

**ICANN Prague Meeting
SCI meeting - TRANSCRIPTION
Sunday 24th June 2012 at 08:00 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.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So let's start in a minute. I think we have transcription this morning and let's just wait for another minute and then start.

Coordinator: Your recordings have started.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Our recording has started as well? Okay, so in this case good morning everybody. This is the Standing Committee for Improvements Implementation meeting in Prague.

And we have - I would like right now to start this meeting. May I start to ask maybe Marika for a roll call?

Marika Konings: Good morning everyone. This is Marika. I'll just look around the table. I see Mary Wong, Carlos Aguirre, J. Scott Evans, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Avri Doria, Robin Gross.

I don't know if there are any other Working Group members in the room. I don't think so. And we have for Staff Glen de Saint Gery, myself, Marika Konings and I see Jonathan Robinson just walking in, and Nathalie Peregrine in the back.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you very much. We have a agenda here on the screen for today, and just let me ask is there anything about Statements of Interest for the service here. Please J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: I should disclose that Yahoo! has filed two applications, one for Dot Yahoo and one for Dot Flickr, so we are an applicant.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thank you very much J. Scott. The agenda - small agenda. Please have a look through that. Is there any amendments, any question to that? I see none.

So then let's go into that agenda. Yesterday morning we had reported to the Council what we have done in the past, and the presentation to the Council is on the Web site.

I am pretty sure that you are aware of that so because just some days before I circulated that presentation and so that you had a chance, right, to look at this. And I thank you very much well to the comment on the presentation.

The - I have listed some points of the virtualized and it is - it was questioned yesterday on Council. The one was right under here in suit. It's the different items we were talking about.

The first was the - if I recall because I don't have this presentation here - it was consent agenda and the items where we had consensus on consent agenda plus the voting threshold table.

And the question was - what we talked about was how to handle that right now, so after we have - we found consensus. So there was a discussion on Council level about should it be sent to - for public comment and which how to handle this if I recall correctly, and my cap is helping me in this respect.

There may be needed to add a discussion on Council level about that. So that what we are going to do is - my suggestion was we send it, provide it to the Council, okay.

That's our resolve. That's our suggestion on that and please handle that according to the rules, so there might be rules which may - really which need the Council to put it out for public comment. With that I'd like Marika please.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika. For those that weren't there yesterday we actually confirmed with the legal counsel that there is a requirement that it's - our changes to the GSNO operating procedures there has to be a 21 public comment period as a minimum.

It doesn't talk about, you know, who should do the public comment forum but at some stage that needs to be done. So as Wolf said that's up to the Council to decide who needs to be doing that and at what point so that can be as well a set procedure for any recommendations that might be coming from the SCI that would change the GNSO operating procedures.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes okay. Okay, please Avri first and then Jonathan.

Avri Doria: Yes, I wanted to ask - they also then go to the Board not for approval but for viewing. Now I thought that there was a step like that now that they had to have in a chance, that they were sent to them but they didn't actually have to formally approve them but they had to look at them and not have a complaint. Is that not true?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think it's Board oversight so I guess that means that any Staff would send the paper to the Board saying, "Just for your information the GNSO has adopted these, you know, changes to the operating procedures."

And then the Board has a chance they'll, you know, we don't agree but it's not a formal requirement. They can say no but if they don't say anything then - at least that's my understanding - then it passes.

Avri Doria: That was my understanding too that they got a - that they were sent to them and then they could object, but otherwise ignore.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Okay. Jonathan, you would like...

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, thanks Wolf. It's Jonathan. I think it would be helpful then to just have a very - clearly we discussed it. We recommend some changes and then do they go to the GNSO Council for review and then thereafter go back to - it'd be very useful to just step through, just a quick walk through that process and make sure we're clear on...

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes. That's clear so the Council has the right well to comment on that if any, so if it likes. Otherwise, you know, it could be put through up to them for more public comment or for comment on the Board person in the public comment. Marika please.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. That is rather, you know, the SCI charter doesn't outline what the steps need to be. I mean, if you look at the PDP Working Group it really clearly prescribes like when a public comment period needs to happen, when it needs to be sent to the Board or to their Council, what the Council needs to do.

But in this case we're talking about, you know, recommendations on operating issues so there's no real process. And I think that's what part of the discussion needs to be with the Council and what should that process be.

I think what we heard yesterday a bit there is a, you know, it's a little bit of a mixed bag if you were saying, "Well, you know, it should be the GNSO Council who puts out those things for comments."

But - and at the same time people said, "But well, you know, the GNSO Council puts them out." But if they're comments, the usual thing is that they just give it back to the Working Group or a team that was looking at them to review the comments and see if any changes need to be made.

So wouldn't it be just as efficient for that particular group just to do it? So it's a part of a point of principle who needs to do it, and then it'd be who looks at the comments.

So I, you know, I agree in that respect with Wolf. It probably is good for the GNSO Council to determine how they would like to see that happen. And actually I can still say, "Well we don't agree or we suggest it."

But I think, you know, to have that clear because it's, you know, it's likely that more recommendations will be coming out of the SCI that recommend changes to the operating procedures.

So if we are really clear from the start that these are the steps that need to be taken then, you know, we can follow that process going forward.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay, so we have a process. So I got checking on this with Marika about those steps and then we can I think put it forward that way.

Jonathan Robinson: Jon. This is the practical suggestion and Wolf what I would suggest is that we may put that into a little flowchart or something so it's more clear here and get to the Council and it gets brought into as this is how we're going to do it, because I think what I'm understanding Marika is there's a difference here between fundamental changes to GNSO procedure, which was taken through, and minor changes to how we actually execute what's intended. Is that right or is there - in all the...?

Marika Konings: Well I guess it's something up for discussion. I mean, we discussed before a recommendation that might come from the SCI is a recommendation for no changes.

You know, presumably, you know, you can still argue we don't have to go out for public comment because you want to have community input on whether nothing needs to be changed.

But whether the minimum is a requirement as to our changes that there is a public comment period, so again, you know, you could argue that it should be for anything that comes from the SCI but in certain case you might say, "Well if there's a recommendation for no changes, you know, do you really need to get community input on, you know, the fact that you don't want any changes."

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Speak to J. (Collin) and Carlos please.

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott Evans. You know, I think that when we did the Working Group guidelines and Avri was part of that, we - the Working Group itself put out the document for public comment before we sent it to the GNSO Council.

Then we took in those public comments. We read them. We made some changes and then we responded where we didn't make changes. I believe that's what we did Marika.

And then we sent that - along with our report we sent our analysis of the public comment and everything, that it all went as a package to the GNSO Council.

And then they considered it based on that and then they approved it based on our work, the public comment, our analysis of the public comment. And that seems to be what Alan was saying yesterday is it seems to be more efficient if we would send it out for - and just those public comments.

And then as part of what we send to the GNSO Council we send our recommendation, whether it's to do something or not to do something, and our analysis of the public comment we received on whatever we suggested so the GNSO Council has all of that when they consider it.

Now if they consider that it's deficient or we didn't properly listen to public comment or something, they could then send it back to us. But I think that's where he was talking about the efficiency was why should it go to Council that may have to take a month or so to get it on the agenda before even it goes to public comment, when we could put it out through Staff, get it in, get it back and get it to Council and they would have - not only would that be - it gets to public comment faster, but they would have the public comment responses as part of their consideration when they consider the recommendation.

Carlos Aguirre: Thank you Wolf. Carlos. My question - what Scott said is - have very sense. I mean, a lot of times very clear. But are there some rule, right, about this?

Our recommendation go to the GNSO and then public comments and then please clarify me.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. And so there currently is no process. The only requirement is that if there are changes - if that proposed recommendation's for changes to the GNSO operating procedures there needs to be a 21-day public comment period.

It doesn't specify by whom or when but I said I think it's, you know, something that the SCI - you can work that out with the Council. But they are happy with, you know, you doing it.

I think that's perfectly fine - something that just needs to be on the record that, you know, this is the process going forward, you know, that you do the

public comment for them and you deliver the report if there are any comments or, you know, explain why you've made certain changes.

And if the Council's happy with that I don't think there is any issue either. It's just I think a question of clarifying and really making sure that both parties know what is being expected and what is going to be done to avoid any kind of situation where the Council would say, "Oh but, you know, how did you dare - putting this out for public comment which is what we believe our role is?"

So I think that's the - maybe I should just get it clear and as well as getting a common understanding of what the SCI would like to do and make that proposal like I said to Council.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Avri did you raise your hand? Okay.

Avri Doria: Trying to finish your approach here. Yes, I understand what Scott is saying. I'm just guessing but I'm - it seems like it's becoming heavier weight as - and pretending more to be a Working Group than just a committee of the Council.

Certainly anything that's going into Bylaws needs to have - I think a lot of things that this group's going to come out with is a recommendation on a practice they might tweak, you know, a, "Gee, we don't see any reason to change anything recommendation, et cetera."

So I think we should be sort of careful in terms of mandating a tree that says it always goes to a public comment and gets tied in a final report and gets sent to the Council.

I think perhaps that we want to say, "If recommending Bylaws change then sure, you send it to Council as opposed to, you know, waiting for Council to do it."

But I think for the most part what we're going to be doing or what this committee is going to be doing is tweaking things, is looking at it as sort of saying, you know, "You don't need to change the Bylaws every time a practice needs to be tweaked or something you can try."

So I'd hate to see us make this group already a - everything you send to the Council needs a comment period and a review. And that's where I was thinking the Council would look at the recommendations of this group and say, "You know, this - yes sure.

This doesn't need a comment," or, "Oh, this is a Bylaws change. Then go for it." So that's what I'm looking at. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay Jonathan please.

Jonathan Robinson: Wolf I know you're anxious to move on. So I think Avri's point is very sensible and well made, so perhaps that still seems to suggest to me that some kind of mini flowchart of the, you know, this - of the kind of decisions or the kind of topics we'll be talking about and the process that goes through, that we could just get buy in from this group and let the Council know that that's how we intend to work and seek feedback for the next report to the Council from that, you know, our suggestion. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks. And I think your - maybe we could do that. And to my understanding right now. What is not that clear is the question, "Who is dealing with that matter?"

So it's not about, you know, the flowchart I think we can establish it because it is clear what we're intention and how we should deal with that, but who is going to deal with that, either the SCI Committee itself or the Council?

May I suggest in this case right now so we simply we in the SCI have current consensus on two items. The - in this case make it approach. We send it to the Council, file them, okay.

There are - according to their words there may be a necessity to put it out for public comment and asking the entire Council for its comments from the Council side and if not well then throw in the rules and send it out for article business case, because we would like to have it in place as soon as possible.

And in parallel we report to the Council that there is this - maybe this lack on who is - that the SCI itself or the Council should be in place for - to send our things to for public comment and that may cause further discussion also on Council level.

Could we do that in this case, you know, so that it is still open, you know, how to deliver that in there but to put forward to both items we have consensus about? Did you understand what I was saying? Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: I'm not sure I do actually. What I - what...

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Just being clear and so the two items, we send it to Council and then I'll - okay we have found consensus according to the rules it should be send out to - for public comment at least 20.

But if you - it may be open or it may be we would like to have a discussion on the question. But in the future the SCI could put forward a document directly for public comment.

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott. I think what he's saying is we can get the question answered about procedure at the same time we put together the - we could ask the question, send in the stuff we have consensus on now and say, "We believe we have to have a public comment period on the things we've reached consensus.

Please tell us in the future if you want us to send stuff out once we get consensus or do you want to send it out?" So in other words go ahead and submit what we have consensus on now and get clarification on process at the same time.

Jonathan Robinson: But does - it's Jonathan. Does that deal with your point about bundling as much as we can together in one go?

J. Scott Evans: Well I take Avri's point that, you know, it may not be that everything we do requires public comment. I'm not sure. I think that we need to get the Board to tell, I mean, the GNSO Council to tell us what they want.

And if it - if they believe our work requires public comment, I think it's more expeditious if we do that only because then we can give that to the GNSO Council and it would have already gone through that process.

And I think they will have more information before they implement a change or implement no change. They would know. I think they'll have more information.

The more information they can receive I think the better decisions they'll make. But, you know, so I think we do need to get some clarification from Council about how they would like us to proceed.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Okay. Thank you. So then the other topics I was reporting on that was, you know, comments I had made to the follow up motions and the discussion of that.

And there were some people wait so - and at the end especially in particular the - they would like to see that we put in place a formal procedure on motion deferred.

That is what we have discussed before here in this group. If there is the request well to do so, then we should come up and we would come up with a procedure that not only just deciding upon whether we should do that, where we would like to outline and to establish procedure and so a comment procedure on that.

So that was a clear message yesterday so from the audience now to have in place a formal procedure on deferral of motions. So let me say what I have - I took back from that that we should discuss that, how we should deal with that which - do I see comments on that? Wendy and then Carlos.

Wendy Seltzer: I'd like to put on the table abolish the deferral of motions, give us a strict timeline and stick to it.

Carlos Aguirre: I'm surprised - well no, sorry, because at first Alan said yesterday so that was a clear message with regarding also the new way that that's asking for a formal procedure on that.

So, I mean, so I'm a little bit confused about that right now. I heard also other opinions well to abolish, but that came through to me. Sorry.

Wendy Seltzer: I'm sorry. I said what I would like to put on the table my proposal is that we abolish the deferral. Yesterday I said we had two choices. We could either formalize or abolish.

My suggestion - we're all going to be so bogged down in procedures that my choice - as an individual and as an individual Councilor my choice would be to abolish this.

And in particular I think it would be useful to us not just from a procedural streamlining, but from a economy of time we'd - we would like to be able to set closer timelines and tell people, "This is when you can expect things to happen."

Having a clear timeline from the introduction of a motion until it's voting would help that. That's my proposal. I'm not saying it represents consensus or - of every, I mean, yesterday.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Comments. Jonathan please. Oh sorry. Carlos wanted to - sorry, and then Jonathan. Sorry.

Carlos Aguirre: Thank you Wolf. Carlos again. My position is we need a rule. In all cases the discussion is warranted. I think we have at least three instance to discussion for us to this one rule.

Then and just of course, you know, then a comment periods so our position, our recommendation is not the final decision. But I think in this particular case we need a lot of discussion, more discussion.

It's a very sensitive issue. In relation with - if deferral motion issue should be maintained as an informal or to be formalized, in my case I vote for the formalization because I consider right rule is better than something in the limbo.

And it's better than something in the limbo and only under the decision of the GNSO Chair and obviously less than jurors. The question we needed a rule - definitely yes is my response for many motives.

I expressed motives in the wiki. If you read you can see my position in this case. How must be this rule? My response is simple, clear, something ask me what means clear.

Clear means clear and you see and understandable itself. I said in the wiki comments we - in order to reach a consensus we need to avoid or eliminate the egos.

We need to open our minds. For that I propose the possibility to have a mix between other proposal presented and my position. Definitely I get - I think it's needed a rule but I guess it's not useful more than one deferral.

So I insist with my position always that it's required deferral will be granted without conditions or considerations. Always we need to give the possibility to defer a motion but for limited time, one time for a limit time.

In my - I think no more than 21 days. And exceptionally Council your Chair could we consider a second deferral under limited conditions? These conditions are mentioned by Avri in her comments on the wiki.

Motions substantially change information for about not available and information come after a date motion posting. So my position is to be clear - one deferral possibility always and then exceptionally under conditions - under three conditions second deferral if Council approve. That's it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks Carlos. Okay, yes that sounds very clear and then you outlined also on the wiki. We have Jonathan now your comment.

Jonathan Robinson: I guess - or actually we heard what Carlos has said but in my mind it's possibly a question for Carlos. Carlos, in your thinking how would you deal with the exceptional case that we face which sort of go - rose - it rise to this topic which is where the deferral is in effect gives rise to the defeat of the motion because of a timing issue.

Would you - do you consider a scenario where the request for deferral could be overwritten by the Chair, by the Council, because the problem with the automatic is it might lead to that circumstance again where there's an unintended or even intended consequence of that deferral?

Carlos Aguirre: I think there are on times many circumstances where group - Stakeholder Group or consequences to - not to say what is their idea for what ask a deferral motion.

Maybe for a strategic or other possibilities, so I think that automatically possibility is good. We no discuss - not discuss about if a motion was substantial change or if the information is not available in time.

I think if we discuss about these conditions the remedy could be worse than illness. If we give the possibility to take a - to get a deferral we need no discuss about the conditions in our case, understand?

Jonathan Robinson: I don't think it answers my question. It's under what circumstances could the request for a deferral be overwritten, because your whole supposition is that a deferral would be automatic.

And I'm saying under some circumstances we need to for practical or other reasons...

Carlos Aguirre: I understand. I understand. For the finishing I think rule could be right in my case. I'm a lawyer so I need a rule, not informal and automatic is my position.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Okay, I have Avri, Zahid and J. Scott.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I guess I'm having a little bit of difficulty with this discussion. First of all we're in one of those cases where everybody's being very careful not to point an accusatory finger, so I'll probably point a couple.

I think also we have to remember sort of an old adage that I'm going to paraphrase badly about difficult situations making for bad rules. So we currently have a situation where they're automatically granted.

And I think that contrary to my friend Wendy's recommendation that we never have deferrals, I think it's necessary because sometimes motions come before the Council before their time, that they're rushed, that they're unprepared, that documentation isn't finished, comment periods aren't finished, proper process hasn't been followed and one has to defer as opposed to rushing to some sort of summary judgment that is inappropriate and wrong to do, so you need to have some deferral.

Now I've been fairly vocal on the list about thinking that we haven't had time to think about it reason is unnecessary these days, because that was put in at a time when motions could show up the very day of the meeting and people certainly wouldn't have time to think about it.

Now it's requiring an eight-day advance. You know, we've all committed to doing this work. Those of you on the Council have committed to doing more work than those of us that aren't on the Council, but you've got a week.

We've got leaderships in these Stakeholder Groups and constituencies who have committed to doing a certain amount of work, and they've got a week. If a week's not enough for a motion then do two weeks for a motion.

That perhaps will make it easier. So I tend to disagree with Carlos on a - anytime there's a deferral it should go through at least once. I think there has to be a reason for it.

I think that an incomplete comment period is always a reason whether it's the first time, the second time or the third. I think changes in motions where it's substantively changed and it substantively changes at a very late - is always a good reason.

And I think that incomplete documentation where the documentation that is supposed to back up a motion is not available is also a good reason. So I

would be very careful about saying never because there are good reasons, but I'd also be careful about saying always at least once.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Well I have a list here. Zahid, J. Scott, Marika, Wendy and Chuck as well. So I would like then to close on this item after that and just thinking about how to do. Zahid please.

Zahid Jamil: Thank you. Three points - I'm going to try to make sure I don't forget these. And you're right. I think Avri we have to be able to speak freely about things because, you know, that's what we're trying to solve here.

I agree with you. First of all on deferrals I think it's absolutely necessary. The reason is, you know, the amount of work that we're facing generally as a community, we have to remember we are voluntary individuals.

Those of us for whom it's a job, it's linked to their core business, that's a different story probably. But a lot of us are voluntary workers here and, you know, time is sort of a problem for us with the amount of work there is.

So it is a genuine problem when a constituency hasn't had a time to either consider something and to say - I take your point. You have noticed. You got eight days or, you know, 14 days or whatever it is.

The trouble is that we have already gotten notice of the agenda, so that doesn't solve the problem. The agenda is already out there earlier. People are having their meetings, but despite that there are times when constituencies are unable to have proper consultation or give enough time to something because of prioritization.

I wish we weren't in that situation but that is a problem, so I think it's a genuine issue and it won't be solved by simply saying, "You had 14 days. And sorry we're going to move ahead."

The second is the issue of reasons. So far the use of deferral was for the purpose of saying you didn't have time so that's what everybody uses it for. I agree and I acknowledge that a lot of people use it for tactical purposes.

But when you give a reason, which is different from the traditional reason, then it becomes an issue. However - and in that position people said it was inappropriate.

But if we are to make rules about it I agree with Avri. It would - to us to decide what are the various reasons for which a deferral can be, you know, that we can go ahead with one.

And in that if that is what the group decides that's fine, but it needs to be clear what the reasons need to be. The third was the emergency issue. If you have an expedited or emergency session for resolution what happens then?

Well in many companies there are, you know, the regulars, you know, ordinary resolutions going through. And then you have an extraordinary meeting where you have to consider an emergency or extraordinary resolution.

In those circumstances I think it would be fair to say that sorry, this is something urgent. Get your act together. It's something that the community needs immediately.

And for this purpose deferrals will not be accepted, so that's an exception but I would say it would be needed because there are times we have to respond like we had to previously. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: All right, J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Couple of things. First, I sort of as an individual I like Wendy's idea because it's just the cleanest. Unfortunately having lived the life I've lived, I know that

there are extraordinary circumstances that happen in your personal life that cause great delay, so you have to have something there.

I'm a little amazed that we're having a conversation like we all live in a vacuum. Every organization has some form of this tabling or - and so we don't have to create this from a whole cloth.

My suggestion would be we look at something like Robert's Rules and find out what they suggest in their parliamentary procedure for tabling or deferral, because I do believe there's probably something already out there.

With regards to Jonathan's point I do believe there needs to be some sort of mechanism that if a majority of the people on the Council believe that the deferral should not occur, that it can be overwritten.

Where we got ourselves into this problem was that there was no formal procedure, so when people were disgruntled rightly or wrongly by what was going on, no one could answer the question, "Well what do we do when everybody's disgruntled?"

It was - this had been some informal courtesy and that's where you get yourselves into problems with these things, because then one group feels like they have never had the courtesy and the one time they ask for it - and I'm not pointing fingers at any group because I know the IPC has asked for deferrals on numerous occasions, and many times it's because nobody has read anything.

I don't care how many days they've had. And it comes up in a conversation and nobody has a position because nobody has read anything. And that's frustrating because I've read it but I'm not a committee of one.

And if I was a committee of one, then when I get up and I talk everyone tears me down because I haven't gotten proper consultation with my group. So you

got to have some mechanism because people are busy and we're volunteers, and so I think we have to have something.

My suggestion was - is that we look at maybe some other groups or Robert's Rules or something for how this is handled already, rather than making up out of whole cloth.

And perhaps if we use some sort of guide that's sort of more streamlined, it will jump-start us into a procedure that is less emotionally fraught. It's something that's sort of standard.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you J. Scott. Guys, we have still 15 minutes left and I'm going to cc on the other guys talking in before that time. So there's still Marika, Wendy and Chuck and we should come to a close then about this topic. Marika please.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I mean, something to consider as well if you are on down the road of establishing criteria for when, you know, these motions can be deferred you really need to think of right objective criteria, because who is going to be the judge of whether, you know, information was received or whether it's substantive changes to a motion or it's months of standard?

So you might put a Chair which I guess would normally be the judge possibly in a very difficult situation, and then a cleaner solution is just that you either know the first or saying whatever the reason is, if you request deferral you get it because otherwise you will need to really have objective criteria so you can establish, you know, if it's a valid reason or, you know, people just will try to fit the category of the reasons that are going to be allowed for deferrals.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you. Directly - go ahead please. Jonathan please.

Jonathan Robinson: Very brief response to what Marika said. I mean, there is a very - I'm not sure I understood whether what Avri was saying on - and with reasons

because the one way in which one could deal with that is simply have a requirement that you provide a reason.

That's not a condition for - it's not that they then - that that reason isn't tested for whether or not the deferral is granted. One simply provides a reasonable rationalization so you are obliged to do so, but it doesn't - but you'll still automatically get the deferral. So - because previously we had none so that's a very hot topic.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Okay, so Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: Yes, very briefly I just wanted to urge that in moving this forward we consider the cost benefit analysis as against the baseline of the simple rule of no deferrals, and the benefits versus the costs of adding new procedures.

If we do go down that - the other road I think J. Scott's suggestion that we look for places in parliamentary procedure where this is already done and adopt those is a good one.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Thank you Wendy, and then Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Wolf. Good discussion. I'm really opposed to denying a reason that we've all used, and that is a reason that we need more time to review. And in our last charter our Councilors are required to come back to the group and not make a decision on their own.

In eight days sometimes we can do that; sometimes we can't. Two weeks is better so, you know, that's an idea changing that. But sometimes two weeks might not be enough depending on the issue and the complexity.

If we really believe in the bottom up process we have to allow time for our Councilors to get feedback from their groups. And I know we've been a little

smaller group in the past, which made it a little bit easier than some of the rest of you.

That's already changed, even with a, you know, we have more observers than we do voting members right now. So disallowing a reason that you need more time to review, you know, we have to trust one another to use that legitimately.

And I see no value in trying to criticize each other in terms that we're misusing that. That is a very legitimate reason in a bottom up process.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Guys really so we have - I think it's crucial and it's important really then. I just - if you have just brief comment on that you both so then that's over then. Zahid first and then Carlos please.

Zahid Jamil: Two very quick points. It can't just be any reason. The reason is because then if it's a substantive point of merit, because you don't like the motion you object to the motion.

That can be a reason for a deferral. That can be a reason to vote against a motion, so I think we have to be careful what reasons are allowed if you're going to do it.

And if they want to use it for a tackle purpose let them do it, but there should be a formal process to it. Secondly, on Robert's Rules I looked it up. It's about 2/3 majority to even get this motion to deferral - to defer it or pass.

It's a very high standard. I just looked that up. It's 2/3 majority. You have to take a vote to defer and it takes 2/3 to do it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thank you. Carlos.

Carlos Aguirre: Yes. For what Chuck said it's my position that one time always for 21 days - no heard nothing. It's good for tactic, for a strategy for necessity to discuss into a group or consequence. So for me it's good one time always 21 days. No problem.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you for this discussion. So we have in the committee the - let's say and not an unwritten rule or - so if we would like to recommend something so we would like to find a consensus on this call about.

So we are still - in the status we have pros and cons and then - and the - I would say that we not yet I couldn't say we have found consensus on one or the other option.

What we have talked about in the past was also should be make a poll here in this group and the SCI about a proposal, but that was discussed and we said, "Okay, that needs clear questions in advance but to be worked out."

What should we - how should we poll? What should we ask the committee there to poll about? So I wonder because we have I think - and we have really put on the table many arguments with pros and cons, whether we want two or three of us should put together those arguments or - and try to work out a set of questions or let me say combined question well to the SCI and for the next meeting, where we should really make a kind of rule or polling about to promote that.

So I would like to put that forward here from - for - to think about let me say and then if we continue this currently on the list about that. So my proposal would be really to work out - to put all the options on the table, to work out a set of questions as Avri was all - the suggestion last time so that we could then have a poll on that question.

I would like to ask who is - we have a subteam on this deferral of motions.
Who is - who are the members of that - those subteams? Is it - Avri are you
one?

Avri Doria: I'm on several and I don't remember which ones I'm on at the moment. Sorry
- but probably.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: So Marika, you?

Marika Konings: Yes, on the deferral of motions the members are Ron Andruff, Angie Graves,
yourself Wolf-Ulrich, Krista Papac, Avri Doria and Carlos Aguirre.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: So almost all of us.

Carlos Aguirre: But Wolf I'm not on that but I will...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes, and I would like to ask you well for opinion now of such a kind of
procedure because otherwise, you know, we - from my point of view at the
time being since we cannot find consensus I - we could get - go back to the
pros and the cons and say, "Okay, we discussed cons and we couldn't find a
consensus on that. These are the options."

And so you can make use of that and continue the discussion on Council
level, or we have a suggestion - a firm suggestion from our side which - on
the basis of a kind of sorting out and voting on that.

J. Scott Evans: Well I would suggest that we, I mean, I don't think we've had a sort of a
conceptual discussion. I don't think we've had a proposal yet. I think we've
got one proposal which is Wendy's proposal, which is to get rid of it
altogether.

I think what we should probably do, and I'm happy to do this, is go to Robert's
and put that out so everyone can see what it has to say, and maybe ask

some other boards that I'm on how they handle something like this and say, "Here's A, B, C, D," and see if - and then have us discuss that - options and do we want to go with one of those, or do we want to create a hybrid of that that would be created by our group?

But I don't think we've had anything but a conceptual discussion at this time. I don't think we have a proposal that we - to draw a consensus around. So I'm happy to do that like we did with the - I think we did something similar with the consent agenda where we looked at what other groups did, and we sort of looked at how that was.

And I think it sort of led us to consensus so I'm happy to do that if that would move things forward.

Jonathan Robinson: Well - sorry Wolf. Just one constructive suggestion. I like what J. Scott is suggesting there and to me it seems that there are four or five pivot points around which there is a discussion to be had or a decision to be taken.

And I think when we see them laid out like that it's do we defer or not? Do we need a reason or not? Do we - can the deferral be overruled? There's a set of, I mean, perhaps I've just - currently seeing things in a kind of logic tree, but it seems to me that there's the same...

J. Scott Evans: And I'm happy to set those out and then have people agree or disagree if those are the touch points. And then once we decide what the touch points are look at the options.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Okay, thank you. I think that is a really good proposal and happy well that you step in here. I'm wondering - may I ask you J. Scott if you can look through the timeline what was your suggestion relative to this?

J. Scott Evans: I would suggest that a realistic timeline giving summertime if they have something for us to look at by first of August.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: So that would give me, I mean, it's actually - I'm on NonCom so I'm not back until the, you know, we have the American holiday the first week of July so that'd give me about three weeks to get this together if that's okay - if like 1st of August.

I know a lot of the Europeans will have to take August off, but we don't have to act on it right away but you will have it to consider by August.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thank you very much. I think that we should accept that and thank you very much Scott for stepping in. Well before we close we have to close because 9 o'clock, so all the other guys are coming in here.

I would just pay attention to the other point which we're talking about the proxy voting procedure. And I told the Council we had no consensus at that time but there is a suggestion which was made by Avri to - that means that Staff should rework that procedure and to allow for parallel notification directly to the Secretariat and the Council in case of proxy voting.

So this suggestion is on the table so we don't have the time right now to discuss it. I would like to ask you to discuss it on the list further on, and then that we start with our next call with that item and then make a proposal with regards to that.

I would say right now -, so two minutes to go so that we close the meeting today, and just asking for a new time. I would say Marika that we are talking about a potential time maybe two weeks from now also when we should have the next call. And you're sending out a Doodle for that if you can find one please Marika.

Marika Konings: Could we maybe just, you know, take hands and if we could continue on the same time? I think on the last meetings we always had it on Thursdays at 19:00 UTC which seemed to work.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Marika Konings: But also if we can maybe in two weeks' time on the Thursday at that time would that be...?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: It seems to be convenient. Is there are any important reason well against doing that? No. Then please let's - we will talk about it. We would just maybe ask. Yes, we should make this meeting, yes.

So with this is there any final comments for today? So thank you very much for this lively discussion and the meeting is adjourned. And operator, please close the line. Thank you.

END