ideas I think were very valuable and I think that's really kind of how this group started. And so I would offer Angie - and I hope she appreciates I'm throwing us both into this to say we will take the pen on this initiative. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Well if - I think that - it seems to be accepted, yes, so from my point of view - so I welcome that and would be happy - and I understand you would just start well to getting into more detail with regard to that statistics and then draw your opinion from that and come up with some - with some suggestion.

Ron Andruff: Well if I may? Yes, Chair, what I was doing is kind of giving the framework of where we're at with the hope that that Ron, Angie, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Krista Papac, Avri Doria and Carlos Aguirre will all do that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, okay, sure.

Ron Andruff: So we'll take the pen. So if the ideas kind of flow in from wherever you guys feel this is at or what you feel that, you know, the direction it should go and

then Angie and I will try and craft something that reflects that that we can bring back to the larger group.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: ...large measure what we just did with the consent agenda.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes okay. And I see a comment from Avri please.

Avri Doria: The comment is really confusion. And perhaps this last bit that you added may be made it a little less confusing. At first I thought I was hearing so the two of you are planning to do it all and then you'll let us know what's going on or maybe it's changed. I really don't understand what the two of you taking the pen on this means.

Ron Andruff: Well, Avri, if I may?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ron Andruff: The logic, as I understand these elements are is that we have a larger group and then we have all of these elements of which very few of us are up to speed on them completely. So the group break down of workgroups as I understood it was to try to distill what are the elements that we're discussing here that the SCI should be aware of and bring them to the SCI as a whole so then we could then do what we just did in the consent agenda discussion.

So in other words if you put it in terms of Marika and I were the sub group on consent agenda. And we developed - we looked at the various elements of it, we looked at what the differences were between the three drafts that were on the table. And then we tried to construct something that would fit the bill for ICANN and this process.

And then we brought that to the group. And the group then chewed around on it for this last hour and a half or so and we finally came to a position where we kind of feel pretty comfortable with it. Probably some work still to be done but we're more or less got that one done.

Now the group itself, the larger group, needs to work on that and come back with what they think.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ron Andruff: So it's just that process that's all. So I was just saying that Angie's new to the process and so I welcome having her on board with me. And so that's why we'll develop - I said we would just - if everyone wants to flood us with their thoughts on the topic we'll just put them all on one piece of paper and send them back to the - to you guys.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ron Andruff: That was the point.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Ron, that's what I understand. So we can expect the group - the group Number C can expect a paper coming from you - from your side. So right now just like it was from - with regard to the consent agenda is that - because that is needed. We need the paper, well, on which bases we can start to discuss and with regards to Item C.

Ron Andruff: Exactly. That was my original suggestion with these work teams and now we're - that was...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ron Andruff: ...the principle I'm discussing now, yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Avri, any further question to that?

Avri Doria: I guess I just don't feel comfortable about it but I don't want to make an issue of it at this point.

Ron Andruff: Avri, I'm happy to defer to you if you want to take the pen. We'll just...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: No I just - I just - it just doesn't - I don't know.

Ron Andruff: How would you prefer to do it?

Avri Doria: I don't know.

Ron Andruff: Okay.

Avri Doria: I just feel that it was a very quick we will take the pen. We've just basically got the group together at this point. We even haven't had a chance to look at all the information and think about it and already somebody's got a pen on it. And I guess that - the speed made me uncomfortable.

Ron Andruff: Apologies for my...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Ron Andruff: ...CEO mentality...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Now, Avri...

Ron Andruff: So no problem. And I'm happy to defer if anyone else wants to...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I guess it was my academic mentality that got in the way.

Ron Andruff: Fair enough.

Avri Doria: Apologies.

Ron Andruff: Fair enough. No and from my point of view truly I - it doesn't matter to me how it happens. All I'm suggesting is that that simple process be followed. It's just really...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes and...

Ron Andruff: ...gather all the details and if there's a number of people out there committed to a team...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yes, because I'm not even sure we have all the info we need yet.

Ron Andruff: Well that's the point; that's the point. Let's go out and get as much as we can and then we'll as a group - SCI group we'll decide if we have enough or not. But let's go ahead - somebody has to start it, that's all. I step back, Chair, sorry.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes so we should really take care about, you know, what questions we have. So in addition to that - maybe also, you know, I personally because I'm on Council and I had to deal with this deferral of motion maybe I have kind of a curtain in front of my eyes and don't see the - the really background of that and the problems.

And I do hope that all of you in the group come up with questions when Ron comes up with a paper so I only see that as a starting point. And then if he needs further on - more information about that so which I at the time being it doesn't come to my mind but may come to our minds during the process so that would be helpful to come up with.

So that - we said that so I would like to move to the group Number D, voting threshold rules for delaying a PDP. Is it the same as we have - or do we have already some - I understand we have a comment from - a paper from Marika from last time. Was that - and that is comment of staff and opinion of staff. Do we have more at the time being available? Does anybody know from that group? Ron, please.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Chair. I'm not aware of any other further documentation...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Ron Andruff: ...in that regard at this point. But I have a suggestion that perhaps I can make at this point with regard to - we just left off with the idea of who writes what. Maybe Angie and I should write up the PDP seeing as how we're the only ones on that group for now. And, Avri, maybe you and someone else could pick up the, you know, kind of coordinate...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I want to point out that you're actually not the only ones on that one; it goes across the paper.

Ron Andruff: Oh okay.

Avri Doria: There's two other people on it.

Ron Andruff: Oh very good, oh okay. All right.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: You had said that before and I hadn't bothered to point it out but I figured I'd point it out this time.

Ron Andruff: Oh thank you. So my point is it can go either way that, you know, someone can - I was just - so I'm just saying I will step away from deferral of motions and pick this one up if you'd like; whatever you prefer. But otherwise, Chair, I'm not aware of any other information on this because we haven't - we're just forming the group at this point as I understand it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, yes it is. So anyway so where are with D right now? So is it - that somebody takes these - the papers or the paper available and then starting with that and then sharing that with the group? Avri, please.

Avri Doria: Yes, if I can make a recommendation for both...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes please.

Avri Doria: ...of these multiple-peopled ones and that's that any of us, you know, can go and start a Google Doc or a, you know, EtherPad on these topics and then basically we could start collecting anyone's thoughts in that one page and see where we are. So no one is stuck with a pen but whoever wants to start it first, you know, starts it.

We can easily put together whether it's two Google Docs. I figure no one in this group - I'd be the closest - is a purist about not wanting to use Google so we could probably use Google Docs. It's not like when I'm working with civil society groups. Oh, we can't use that.

So perhaps we set up a Google Doc document where people just start crafting their thoughts about these things.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Okay so I need to understand correctly that you are starting with that?

Avri Doria: Sure, I'll start two Google Docs. I'll make them empty until I have announced people and then people can go put stuff in, how's that work?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Can I maybe offer the wiki for that? That might be a location where people are already familiar that we create, you know, specific pages for the different sub teams so everyone can as well look at that and see what everyone's doing?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: The only problem I have with wikis is that wikis force a sequential whereas Google Docs and EtherPads allow several people to work at the same time. So what happens in wikis as a multiple person working document is that whoever happens to have it open is blocking everybody else from doing anything. That's the problem with the wiki page as a collaborative work environment.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So...

Marika Konings: Could we maybe just use the wiki as a home where people can link from? So just trying to make a, you know, a central page where people can go if, you know, they want to find wherever that work is being, you know, being done. Would that be...

Avri Doria: Oh certainly the wiki to point to the various...

Marika Konings: Right.

Avri Doria: ...EtherPads or Google Docs, yes, that'd be great.

Marika Konings: Right. And then maybe I can just create like pages for the different sub teams that also lists who are working on it. And that can be a place, as well, to post the other document that, you know, we have already sent around, for example, additional information that people have...

Avri Doria: Sure.

Marika Konings: ...have collected. So okay I can take care of that.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...as a relatively static repository of information it's just not a collaborative work.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So may I just comment? Because I'm not so familiar with the Google Doc, I'm familiar with the wiki page. But I'm keen on to learn about that. And for me the most important thing is so that nobody of the related group is going to be missed, you know, on one of those docs, you know, there must be - it must

be sure that - it must be ensured that everybody of this group now is - could be aware - could - I think could be made aware through email or whatever, you know, that if there are some changes on the document that he or she is aware of that. So that must be sure. And I'm sure it is.

Okay so we are running out of time so it's - well it's one hour. Let me just briefly, well, come to the two other points. With regard to proxy voting procedure I have shared today a small document personally which I drafted while - how I sat - how I am seeing the existing - the present voting procedure - proxy voting procedure and where I see questions with regards to that item and which questions should be solved.

I would like to ask you - I'm going to share that with Carlos at first. But in addition since it's shared already with you, if you have comments on that and ideas on that please share that views with us and we will come back with that document.

Now there is one - the Council voting results table. And how should we deal with that? Do we have any idea?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: The table? Yes, this is Anne Aikman-Scalese.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: And my comments were minor; they were just hoping to provide in a couple of cases a little bit more information. And whoever else is working on this team should check their own review.

I thought it was a good summary but I did notice that for someone coming new to the Council they might want to know, for example, Marika, with respect to terminate a PDP at the very bottom of the first page of the table that there is a standard in the bylaws that the votes should be based on - only for a significant cause.

And that it might just be helpful to clarify right after that terminate a PDP just to add those words, only for a significant cause, because that's supposed to be the basis of the vote.

Then a similar comment on the second page I think it's the third one down. Approve PDP recommendation imposing new obligations on certain contracting parties. And there is a bit of additional information in the bylaw about this applying when a two-thirds vote of Council equals consensus. Which might be worth noting whether you do it right there in the box or as a footnote as you've already done with respect to the first item on that page.

And then the only - the last comment that I had related to - in the middle of the second page where it says modify or amend and approve PDP recommendation.

And again this probably only applies to new people, new councilors, but it's just very helpful when you have a nice short reference like this that the bylaw itself says - and I would suggest you put, you know, paren, prior to Board approval, close paren just so it's very, very clear there's no amendment of PDPs. I mean, it seems silly anyway but it just - it would be helpful.

So - and then I actually did not get a chance personally to look at the items beyond that when I - I haven't looked, Wolf, beyond - I got that far, that's all I'm saying. I didn't get...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: ...any farther.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you, Anne. But what I want to do is so - if possible do we have - let me say if you make remarks in written form could you...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I tried to - yes...

((Crosstalk))

Anne Aikman-Scalese: If Marika could send me a file that can be modified...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: ...because the file was sent in PDF and...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: In PDF, yes, okay I understand. So, Marika, just - Marika, raise your hand so you could comment on that just briefly. But we are almost - we are over the end of our session and I would like, well, to come to the close of that; not to keep you waiting here...

Marika Konings: Yes...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Marika please.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I can be brief, indeed. Anne, I'm happy to send you the Word version. I think the suggestions you made were very helpful. I, unfortunately, didn't catch them all so it would indeed be really helpful if you could, you know, make them...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...in a document. But I think from staff perspectives those clarifications seems to make a lot of sense.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, be happy to do so.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thank you, great. Ron please.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Chair. I'm not sure where this is going from the point of view that it looks to be a movement to modify the proxy voting procedure by allowing it to happen on site during an event - an event being a meeting.

And I don't think it was written in that spirit. And I think there was discussion in the last call around that topic. We spoke about the idea of if you're not there - if you're given a proxy and the proxy is not there then that is a fact of life. You know, you have to live with it. And just like the - if the rain comes down I'm going to get wet. I have no choice.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ron Andruff: In the same way the proxy has been given and that choice is not there then that doesn't happen. Now I'd like to go back and look at the notes in more detail but that's certainly something that needs to be reviewed because it seemed to me there were a number of voices speaking in that direction.

And now I'm looking at document that's showing how we can sort of slide this one in and let people do it on the sly. GNSO Council is exactly that, it's a council. And they're made up of the GNSO which are all the bodies that - the various constituencies and the like that make up the organization as a whole.

The councilors are supposed to reflect the wishes of the Council and - or sorry, the counsel of their constituents - constituencies. And what we're saying here is - there's been direction given, everything is in place but something has happened now and someone's passing off the vote; they're handing something off. And I don't think that is - was the spirit of the way this was developed.

So before we start word smithing this proposal - it's a straw man I accept but I think there needs to be more discussion on it. And so I would suggest that we might just want to pick this topic up as the start of our next conversation...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ron Andruff: ..because in fact we're over the time and I have to jump as well.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Sure, sure, sure, sure. It was just a starting point and I'm happy - well, to receive comments on that. I just tried, well, to make it transparent where the points are in the roles in case - if, you know, we suggest this or that way. So that's what I was trying. And I'm happy, well, to get comment on that. But thank you very much.

I also - I would like to come to a close. So we couldn't cover not yet the survey and the additional one item which I brought up. I would like to suggest, well, that the next time at first - I would like to suggest to have a meeting in the next week if you agree.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Oh no - sorry, excuse me, this is Anne Aikman-Scalese. But with the International Trademark Association's schedule...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: ...I can't - I don't think either J. Scott nor I - that's not really possible.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: How do the others see?

Mary Wong: Yes, Wolf, this is Mary. Like I'm in the same position; I'll be at the INTA meeting as well so next week is not a good time...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Is not a good one. Okay then - but the week after that so just two weeks from now would be more - even more better, yes?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay so then let's keep it at - for the next time. And I would suggest, well, then to start with the - with the survey just to understand that and then to allocate the work with regarding the survey. And then with the other items with regarding to the items we have received comments on that. And I will send you the agenda this way, yes?

Okay so then sorry for keeping you waiting. And thank you very much. And, yes, good-bye from my side.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you, Wolf.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Wolf.

Marika Konings: Bye.

((Crosstalk))

END