

## ICANN Transcription

### SCI A-Team meeting Friday 12 February 2016 at 17:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of SCI A-Team meeting Friday 12 February 2016 at 17:00 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.

**Mp3:** <http://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-sci-12feb16-en.mp3> On page: <http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#feb>  
(transcripts and recording are found on the calendar page)

#### Attendees:

Angie Graves – BC – Primary  
Sara Bockey – RrSG - Primary  
Lawrence Olawale-Roberts – BC – Alternate  
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC - Primary

#### Apologies:

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISPCP - Primary

#### ICANN Staff:

Julie Hedlund  
Mary Wong  
Terri Agnew

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the SCI Sub Team A teleconference held on Friday the 12th of February, 2016. On the call today we have Sara Bockey, Angie Graves, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts and Rudi Vansnick. Side note, Angie Graves will be joining audio shortly but she is on the Adobe Connect.

From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Mary Wong and myself, Terri Agnew. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and please begin.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Terri. Rudi Vansnick for the transcript. With this we can start our meeting with the second item on the agenda, Statements of Interest. Always important to have a review and see if there is any - or if there are any

changes in Statements of Interest from the members of this group. None then we can start our real discussion.

And thanks to staff for bringing up the notes from our meeting and what we agreed upon. We agreed last call that the - with regards the motions if they should be a second yes or no. We agreed upon that there is normally a seconding required in order to allow voting of the motion. There was some discussion about if there needs to be first discussion and then a seconding. And at the end we decided that there should be a discussion prior to the seconding of the motion. And with that, staff has been looking into procedures for Steps 4 and 5, which are for the motions discussed at the Council meeting and 5 is if a GNSO Council member seconds the motion the GNSO Council chair calls for a vote, then we succeed with the vote normally.

But then the question came up on - I'm taken notes back here - if the seconding should be by another councilor, yes or no. That was in fact where we got stuck last time to see if this - something that is required yes or no. And if there - the councilors should be from a different stakeholder or constituency.

I think this is the only clearance we need to have on this point at this level of the discussion. And I would like to know from anybody on the call what would be the preference would we go for a councilor from a different stakeholder group or constituency? Or could that be a councilor from the same stakeholder group? I think that's a quite important question.

And it's up to us to decide if we want to go for that kind of request. I don't know if there is anybody that is willing to comment or give any suggestion? Lawrence asks, you're not in the Adobe Connect, you can probably not see the text. You're just on the phone call if I'm not wrong?

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: I'm trying to connect to the AC room now. I should be there in a few minutes time.

Rudi Vansnick: Yeah, no problem. It's good that you can see the text that is displayed in the Adobe Connect. It's easier to follow the discussions and have some opinions. But meanwhile maybe you can have your parts on this. Do you prefer that the seconding would be done by a different - from a councilor from a different stakeholder group? Or may it be from the same stakeholder group? What is your opinion?

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: I feel that - sorry, this is Lawrence for the record. My opinion is that it could come from not only the councilor it could be from the same or from - it could be from the same stakeholder group or from another stakeholder. I feel that since we're talking about seconding the motion in some cases it might - eventually there is going to be a vote on whether it's really acceptable or not.

So I feel that even if we have a councilor from another stakeholder group supporting it could (unintelligible) to the - I mean, eventually there's going to be a vote on what position should be taken. And it's - I feel that whether - I'm open to any of - I feel that it could be from the same stakeholder group. I don't have an objection to that.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay. Thank you, Lawrence. Rudi for the transcript. I don't know if Angie or Sara has any opinion on this? Eventually can - if you don't have audio we can eventually use the green flags in the Adobe Connect to agree or disagree. So the proposal would be that there is no requirement of having a councilor from a different stakeholder group being the seconder of the motion. Is that what we would like to go for? Or - and in that case I think we can use the green V to confirm.

Okay, yeah, Sara, rather wants to go in the other direction and having a seconder from a different stakeholder group. So it's up to Angie what's your opinion?

Angie Graves: Rudi, hi. This is Angie Graves. Yes, I'm still considering this. I don't have a specific opinion one way or the other I'm sorry to say.

((Crosstalk))

Angie Graves: Yeah.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, go ahead.

Angie Graves: Well, Lawrence and I have had some discussions recently on other topics. And Lawrence, I don't want to put you on the spot but you are certainly welcome to speak up here with respect to this issue. I think you've put a lot of thought into your position so far in our communications. Thank you.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Okay, thank you. Thank you, Angie.

Rudi Vansnick: So, Lawrence, you want to give some extra input?

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Thank you, Angie, for that. Lawrence for the record. So I too will want to maintain the (unintelligible) defer to whatever Angie has to say on this, her (alternate). But I'm just - review that, you know, like I said earlier, since the motion is still going to have to go some form of discussion and voting by the entire Council so I'm of the opinion that it might not be necessary to have the seconder of the motion be from another SG.

If it is seconded by a member of the same SG, eventually there's going to be some discussion. And after the discussions there will definitely be some voting. In fact with what we are proposing now it's possible for the motion to be amended even before there is a vote on it. And the amendment doesn't have to come from the seconder, it could come from any other of the councilors.

So I feel that it might not be necessary to have the seconder come from the same, I mean, from a different SG since there is still going to be some other process of input into whatever motion is going to be voted on.

Rudi Vansnick: Thanks a lot, Lawrence, for your comments and vision on this. I also tend to say that it really doesn't make any difference as at the end the voting is going to decide if the motion passes, yes or no. And as we already said that the discussion should be before the final seconding is done so that when somebody is seconding the motion the (unintelligible) step that follows is that the motion will then be called to a vote by the chair. So that there is no longer any other discussion starting after the seconding has been done.

As in fact it doesn't change anything if the councilor is from the same or from a different group. But I see, Sara, you have your hand up I would like to let you speak.

Sara Bockey: Yes. I just have a question. And once again this is Sara Bockey for the record. And I'm new to all this so I don't know if it would make a difference or not. But do we need to take into consideration that if there were to be an amendment made and you have to consider it's going to be deemed friendly or not, would it be better to have the seconder be from a different stakeholder group in order to have, I don't know, keep it more fair or neutral or I don't know what the word I'm looking for.

But would that come into play that it would be important as far as consideration of amendment and whether they're friendly or not that you have it being from two different stakeholder groups? I guess that's my question.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Sara. Well really interesting. But I think that that the second part of our discussion it's about the amendment. The question that I have in that context is that - and then I have to call on ICANN staff to help and help us a bit looking into the process itself. And is an amendment made before a motion has been voted on? Or can an amendment be done after the voting? I

don't know if Julie or Mary you can help us out of this? Yes, Julie? Okay, Julie fell off the call. But, Mary is mentioning in - oh go ahead, yes?

Terri Agnew: Oh sorry, Rudi. This is Terri. I see Julie also typed in there, just letting you know, her line disconnected but she's dialing back in.

Rudi Vansnick: Yeah, okay thank you, Terri. Rudi for the transcript. Well as Mary is mentioning in the chat it's the amendment should be done before the vote which means that in fact it's the amendment that will influence the seconding anyway as the process would be, if I'm not wrong, the process would be there is a motion on the table. There will be a discussion, that's the step - and I don't know if you have your flowchart in side view.

If the motion is discussed in the flow charts that was provided it is mentioned that the motion should first be seconded before there could be an amendment. And that's where I have the question to answer to what Sara was bringing up. If we could infer that question it would make things a little bit easier. But I see, Sara, you have your hand up. You want to speak?

Sara Bockey: Yeah. And this is Sara Bockey for the record again. Yeah, I understand that the amendment would happen before a vote would occur. But I guess my concern is if we don't allow - or we don't require for the second to come from a different stakeholder group and it is an amendment, would we want to give one stakeholder group the power to decide whether it is a friendly amendment or not? Is it better to have that decision dispersed across more than one stakeholder group? Just sort of thinking down the line.

If we do make it that it's not a requirement that a second come from a different stakeholder group, what are the consequences if amendment comes - if it's considered friendly or not when it comes to a vote. That make sense?

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Sara. Yeah, indeed that makes sense. That's in fact the whole picture that we need to look at. It's not just the motion but it's also the

amendments and on top the friendly amendments where again the vote can only happen after the amendment has been rejected or accepted. And then, yeah, in that sense I have also the preference to have another stakeholder group doing the seconding in order to have a stronger proposal.

But I see Julie is back on. Maybe, Julie, you can give us a little bit view on how this is regularly happening in the Council?

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, so this is Julie. As Mary has noted in the chat, in any case in the case of a - in the case of an unfriendly amendment, amendment that's considered unfriendly, this would have to go to a vote. And so that would conceivably operate as a safeguard. But I think that Sara raises an interesting point. And I think it's something that we are discovering here as we look at this process and that is that there is the potential for some interconnections here between the seconding of the motion and the consideration of amendments.

I think that it is a useful question for the subteam to consider as to whether or not a motion has stronger support if it has a - the person who made the motion be from one stakeholder group and the person who seconds the motion being from another stakeholder group.

I think in practice it probably has not made that much difference. But I can definitely see the point that if you do have support from both stakeholder groups for a motion that then conceivably you might be less likely to have someone introducing an unfriendly amendment from, say, a different stakeholder group.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Julie. Rudi for the transcript. Yeah, indeed, I was just wondering, based on the flow chart that gives you a very quick but very clear picture of the process itself. I was just wondering if as we have first a discussion phase before the motion is seconded so that we have the flow chart in front of us now on the Adobe, I was just wondering if the seconding is done and it's required to be done before an amendment is proposed. Because an

amendment is, far as I understand, most often introduced due to discussions on a motion.

So I'm just wondering if there is something that is going to change in the process there that the seconding would happen after the amendment is proposed. That's in fact the question that maybe could be useful to see if we can clarify that the process, phase 1, ends when the motion has been seconded. And that would then have a second phase having the eventual amendments to the motion.

And I see in the chat Julie is mentioning there is currently no requirement for the seconding. To happen after an amendment or before. Okay thank you, Julie.

Then again, I ask the team if this is a requirement that we would like to discuss or change. And I see Lawrence, you have your hand up, you have the floor.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Okay so this is Lawrence for the record. Sorry, Rudi, that I (unintelligible) but I can't recall now. I remember reading somewhere that - or I don't know how I get this opinion that we can have more than one person seconding the motion. And if we don't then I think that we can make seconding a motion open to more than one personality. So in that ways if you have a popular motion and you have almost half of the Council, you know, seconding it it shows that it might have (unintelligible) very little resistance by the time we begin to discuss the motion and then have a vote on it.

So what way we can go around this is if we have a restriction on the number of persons (unintelligible) to second a motion that might be (lifted) and just show that demos we at least one person seconding any motion that is on the table. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Lawrence. Rudi for the transcript. Well, it is clear in the process is written that a motion needs to be seconded otherwise it cannot be voted so there needs to be a least one seconded otherwise there can be no call for vote. So that - I think that's quite clear in the process. We cannot change or we should not change that otherwise we have to review our whole process in this.

But there is at least one second needed before the chair can call for a vote. And there is nowhere written that there is a limit on the numbers of seconders anyway. So the only requirement is one seconder for the motion. And I think the same goes for the amendments if I'm not wrong.

Well my question was rather to see if we accept the chain of decisions as is proposed having submission of the motion is done by deadline. Then the second step if it's yes is it redrawn or is it deferred based on discussions that take place. And then we have the step - the motion is seconded by a councilor. And there the question was should it be from a different stakeholder group or should it be - or can it be from the same stakeholder group?

I think that's the only aspect that we can hear or clarify in the process. If we decide to have a seconder from a different stakeholder group is that an obligation? I think that's what is needed to make the process clear so that is not possibility to have a discussion during Council meetings.

So I'm turning back to that question. Are we going for a seconder from maybe from the same stakeholder group or should they be from a different stakeholder group? I think that's the only point here. So make my question clear, do we go for a different stakeholder group seconder? Yes or no? Then when it's something we can (unintelligible) stakeholder or constituency. Yes, sorry Mary. Do we go for a different councilor or go for a councilor from the same stakeholder group, constituency. That's the question.

So those being in favor for having a councilor from a different stakeholder group and constituency you can put up the green flag. I see Mary, you have your hand up. Yes, Mary?

Mary Wong: Yes I do. And thanks, Rudi. So I was thinking a little bit about Sara's point. And, you know, I think I see you said that's a really interesting one. And there's a lot of merits to having a different stakeholder group or constituency be the group from which the person seconding the motion should come. I think I want to point out, however, that I think somebody said this earlier, that to date as far as I can recall, we have not had problems with seconders who come from the same stakeholder group or constituency. I obviously can't, off the top of my head, recall how often that has been.

So I'm not saying that we shouldn't go with that suggestion. I'm just wondering if the team wants to think about in sort of a more coquille parlance, if it ain't broke don't fix it. So it's just a note to think about but not necessarily expressing a particular preference either way. Thanks, Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Mary, for the clearance on this. Because we had the discussion that I had to ask the question. So the feeling that I have is that we shouldn't make any specific requirements of the seconder coming from same or different stakeholder group and that we leave that to the case itself if the discussion - well, the discussion can influence anyway decisions of the voters. And at the end it's not going to change that much because the voting is - it's the vote who decides if the motion passes yes or no.

So could we agree that we don't make a specific requirement here for the origin of the seconder? Do we agree on that? That would allow us to go into the second block of the process being the amendments. If you agree on leaving the requirement open or, Lawrence, you want to speak? Okay, no problem.

In that case we...

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: I'm sorry.

Rudi Vansnick: Sorry, yes go ahead.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: No I'm sorry, it's my mic. I'm trying to unmute it. I'm sorry.

Rudi Vansnick: No problem. It's star 6 if you have - on the keyboard - on your phone. Yeah, okay no problem. So I'm repeating my question. Are we going to skip the requirement for the seconder being from the same or a different group and allow the Council itself to decide on if they are pushing it that way? As said, it could be quite dangerous to make this an obligation. It could block quite a lot of progress in the call. So I see Angie and Sara have been ticking - agreeing. So I have also the preference to go around this question and not putting any pressure on the seconder as (unintelligible). Okay, thanks to - you can take that space off. And now we are in the process of looking into how the amendments are going to be handled.

And, again, as is mentioned in the text on the screen, there must be a seconder by the point in time during the Council meeting at which the motion is to be discussed before being voted on. Okay that's what we already discussed. And then we have the amendments. Yeah, should there be - the first question was should there be a time limit deadline for submitting amendments to allow each stakeholder group or constituency to discuss this in their groups? I think that's quite interesting question.

And again, I would like to hear from you what your preferences are. If the amendment is popping up during the discussions I think it could be quite interesting that the councilors can go back to their community and have a discussion on if they would like that amendment or not. And then what to do with the amendment. Is that a process we would like to go for? What do you think? Not all together.

As far as I remember, there is no requirement regards the amendments that the amendments are introduced before the Council meeting, is that correct, Mary or am I wrong on this? If an amendment is just dropped on the table at the Council meeting itself the Council doesn't have a chance to discuss this with the group. Is that correct? Is the amendment not required to be entered before the Council meeting? Yes, Mary?

Mary Wong: Rudi, this is Mary. And I apologize if I'm misunderstanding your question because I kind of lost audio for a couple of seconds there. But as - I think this might be clearer. The amendment can in fact be introduced at any time right up to the point before the vote is called. Ideally and preferably because of the reasons that you mentioned, because sometimes depending on the nature of the amendment the councilors or some councilors might need to go back to their (unintelligible). It is not idea to have an amendment be proposed at the last minute. But that has been the practice.

And on the flip side, one can always see why that might be helpful in some situations. For example, if the Council discussions take the particular direction during a meeting and one group realizes that they need to make a particular proposal and amend the motion before it goes to a vote. So I think there are pros and cons on both sides.

Obviously this has certain implications on the seconding. Again, I don't recall that there has been much of the problem, if any, about this particular practice and the impact on seconding. But again, as with all of these sub questions it's something for the subteam to consider. So I hope that answers your question. If not please let me know if I can help further.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Mary. Well at least for me it was clear and I was, meanwhile, thinking about the process itself. As Julie also mentioned in the chat that there is an amendment can be entered at the Council meeting itself. I think that the option here could eventually be if the amendment is considered being

friendly, well in that case I think there should be no discussion. And it could go for a vote.

If the amendment is considered being not friendly then we could eventually allow the group to have the amendment going back to the stakeholder groups and constituencies and have a discussion before it can be really amended. So - but that's a personal reflection that I'm doing here. I see, Julie, you have your hand up. You have the mic.

Julie Hedlund: Hi, thank you, Rudi. Yes, this is Julie. So I would note that if there is an unfriendly amendment that must be voted on, so, you know, I mean, of course if an unfriendly amendment is introduced, you know, prior to the Council meeting, it can be taken back, you know, to the various groups and discussed.

And there might be time - and there has been cases where a motion might have originally been considered perhaps unfriendly. Then there's been discussion on the list prior to the Council meeting people have made changes to, you know, that motion. And then with the changes it's been considered friendly. That's certainly a very helpful process.

But as it stands now, an unfriendly motion could be made during the Council meeting just prior to the vote. If it is considered unfriendly that unfriendly motion has to go to a vote and prior to being considered, you know, as part of the motion. And I'll just show that actually in the flow chart that that is shown here. So if you go down to the flow chart here and we see whether it says "amendments proposed" and "is the amendment friendly?" If yes then the motion just gets amended and the amended motion is voted on.

If the amendment is deemed unfriendly then one votes on the amendment. If that amendment passes, the unfriendly amendment passes, then that motion gets amended. And again, there's a vote on the motion. If the unfriendly amendment does not pass then it's simply rejected. I hope that's helpful.

Rudi Vansnick: Indeed, very much, Julie, yes indeed, it's very helpful. And the flow chart is quite clear. And I was just thinking about an escape mode, if I may say, if the amendment is done during the Council meeting there was no chance to have a discussion up from by the Council (unintelligible) community. There could be a way out of, by saying if it is considered unfriendly that it goes back to the community in order to have a discussion and see if that amendment could be considered being friendly and that it could be voted on.

So that's my personal thought. But, again, I don't know what the other members of the team think about this process, the so-called escape route for an unfriendly amendment to first be discussed in the groups. And, Julie, is that a new hand? Yes, you have the mic.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Rudi. Yeah, it's a new hand. I'm not sure if I understood you completely. But if you're saying that an unfriendly amendment must go back to the groups for discussion then - and perhaps I missed this - then there would need to be a requirement for the unfriendly amendment to be made prior to that Council meeting in order for there to be time for that to happen. Is that your suggestion? And I apologize if I'm not understanding.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Julie. Rudi for the transcript. Yeah, it would end up in having the amendment being brought to the Council meeting before - brought to the Council before the meeting in order to allow the group to have a discussion on it, it doesn't - an unfriendly could eventually, after discussion, being seen as friendly.

And I remember that we had that situation in - I'm hesitating - was it Singapore or Buenos Aires where there had been the quite long discussion on unfriendly and looks like there has been no way to get out of it. At the end I think the whole motion was brought back in another meeting because there was no clear (unintelligible) on the process itself.

So, yeah, the question could be are we asking that we - an unfriendly amendment would be brought to the Council before the meeting? Quite similar to the process of the motion where there is the 10-day waiver. And, again, I'm - yes, Julie, you have your hand up.

Julie Hedlund: So thank you, Rudi, this is Julie Hedlund for the record. My question is though that if this would apply to only unfriendly amendments then really all amendments would have to be made by some such deadline, 10 days before or whatever, because we wouldn't have any way of knowing if an amendment was friendly or not until it's made. And sorry if I'm, again, not following, but I'm just trying to think how would we know if it's unfriendly, we wouldn't know until it's presented. So does that make sense?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, Julie. Thank you. Well again and also I was talking having some difficulties in my mind. And that's where I was rather thinking in the beginning of having an escape route in case an amendment is considered during the discussion being friendly or unfriendly. In the case it is unfriendly that there would be a chance to have a discussion in the group and that the amendment is brought back to the next Council meeting in order to allow correct voting on it. I don't know, if I'm clear here.

But I would like to have a kind of escape route for a case where things get difficult to get an amendment being approved as being unfriendly. It could simply be rejected by the votes. And then the amendment is just dropped off and the motion is normally voted on. That's the correct process if I'm not wrong. So if an amendment is unfriendly and it is not voted on the amendment is dropped and the motion normally passes for voting. That's the correct process.

That means that there is no possibility to have a discussion on the unfriendly amendment by the community itself. And that's where I have the big question. Is that something we need to change? And going back to the text that is,

indeed, in front of us there about the (unintelligible) themselves. Yes, Julie, you have your hand up.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Rudi. Mary and I were concerned a little here on the side. And I understand that, you know, we understand that there, you know, could be an instance where there's an unfriendly amendment that then ends up causing a lot of discussion during a Council meeting because it hasn't had time to be discussed prior to a meeting.

I'm still - I guess one of the questions that we were thinking could bring the group back to is, what is specifically not working? Is there something that's specifically not working? Or what is working well in the current process? I mean, we were trying to recall, and other than the instance I think you mentioned, a situation where the current procedure hasn't worked well.

Generally, you know, from our recollection it's worked really well - the - in that the, you know, generally amendments are introduced prior to Council meetings. There is generally a lot of discussion on the Council list about amendment, it's friendly it's accepted as such. In some cases some people then suggest, you know, changes to even a friendly amendment on the list then the people, the seconder and the originator, agree that those are friendly. Or, you know, as I said, an unfriendly amendment could then be changed to become friendly.

And even with those amendments that come during a Council meeting, with all the councilors present and the discussion that happens, these have been worked out within the current, you know, procedures. And that, if it's unfriendly and everybody deems it's unfriendly a vote is called. It's either voted up or down.

And that it hasn't generally needed to go back for consideration to, you know, to the groups. And I'll just point out that we do actually have an escape clause and that is that that a motion can be deferred. So even if a motion

comes up for a vote and if there's discussion and there's concern about wording in the motion, and this happened recently, then maybe a small group gets together and says, okay, we'll work on revising this and the motion is taken off the table, it's deferred until the next meeting. And then there's time for discussion. So there is really sort of already the escape route that perhaps you're, you know, seeking.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Julie. That makes a lot of sense to me, yeah. I'm just wondering if, yeah, there must be a majority for the votes to get the motion vote, otherwise it's deferred to the next meeting. I was just wondering if an amendment has been turned down, deferred, not turned down, sorry, rejected, sorry for the expression, the amendment was rejected can the amendment be brought back later in next meeting to that motion again? I think that's something that there have been some discussions going on also. And I heard from some councilors that they were mentioning that amendment that was rejected could not be brought back to the motion. Is that correct or am I wrong?

Yes, Mary?

Mary Wong: Hi, Rudi, and everyone. This is Mary again. The - as I'm thinking through this, the - it seems that the only way that an amendment that has been rejected can come back as a motion, would be as a new motion in the next meeting. And that could happen in a couple of ways, which could be quite different. And I'm thinking - I'm talking as I'm thinking through this so hopefully I don't make any mistakes or not too many anyway.

So if an amendment that's proposed as rejected as unfriendly, the motion as proposed then gets voted on. So the motion could then be passed, that is adopted, without the unfriendly amendment obviously. Then in that case to bring it back would involve resubmitting a motion. And this is one topic that the SCI has worked on recently.

If the motion, without the unfriendly amendment, then proceeds to a vote and fails, then there's nothing to stop someone else from proposing a new motion for the next meeting incorporating the previously unfriendly amendment. The chances of that succeeding at the next meeting is, you know, not something that we're thinking of.

So I think the short answer is that it's possible but the way in which it would happen would depend on the fate of the original motion. In other words, whether the original motion passed in the first place or not. And again I hope that's clear. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thanks a lot, Mary. Well at least it's clear to me now that an amendment can eventually be brought back but in the format of an adopted motion where the amendment has been integrated into. And then that motion can come to the Council again at the next meeting where it will need a seconding to be voted. That - then we are in the normal step and normal space of a motion again.

That helps a lot at least for me to say, okay, I feel quite good that there is no - there is no strong rejection, it's always a possibility to bring back something that has no chance to be discussed and has been dropped off the table in order to let the Council move forward. So that's, at the end, also a need that the Council cannot be blocked in a meeting because of too long discussions, that's something also we have been talking about last call.

So the process, as it in front of us on the flow chart, we could consider that one being the regular one. And looking through the steps again, there is, as far as I see, not immediately any request to do any changes, is that correct? Do we agree? Or do we need to change anything in the process here? Lawrence, you have clearly also quite some experience on these things, maybe you can give your reflection on this?

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Thank you, Rudi. This is Lawrence for the record. My thinking through this what comes to my mind is in the process of discussion, isn't it

possible that as the councilors debate on this motion, there is some new information that is generated from the discussions that (unintelligible) for the changes to the motion itself before it is voted on. In that scenario, (unintelligible) that the amendment has to be before the Council meeting then there might be a chance - or there might be a possibility of having a (unintelligible) of some sort towards (unintelligible) and all that.

So I don't know if what we put down could - because I'm looking at the question, is a friendly, if it was (unintelligible) Council meeting, maybe we could amend that to (unintelligible) the point of voting if others don't feel differently about it. Because I feel that our discussion might take a position but having to hear other people debate and new information made available it's possible that there might still be some (unintelligible) changes to be made on the amendment before it's voted on. So we might have to look at that timeline for accepting (unintelligible) or amendments just before, you know, voting takes place. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Lawrence, for your views on this. Yeah, well, a nice question at the end. I don't know if Sara or Angie has any views on this? Have you any ideas of how to handle this? Sara is typing. No ideas at the moment. So if I may make a (unintelligible) of what Lawrence was proposing would be in the ideal situation the amendment should be sent to the Council before the Council meeting in order to allow the Council to have a good discussion on this. Is that the correct (unintelligible), Lawrence?

Yes, Julie, you have your hand up.

Julie Hedlund: So let me see if I understand the proposal. This is Julie Hedlund. So would this then be a proposed requirement that all amendments be submitted prior to a Council meeting?

Rudi Vansnick: It's about all of the unfriendly only. So, Lawrence, what do you think?

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Sorry - I'm sorry (unintelligible).

Rudi Vansnick: Dropped off?

Julie Hedlund: Did we lose you, Lawrence?

((Crosstalk))

Terri Agnew: This is Terri. Yes, we're having an operator dial back out to him.

Julie Hedlund: I guess in...

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Sorry, I just...

((Crosstalk))

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: ...audio bridge. So sorry. This is Lawrence for the record. I just dropped off the audio bridge. I didn't get Julie's question. If you could come again please?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: So my question was then would the requirement be that all motions would have to be submitted prior to the beginning of Council meeting - all amendments? I mean, because even if you say just unfriendly amendments, again, we don't know if an amendment is unfriendly until it's made. I'm just trying to understand the proposal.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: All right so...

Rudi Vansnick: Yeah, thank you...

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: Okay, well as we are close to the hour - Rudi for the transcript - we are close to the hour, it looks like we need some reflection here and maybe go back to our communities and have an idea of what the opinion is. And most probably Wolf-Ulrich will be available to comment on on this also as he will be return from his travel. Yeah, I mean, to me it's still not clear if we need to have that requirement that an amendment should be done before the meeting. It would be ideal if it could be discussed by the groups individually before it comes to the Council.

But again, I think that's a quite strong requirement that could make amendments maybe difficult also if you have a motion on the table and the group feels, well, this is not so bad but we should perhaps change a few lines in the motion to get it approved then at the end you should do that during the meeting, otherwise you are postponing quite a lot of motions. Yes, Julie, you have your hand up?

Julie Hedlund: Just very quickly, Rudi. This is Julie. As Mary and I note, if there was a requirement that amendments had to come in prior to the Council call there's a good possibility that if there was then a late amendment a motion would probably just get deferred to the next Council meeting. But we'll also note that, again, sometimes very constructive amendments can occur during the discussion of a motion. And, you know, language is crafted during a Council meeting. So just as a counter-balance, there are instances in which it's helpful to be able to allow amendments up and during the discussion of a motion.

But I see we're right at the top of the hour so why don't I try to capture these thoughts in our notes for the next discussion and I guess the question is whether or not people might be able to meet at this same time next Friday or whether or not the people would like us to schedule a different time.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Julie. Yeah, let's proceed this way. I think it's better to have now a clear view on how to get through this problem. To me Friday next week is no problem but I'm looking to ask the other members if next Friday would be okay. I see Sara is available. Angie, would that work for you? Yes? Lawrence, you have your hand up.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Yes, it will work for me. It will work for me.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay so it looks like we're all four- sorry - available for next Friday and hopefully Wolf-Ulrich can join us because he's experienced being on the Council for some time. He's quite helpful. So indeed, Julie and Mary, let's schedule a call next week Friday, same time. Then we can - oh, it's Wolf-Ulrich just arrived. Hi, Wolf-Ulrich. Looks like he is not on the audio. Yes, thank you, Angie, for your presence on the call and your participation.

I will try to wait for a little while to see if Wolf can be on the call or not. Because Wolf-Ulrich, we were - we are just at the end of the call. And we have - yes it was scheduled at 1800 UTC so no problem, Wolf-Ulrich, no issue. Let's say that the first phase - the step of the motions we were quite clear but for the amendments we have quite a lot of discussion. And the proposal is that Julie and Mary will put on the notes some reflections we had and how to go through this. Yeah, sorry, it was 17 - 17 UTC? No? I thought it was 18 UTC. My wrong.

Wolf, are you on the call? On the audio bridge? No, he is not. Okay let's reschedule - yes, go ahead.

Terri Agnew: Sorry, Rudi, for interrupting. This is Terri. I was just going to confirm - I'm sorry - Wolf is only on the Adobe Connect with no mic activated. He has not joined on the audio bridge yet.

Julie Hedlund: Right and I think actually because this call was scheduled to start an hour ago he may not be able to be on the audio bridge if there - there is no call

currently scheduled at this time. So let's go ahead perhaps, Rudi, I suggest - this is Julie Hedlund for the transcript - that we close this call. We are scheduled for the same time next week. And we'll get the notice out in a little bit.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay, thank you very much, Julie. Yeah, we can - we can end this meeting. And we look forward to the notes and we will try to have some exchanges on the mailing list. Wolf-Ulrich, you'll have the time to go into the notes and the call itself. It will be at the same time, the same time, next week, Friday which is - it was 17 UTC, sorry, yeah, 17 UTC. And having my calendar still on LA time.

Is that working for you, Wolf-Ulrich? Can you confirm just by chat? Oh he's gone already. Okay, good. Thank you very much. We can stop the recording.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Thanks, all.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Bye-bye.

Rudi Vansnick: Bye-bye.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Bye.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. (Lane), if you can please stop all recordings.

END