

**ICANN Prague Meeting
SCI update- TRANSCRIPTION
Saturday 23rd June 2012 at 09:00 local time**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.

Jeff Neuman: Okay everyone; we're going to get started in a few minutes. I know everyone can start getting to tables. I don't know if people are outside the room, if anyone knows.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Okay. We're going to start in one minute. This is the one-minute warning.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: All right. If everyone could sit down we could get the meetings started please. Yes. If we could get the recording started for the first session. And if someone could let me know when the recording started.

Coordinator: Recording has started.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you very much. This is Jeff Neuman. I am - Wolf and I are taking over as Chair for the beginning part of this meeting. Stephane will join us later on

today. So welcome everyone to the weekend session. This is the Saturday session.

One thing I just wanted to start out with before we get to the first item of the SCI report is many of you all know that the schedule is changed around (unintelligible) (times). This meeting has particularly been challenging more so than past ones in trying to get every single subject in but also (liaisoning) - is that a word -- liasing, sorry, with the other in trying to get everyone onto our schedule.

The GAC has a lot of work before it and so trying to get time with the GAC, trying to get time with the ICANN Board, trying to get time with the new ICANN CEO, that's been kind of a logistical challenge. So I hope we've gotten that all figured out.

The most recent schedule is on the Wiki as well as referred to from the GNSO Web site or I'm sorry, from the ICANN Web site the schedule going to the GNSO working session. So if you click on that you'll eventually get to the schedule.

And what we've tried to do because we've moved the meeting with the GAC; this wasn't our first choice. But we've moved the meeting with the GAC until this afternoon instead of normally on Sunday. And because of that what we tried to do with the schedule is make sure that we are covering all the topics at least internally with our group before we go into the GAC this afternoon.

So a lot of things were moved around. We're going to start with the SCI report, the Standing Committee on Improvements. We'll go to consumer metrics. Then we'll have a break. Go to talk about the new PDP or the preliminary issue report on the ITO protections along with a update from - on the IOC Red Cross Drafting Team.

Then we're going to break for lunch. It's very important. Lunch is actually not in this room. Lunch is going to be in the atrium. We only have an hour so we're going to use that for a real lunch but strongly urge that everybody come back on time.

And this afternoon we'll talk about the RAA negotiations and the PDP that's associated with that. Some motions and some preps for the ICANN Board meeting and the GAC meeting. And followed by this afternoon at 4:30 talking to the GAC in a joint session.

But I want to know if there's any questions on the schedule. I apologize with how many times it's changed. We really tried hard to get everything in. All right. With that said, I'm going to turn it over to Wolf to start us with the SCI report. And take it away.

Wolf Ulrich Knoben: Thank you Jeff. Good morning. Altogether my name is Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. I'm the Chair of the Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation.

And for those of you who are not very much familiar what that committee is about, that committee has been established by the Council after the improvements - the GNSO improvements have been implemented to monitor and to discuss items which - about the improvements, which has come up from the Council, or any group which may be affected by those implementations and to discuss those and come back to the Council with some recommendations, ideas how to deal with those issues.

So just a short report on where we are, what we are dealing with. We have a agenda - a very colorful agenda with regards to the more or less the rules of operation and what is - what we are dealing with. And it is regards to - of the PDP amendments and those things. But we are dealing also with these other things.

But first we have an item here to (show a lot of) motions then - which is with regard the voting and the motions which are the office (level) - a Council level. And then we have proxy voting procedure. Also this has to do with voting.

And (concert) agenda is an administered item so we ought to be - we should deal with that and then the voting results (that was an) issue. We have a lot of things with regards to the regulations (rules) about voting, which the - how the Council is dealing with voting here. Next slide please.

At first the developed motions is an item which came let me say heavily up in the - with regards to the issue we have with the IOC but cost issue. And normally on Council level we have an unwritten rule here and if a constituency or stakeholder group is of the opinion that a motion which is on the table here to be voted on, they would like to defer that of any reason, so they can raise this and then tell us and there - it's an unwritten rule about to defer that motion for once.

And so the question was here in urgent cases. So if there is a real interest we ought to deal with that motion, is there any way should these kind of dealing with this motion - (unintelligible) should that be formalized. So that was the question to the SCI and under which conditions will it be formalized.

So at first we ought to be checking on what happened since the implementation of the - for the improvement so that means to - more than two years. And there we have - you can see the statistics that trended to the first (unintelligible), which have been asked for defer two times and one even for three times.

And it's spread over the different stakeholder groups here. So it's not mainly used by any stakeholder groups so it's more like spread all over stakeholder groups asking for that.

And now a discussion. So it may be discussed out of this the - one of the important things was okay, how could we find time because one of the most reasons why a defer is requested is the stakeholder group or constituencies asked okay, if we didn't have enough time now to socialize the motion between our group and to discuss that and then come up with (a bit to say) a firm idea about that but we need more time.

So socializing is crucial for that. So how we could deal with that. So in checking this we saw - okay, we have the rule that motions should be brought up to the Council eight days before a Council meeting. So if you look to the rules or maybe are using that eight calendar days in the rules it (strongly) says eight business days.

So it is not as easy now to handle eight business days in that environment because everybody has different holidays in all these countries so part of the question could be okay, could we extend that period in terms of calendar days for example. So just maybe are using eight calendar days so and that might be a problem for some of us.

On the other hand, we discussed and we had also a counter opinion on that with regards to the NCAs. NCAs should also be (aired). It is not very clear fixed in the rules NCAs should be able to defer motions as well. And it is another point.

We have then discussed mostly should we impose - should we come up with an idea - could we come up (as if) to formalize that process to come up with. So there are opposing counts and we couldn't find a consensus in the SCI. So it is - I have to say so we are still discussing that and so maybe we could also get some input here from the Council with - to that.

So it's not decision (at all) in case if it is decided or if there's really a wish about to formalize it, okay, we could come up then with a procedure (offer). That must be all together.

So since we couldn't find consensus on that so we are discussing to the poll on that in the group in the SCI about that means that we are - we should prepare first the right question as you know, which would be asked the members of the SCI how should they be asked (to figure out) to that.

So that means should we just ask, okay, would you like to have it formalized or not or would you like to have it formalized under certain conditions and then outline the different alternatives of those conditions? So okay, this point is not - there's not a consensus. We could bring it back to the Council ourselves. So (just) stay tuned that point. The next point please.

Proxy voting procedure. So the rule is we have a proxy giver and I sit in the Council and that the way is so he has to file his proxy or his request for proxy to his organization and then to the Secretariat and then it's going to the Council. And it should be sent before the relevant Council meeting.

And the issue is okay, do we have like kind of shortcut of that way in order to make it possible that during a Council meeting also could be - on really short-term could be a proxy could be on file.

So each (unintelligible). Okay, what we all want to avoid is that any vote is going to be lost here during voting. Also no consensus, not yet about that. But there is suggestion to agree upon. We will have a meeting tomorrow to talk about that.

And that means okay, it could help if in parallel we shouldn't go only this way if all times at first but in parallel we should - an email should - notification should be sent out, goes through the Secretariat and to the Council to inform both. So that means to help in how to earlier inform the Council for that. So we will talk about that tomorrow. Next point please.

Content agenda. We have sent several times content agenda on our, you know, Council meeting agenda. And the question is how to formalize that. We haven't - just make it brief. We have a consensus on that. So we have a suggestion.

I would like (all) to send a text to the Council and so the - that assessment is for to amend the GNSO operating procedures in the relevant parts with regard to that. The major items is here written down.

So that means we have excluded some items - items being not subject to a single majority vote and items subject to absentee vote and shouldn't be included in the content agenda. And then we have a procedure suggesting how to deal with the convert. And so that's the major items. Next point please.

The voting results table, which is next to the GNSO operating procedures. There was a need to check whether it's still up to date because the PDP was - a new PDP was implemented since the voting procedure was published.

So we have also checked that and we made it consistent with the bylaws and the rules of procedure. And we have also a suggestion how it seems - it looks like there is no problem with that. So we send it to the Council as well - the list. Next one.

The one which we did not find - not yet find (unintelligible). It's the question on voting (unintelligible) PDP. And this is a challenge (ratios) for the terminating and ending - finish (agent) PDP are in the - in this - next to the GNSO operating procedure that have outlined.

There is - we have a - a Council may terminate a PDP only for significant cause with GNSO super majority vote in favor of termination. So that's the process as it is at the time being. And the initiation of (unintelligible) PDP is more than 1/3 of each house or more than 2/3 of one house.

And there is a recommendation by staff though to amend that. I think it's just - isn't it Marika. If there are questions you can detail that. But we have not yet gained consensus on that.

I think it's also - isn't that in the same direction like - it's the second part of (names). Go for termination to - of the PDP like it's handled in the second part here to initiate it. Make it - is - and not clear of that right now.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika. The staff proposal is to use the same threshold as for terminating...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes. The same...

Marika Konings: ...yes, the first one.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay. That's the same one. Okay. So next point please. So okay. This is our agenda at the time being. So we have on the agenda on hold another item is, you know, we would like to survey the working groups that have been established since the implementation of the improvements while to also have an - (a section) on that. How the new rules for the working groups are operated and if there are problems, you know, if you could deal with that.

Now not to over complicate right now the process so the SCI understanding is right now is we have finished some points as I have outlined on the table of voting plus the consensus. So we would like to give that back to the Council and well, it is now up to the Council to deal with that. So the question is then only for the Council of how to deal with those items.

It was a discussion and well it's still here on the - on this slide but it should not be over complicated. We ICANNs - it's not our intention though to initiate that - those items to be put - should be put out for public comment again. So it's not really necessary.

So for us it seems to be it is items more or less regarding our rules internally and if the Council could agree to those items as well. So the question is then why should we pose it for public comment. But okay. It's just an item here so the Council should discuss that and it's (unintelligible).

Last point is we have been approached by individuals also how to deal with ICANN's - our rules say that we only accept the (intelligible) items which are brought up by the Council itself or groups chartered by the Council. So we are discussing that point how to handle that. Is it should we stick to the rules as it is here or should we - should it be handled in a flexible way, whatever that means. So it's still in discussion.

I think that's it at the time being. Thank you for attention and I'm happy to accept questions.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Wolf. This is Jeff Neuman. Just before anyone speaks if you could say your name for the transcript purposes. And I just want to remind everyone the way we work this session is that everyone's invited including people in the audience to make comments. If we're running out of time, usually preference is given to Council members. But we generally tend to invite comments from everyone.

So I don't know if anyone's got any questions. One question that I have, and I'll get it kicked off, is you had said so what is - you had made a statement saying - asking whether it should go out for comment again. But have your recommendations gone out for comment?

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: No. Not yet. So we have - we just have these two items finished but just finished well some days ago. So it is not out for any comment on that (I guess). Marika would like to...

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think this is probably one of the more general question as there's no formal procedure established at the moment. And, you know, this is not a PDP working group that has certain requirements on public comment.

I think it's also a more general question to the Council as the SCI develops recommendations on these issues, you know, assuming that it's recommendations for making changes to either, you know, operating procedures or practices; how should it be handled. Is it - does the Council expect SCI to put those out for comment? You know, provide a report on the comments and then provide its recommendations?

Does the Council expect, you know, SCI to make its recommendations, submit those to the Council and the Council will then put those out and review those comments to try and see what is the expectation to make sure that we can set up some kind of process and, you know, follow that going forward. I think that's a bit more the general question around this issue as well.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. I have J. Scott. Anyone else? Okay. I have Thomas and then John. And oh, and now...

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott Evans. I don't think this is completely unprecedented. I mean when we did the work through the working group guidelines and the other groups that worked on the Board suggestions for the (unintelligible) restructuring, we had a process for dealing with that. And I think we can follow something similar.

And also I think we should err on the side of public comment. Because of the transparency issues that everyone has had with this organization, I think the more that we can get it out there and get comments from people who don't participate would be to the benefit of the Council and to the stakeholders.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thank you J. Scott. And then I have Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Yes. I'm Thomas Rickert. I'm the NCA or one of the NCAs to the GNSO Council. And it is with great pleasure that I heard that you're considering to entitle NCAs to ask for deferrals as well. So that's much appreciated.

But at the same time with respect to the question of deferral, I think this is (totally) related to the discussion that we're going to have at the end of the session, workload for Councilors.

This - what I think might be useful considering is not only to have the pending project list but also to flesh out this list in terms of timing. You know, how many projects do we work on in parallel and how long are these going to - how much time are these going to take in an ideal world.

I do remember well that our next but one - let's say CEO said yesterday that he is the defender of the (most) stakeholder approach and it's speed. But at the same time he also said that he would make sure that ICANN worked as fast as possible.

And I think streamlining also the practice with deferrals or reducing the need for the referrals would be useful thing to do in order to keep processes as expedient as possible. And therefore we might wish to consider to actually have a project list also where we fit this in and then maybe the need for deferrals is lower.

Jeff Newman: Okay. Thanks Thomas. I have John Berard, Alan, Zahid and then Wendy.

John Berard: So if we accept J. Scott's point, which I think is well made about erring on the side of public comment and does that not answer the second question on that particular slide? I'm not looking for an answer but it strikes me - it strikes me that it does answer that question.

The point that I would like to dive into relates to the consent - I mean to the deferral of motions. Is there any qualitative or character distinction between

the five (motionings) that were deferred and the 17 that weren't? Is there any insight we can draw from that?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Well the qualify you mean between the ones who have been deferred and the others. SO that's - I'm not aware of that to qualify. We have qualified the motions which have been deferred in terms of administrative ones, policy related ones and other ones. It's - I'm looking to Marika also. Do you know the others, you know, how that (spread) is an answer? The quality of (motions) that meets PDP motions or policy motions or whatever.

Marika Konings: Sorry. Could you just repeat the question because I was checking something?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: The question, you know, we have any statistics; so we have the number of motions qualified by such of - like administrative character, policy character and others - the deferred motions. Do we have the same with the other motions which have not been deferred in that time period?

Marika Konings: This is Marika.

John Berard: Well I think you're asking it more broadly than I intended. So there...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay.

John Berard: ...are 22 motions that have been deferred.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes.

John Berard: Five of them have been deferred more than once. So is there a character difference between the five that had been deferred more than once and the 17 deferred only once?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I would have to look back at those in order to be able to comment on that because I don't know it by heart which ones those are. Apologies.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I can check. So it's not a problem. I can send it to the list as well.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. I have - so Marika, you want to comment on that or just out of the queue? Okay. So I have Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Couple of quick comments. With regarding who can defer motions and NCAs, the PDP Working Group had extensive discussions on that we ended up making a recommendation, which the Board has now approved, that all Councilors can request deferral. I or Jeff or someone would be happy to brief you on or summarize the - our thought processes as they evolve if it would be of any use.

And in terms of public comment, I thought the question asked - that was being asked there is should you go out for public comment, try to resolve the unresolved issues. And my personal feeling is I think you should go back to Council to the wider group of Councilors as a first step. I think the whole set of changes should go out for public comment before approval.

But the fact that your working team cannot come - or design team cannot come up with the answers, I think you should go to the wider GNSO community before public comment at this point. You know, we have enough public comments not to add one at this (mid degree) level in my mind.

And lastly, the question of canceling a PDP. Can you repeat - go over again because I was - ended up being confused by Marika's last answer. And I wasn't sure what it was. It requires essentially 1/3 majority to start it. What are you suggesting to cancel? Another 1/3 or keep a super majority?

Jeff Neuman: So just to - we're not talking about canceling. I think we're talking about deferring. So on the last...

Alan Greenberg: I thought the word was terminate actually on the slide.

Jeff Neuman: Well that's already been developed. The termination one is in the PDP process that we approved.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Jeff Newman: Right? But now we're talking about the one issue that came up a couple of meetings ago when we defer - I think it was with thick Whois when we were talking about...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Jeff Newman: ...deferring. So we had accepted the fact that we wanted to initiate the PDP. But now the question was can we defer it a few months or however long.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry. I came in just as that was being discussed. I missed that. Thank you. Then I have no problem with that.

Jeff Newman: Okay. I have Zahid, Wendy, Chris and Marika.

Zahid Jamil: Thank you.

Jeff Newman: And then I'm going to close, sorry. I'm just - I'm going to close it after - I saw Bill has his hand up.

Zahid Jamil: Thanks. I think it's a good idea to make this process with regard to deferrals formal. What I'm reminded of is a incident that took place where there was a deferral which became really contentious. And one of the aspects of that deferral was that although there was a request for deferral and usually that is

because you haven't had time. And the unofficial rule is you haven't had time to confer with your own group.

But this deferral was a deferral with a add on saying we don't agree with this resolution. We have problems with this resolution. Not saying we haven't had time to consider it, which is quite the opposite.

I'm wondering whether in the group you guys had time to think about if somebody gives a reason for a deferral does that disqualify the deferral? I mean is there a criteria to (unintelligible). So that's one of the thoughts that I would sort of put forward that deferrals should be for what it was previously in the informal process because you just didn't have time.

So if you make a statement while you're deferring it, it kind of sort of takes away from the whole purpose of it. And I think maybe you guys want to think about, you know, whether that goes into the rules.

The other thing is I think it's - the eight days that you mentioned, I think that's a bit onerous. Maybe it should be shorter. Maybe it should be on the go (I'll tell you). I think it's - from experience when you're - as a Councilor, there are times when you hear the discussion and resolution and you think that's fine. I think we can go forward with this. I don't need to stop the process.

But you've already gone ahead and requested a deferral in advance, there's no way that that's going to happen. So that's less of a deferral, more of take it off the agenda. So I would sort of try to distinguish those two and say give the Councilors the opportunity. But if they do want to go ahead and not defer there should be a mechanism to do that.

The last question was actually on the PDP delay, which is - which I thought was helpful. But when I heard that staff had wanted to change the thresholds for initiating a PDP - is that right? Okay. I misunderstood that. All right. Thank you.

Jeff Newman: Okay. Thanks Zahid. And just the SCI Group, are you guys meeting tomorrow? Is that right or - okay. Good. So they're bringing up a lot of topics you can address tomorrow. Okay. I have Wendy and then Chris, Marika and Bill.

Wendy Seltzer: Thanks. Wendy Seltzer with regard to deferrals. I think we should abolish them. I don't think we are any longer a collegial body that's capable of accepting the requests to defer on someone's statement that they simply want more time to consider it.

And if we were forced to go into all of the reasons that people wanted to defer, I think why not just either make this into a formal process that has voting thresholds to override the deferral and move things forward or abolish it. But we're not doing well with this - for - with this informal process we have.

Jeff Newman: Wolf, you want to respond?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Just (unintelligible). It is the (unintelligible) currently have and the goal cannot (unintelligible) both standpoints. So and that's why we have no consensus on that. So Wendy I would like to invite you by the way to participate in the meeting also early morning at 8 o'clock, the SCI meeting but it's public.

Jeff Newman: Thanks. Chris.

Chris Chaplow: Good morning. It's Chris Chaplow, Vice Chair, Finance and Operations from the Business Constituency. Notwithstanding that I'm not familiar with the charter of the group, the GNSO improvements was quite broad and it was for improvements of the whole GNSO.

And what I've seen so far seems to be very narrow to do with Council procedures and operations. And so I was just wondering are you taking

onboard things like the upgrade of the Web site - new Web site or the other organizational things and the communications - actually communications and coordination workgroup in its own report asked to review at 12 months. There's a lot of other things there. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: May I immediately answer? So we are doing with all items (come right) and are derived and are coming from the implementation of the improvement recommendations. That includes the - this is kind of things you are thinking this because we had a group also (Jeff and Mason) regarding the - that was a public (unintelligible) with that. So that's (right) and all these things, so.

Is there some issue coming up? But you have to bring it up, you know, and you have to come to us so the Council or constituency or whatever group that we are talking about that. But then we are going to deal with that.

Jeff Newman: Okay. Yes. So the role of the SCI Group is really to address those issues that are left over. So I think that's a good - that's a good point. I have Marika and Bill and Yoav, you want to be on it. Okay. Then I'm really cutting of the queue because we got to get to the next subject. So Chris just went. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. I think just on that last point about part of the SCI (I remember this as well) is something they're looking at is indeed the standing review of the different recommendations that have been adopted over a certain period of time. I think it's something everybody's looking at as most of the recommendations have only just been adopted or, you know, haven't been enforced for too long.

So they're dealing now more with indeed ad hoc issues that have been identified as posing problems or not being addressed. So just maybe to clarify on the - because I can see the hands that caused some confusion, the voting thresholds that specifically relates to a possible voting thresholds for suspending or delaying a PDP after it has been initiated. Something that happened with the thick Whois PDP.

There are no formal rules currently in the PDP. And at that point we were struggling a bit with the question of which voting thresholds should apply. You know, should it be the same ones as for initiating? But it opens the potential for gaming because you have a low threshold so the people opposing the PDP could immediately vote to delay it or suspend it.

Or do you apply, you know, the super majority rule so if there's broad consensus within the Council that there should be a delay for various reasons, you know, what happened with thick Whois, which I think was a unanimous vote, you know, you might want to apply that voting threshold. So that's what's being looked at. It's not about changing, you know, the current voting thresholds that are already there.

And just on the last point on the public comments. I think to Alan's point, basically I think the question from the SCI is more like should the SCI go out for public comment on recommendations that they have consensus on? It's not about, you know, asking questions that are open, which I think they're free to do so at any point.

But it's more once recommendations are finalized at what point and by whom should those be put out for public comment. And I just checked as well with our legal counsel and there is a requirement in the bylaws that changes to the operating procedures should be put out for a 21-day public comment period before entering into (force).

So at some point whether it's by the SCI or if it's the Council, there should be at a minimum this 21-day public comment period on the proposed changes. So just to take that into account and discuss this further.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: The only question is then who is going to do that? Done by the Council or if the SCI (unintelligible) to put it forward to the public comment itself - public comment (out).

Jeff Newman: I think normally we've done it through the Council. And I think that's the type of thing we could put on the consent agenda because I don't know if that'll take discussion - much discussion to put something out for comment. So I think maybe we can add that to our consent agenda.

Marika Konings: And if I could just respond because I think what has happened in the past - I mean it's the Council that puts it out. But if comments come in it's often the Council and actually giving it back to the specific group to look at the comments and see whether changes are needed. So that might be something similar to consider.

Jeff Newman: Right. So I think I was a little disturbed on that. So let me go quickly to Alan on this but I do want to wrap up the whole discussion, so, Alan and then Bill and then Yoav.

Alan Greenberg: I just wanted to say something related to what Marika said. Since Council's practice these days is to send it back to the group anyway, I think it's a lot cleaner for the group to put it out when it thinks it's finished reviewing any comments and then pass it to Council for acceptance or not. Council shouldn't put it out again at that point.

But since it's going to be referred back to Council if there are any comments - back to working group if there's any Councils - any comments at all, there's no reason for the working group and, you know, in this case not to send it out themselves in my mind. Just - it just adds another Council meeting and another month delay if we have to do it.

Jeff Newman: Okay. Thanks Alan. Let me go to Bill and Yoav. And I think this topic - let's get your recommendation after tomorrow's meeting on that.

Bill Drake: Thanks. This is Bill Drake. I would certainly agree with Wendy's suggestion that deferrals should be formalized more that the conditions for being able to accept them should be laid out.

I think in the contentious case Zahid mentioned the fundamental concern in that case would have to do with a public comment period and I think that that's a legitimate reason. And I think that that could be listed as one that's okay.

I don't think it's so great to do it on the basis of people haven't had time yet at this point. That seems like an easy - unless there's been a substantive change to the motion or something. Saying that people haven't had time to review it is just kind of problematic for me and we've always kicked the can down the road because of that.

On the proxy thing, I think we - I would definitely go for making it easier to get proxies. That we take a step out of it and just have modifications to the email list by the Chair as long as it's before the meeting starts. That should be sufficient.

If you have added such of having - have things cleared through additional email cycles with different people, you have the possibility that something gets lost in the frenzy right before a meeting and then the notice doesn't go in. So I think trying to make that easier would be much better.

Jeff Newman: Thanks Bill. And Zahid I got to cut it off after Yoav because we have to get to the consumer metrics.

Yoav Keren: Yes, I'll be short. I actually support the same view of Wendy and Bill. I think we should have a formal procedure. And as we've seen in past this sort of custom was kind of used or exploited I would say to take things off the table. And we don't want that.

When it's for some parties to learn the issue more thoroughly to be prepared for the next meeting, it's okay. But it's exploited to take things out of the table and not have a vote on it on time, that's a very different thing. So we should have a formal procedure to vote on deferral and I think it will resolve this issue in the future. Thanks.

Jeff Newman: Thanks Yoav. Thank you everyone for this. And while the next session sets up we'll stop the recording on this topic and then (Steve) will set up. (Steve) you're making the presentation for the consumer metrics? Okay. So while (Steve)'s setting up we can stop this one and then we can...

END