

**ICANN
Transcription
Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation meeting
Thursday 04 June at 18:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation meeting on the Thursday 04 June 2015 at 18:00 UTC.

Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to Inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-sci-04jun15-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jun>

Attendees:

Anne Aikman Scalese – IPC – Primary - Chair
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen – ISPCP - Primary
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC - Primary
Amr Elsadr – NCUC - Primary
Avri Doria – NCSG – Primary
Lori Schulman – IPC - Alternate

Apologies:

None

ICANN Staff:

Julie Hedlund
Mary Wong
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Thank you and speakers your recording has started you may begin.

Terri Agnew: Thank you (Tony). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the standing committee on improvement teleconference taking place on Thursday the 4th of June.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you everyone this is Anne Aikman-Scalese and I guess we will begin with our roll for the SCI meeting today. Terri can you hear me?

Julie Hedlund: Terri this is Julie. Did we lose you?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I'm still here I don't know what happened to Terri.

Julie Hedlund: She says she lost audio and she says one moment she's rejoining. So I think she did not hear you.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay she's coming back in.

Julie Hedlund: She's coming back.

Terri Agnew: This is Terri can you hear me now?

Julie Hedlund: You're very faint Terri could you speak again?

Terri Agnew: Is that better? Is that better?

Julie Hedlund: Yes it's still fairly faint but at any rate Anne was asking if you could go ahead and do the roll call.

Terri Agnew: Certainly on moment. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the SCI teleconference taking place on Thursday the 4th of June 2015.

On the call today we have Anne Aikman-Scalese, Rudi Vansnick, Avri Doria, Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, Lori Schulman and Amr Elsadr. We have no apologies listed for today's conference.

From staff we have Julie Hedlund 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 back to you Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Hello everyone this is Anne Aikman-Scalese and thank you for taking the time to participate today. First I'd like to ask are there any changes to statements of interest?

Okay, seeing none we'll move onto our next topic. I don't know if anyone has felt an urge to move into the SCI vice chair position but if we have any volunteers I would appreciate your letting us know that at this time.

And if not I would really appreciate in Buenos Aires if you could, you know, talk to members, you know, both primary and alternate about potentially coming into this position.

Again I consider it a very important position because I'm basically not going to publish any sort of communication or drafts or anything to the full SCI membership list without reviewing those first with whoever the SCI chair, vice chair is.

So then if we could move on to our first issue we determined in our last call with advice from staff that we would consider first the interplay between the ten day waiver rule and the resubmitted motion rule.

I tried to send out a basic summary of what that issue is. It really I believe is the question of whether a resubmitted motion can benefit from the ten day waiver rule.

For those, you know, who participated last year you are aware that we went through a lot of discussion to determine what constituted a resubmitted motion and what did not constitute a resubmitted motion.

And those rules were put in place by GNSO council in the form of 4.3.3 and 4.3.4. We should probably mention that the motion that contains the material change is not a resubmitted motion and we should also mention that a motion cannot be resubmitted during the same council meeting.

In fact it must be resubmitted 24 hours at least before the next council meeting. And in addition to that a motion that is not voted upon will not be considered a resubmitted motion.

So in connection with the ten day waiver rule just to summarize the reason for that rule is that there are some motions that can be introduced in fewer than the ten day advanced timeframe that counselors may agree unanimously that they want to vote on that motion at a council meeting.

And so this is a practical rule that allows councilors to proceed on something that is theoretically anyway not controversial and to waive the ten day advanced rule.

So the question that we're presented with from council at this time is whether a resubmitted motion can benefit from the ten day waiver rule. Now if possible I would like to first ask Amr to comment on this since he was active on the list and in our meetings last year with respect to this issue.

And Amr if you could summarize again what you think the concern is and perhaps suggest what you think the resolution might be I would appreciate that.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Anne this is Amr. I think you summarized it quite well. There are in the work that this committee has done and has presented to the GNSO council on both the ten day waiver rule as well as the resubmission of motions there were sort of rules to how that could be done and under what circumstances these exceptions would be allowed.

I think that the main issue here is that there are exceptions. There are requirements in resubmission of a motion that sort of conflict with some of the requirements of the ten day waiver rule.

So what we really need to do is make sure that if we do suggest any amendments that they do not conflict with each other anymore. Personally I see no reason why a ten day waiver rule should not apply to a resubmitted motion as long as all the rules in the waiver of the ten day rule are adhered to, which I think give a lot of flexibility to members of the GSNO council to not agree to a waiver in the event that they would choose not to.

But as they are now I think it would be a good idea to just make sure that the ten day waiver rule applies to resubmitted motions.

I would also like to add that last year in February of last year Mary had, Mary Wong had circulated a draft proposal on how to get this done in the PDP manual.

I dug it up and the SCI list archives in them and I'm putting the link to that in the chat. If anyone would be interested to take a look, thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: That's great Amr. Thank you there is - this is Anne again. And there is one question I wanted to ask you about with respect to conflicts and I do want to get others thoughts on just the notion generally.

But in noticing my error and reporting the resubmitted motion has to be resubmitted 24 hours in advance is that correct or it does not?

Amr Elsadr: No I believe the resubmitted motion has to be resubmitted at least ten days prior to the next council meeting.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I'm sorry so I'm mixing...

Amr Elsadr: Yes so what we want to do is make sure that the ten day waiver applies to that as well so that resubmitted motions can be introduced 24 hours prior to a council meeting.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay so the resubmitted motion would be required to be submitted at least 24 hours in advance and I assume then we're thinking that the explanation could come 24 hours in advance of why it's being resubmitted?

Amr Elsadr: Yes that is correct. However in order for any motion in this case whether it's a resubmitted motion or whether it's a new one there is a - what one of the rules on waiving the ten day rule is that there has to be no objection from any councilor amongst the GNSO council.

So technically whether it's a new motion or a resubmitted motion for any reason if a councilor feels that a ten day waiver should not apply then they could object and then the motion would not be submitted.

So that's kind of why I think that there is plenty of protection or sort of plenty of safeguards in the ten day waiver rule that should allow us to be applicable to resubmitted motions similarly to the way it is applicable to new motions being submitted, thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great thank you. Wolf-Ulrich could you give us your comments please?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes thank you and sorry maybe I did not follow in the past so exactly, you know, what's going on and I was reading the two texts you provide or Julie provided recently gone through the waiver and the resubmitted motions which was (unintelligible) approved by the council.

I could not find anything about the 24 hours you mentioned. So that is my first question. I only found things relating to the ten days rule and to the rule

saying resubmitted motion must be published no later than the deadline for submitting the motion whatever that is.

So that is one thing. So the 24 hour is not very clear to me. On the other hand I understood why now that it is the request of several (unintelligible) with the councilor so it may be clarified that the motion, the resubmission of motion is going to benefit as well from the ten day rule as the submission of motion is.

So my question is since I mentioned some conflicts here between what the real conflict is and whether the conflict could just be solved by clearly explaining in the resubmission of motion rule that its benefits from the ten day waiver rule if that is the case.

These are my two points I would like to clarify, thank you.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you very much Wolf-Ulrich. I believe the 24 hour advance notice is contained in 3.3.2 and then subsection A and, you know, I admit to also having been a bit confused about how these would, these two would interact.

But what I'm understanding from Amr's explanation is that once we say that ten day waiver rule is available for resubmitted motions we would be saying that 3.3.2 A applies and that that would if you will trump the advance submission requirement of a resubmitted motion.

So that it would be 24 hours in advance of the GNSO council meeting accompanied by the request for consideration. And I think there if we were going to your second point if we were going to modify the resubmission of a motion rule we would have to also state in addition to it being subject, you know, to the 24 hour advance that the explanation of why it's being resubmitted would have to be also accompany that request.

And this relates to the language of subsection B of 3.3.2 which talks about requests for consideration. So if we were going to modify the language in the

resubmission of motion rule we would I think have to translate that into a requirement for the explanation as to why it's being resubmitted.

Any more thoughts? Avri did you - I think you were involved in the discussions at the council level perhaps. Are you with us?

Avri Doria: Yes I just had to find my microphone...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay good.

Avri Doria: ...(unintelligible) and all that stuff. I don't know that and maybe it's just my lack of recall and someone like staff or Amr who, you know, or those who remember everything will correct me but I think we ended up more talking about the issue of their being something to talk about and did not get deeply into the details but I may be forgetting. So I got nothing to add, thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay and so I guess that clarifies, you know, why we are talking about it now. There doesn't, you know, so far seem to be a lot of controversy about this topic.

I don't recall any particular controversy either other than the fact that it might not be, you know, clear one way or the other. And I see that Amr has posted in the chat some language that Mary had suggested to be added to in this case I guess to the ten day waiver rule rather than to the resubmitted motion rule.

So I'll recognize Amr now to hopefully explain that.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Anne this is Amr again. I also wanted to sort of go over my recollection of why this became an issue. If you recall correctly we didn't deal with the ten day waiver rule and the resubmission of motions simultaneously.

They were two projects that sort of we undertook consecutively on this committee. And we had finished working on one we had started on working on another.

And I think the issue here was that if we wanted to have the ten day waiver rule apply to resubmitted motions that would have required a second set of recommendations concerning another section of the PP manual which would have required a second public comment period on those changes as well.

So they would have been handled, they would have had to have been handled separately. And I think this was perceived to be sort of a complication and the decision at the time was to sort of just not tackle that then and wait to possibly deal with it at a future date.

I see Mary is also on the call I hadn't noticed earlier and I've been quoting her a lot so maybe she could help us with recollecting some of this as well, thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you Amr. That is a very interesting point. You mentioned that you thought that there would have to be a change in the PDP manual if this rule were changed in the operating procedures. Could you clarify I'm not sure I understand?

Amr Elsadr: Yes I'm sorry I meant the operating procedures not the PDP manual I apologize.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay, okay so the issue is just simply that if a change is made here that it would require public comment and that the thought was that that couldn't be added at the last minute because the public comment period was already closed. Is that your understanding?

Amr Elsadr: I think we would have had to run two simultaneous public comments. One on resubmission of motions and then a second one on having the ten day waiver

rule apply for resubmitted motions just because they were addressed in two different parts of the operating procedures.

That is if I recall correctly and that's sort of what created the complication then and if we wanted to because as you know we like to have a very light touch to whatever changes we make on the SCI.

And so I think the decision was back then to sort of not over complicate matters with two simultaneous public comment periods that may confuse folks who are looking at them.

But yes but the language as is I don't see how the ten day waiver rule could apply to resubmitted motions although I see no reason why in fact it shouldn't. It would - I think it would provide the GNSO council with more flexibility in how it does its work.

So I think just a very slight tweak needs to be made. Perhaps the section 3.3.2 and I did paste some of the language that Mary had suggested back in February of 2014 to that effect.

I personally think it's good language and I thought the others might want to consider it, thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay thank you Amr. I see that Rudi has posted a question in the chat that I'm hopeful that Mary will answer for us directly here on the call and Rudi's question is, if the ten day waiver rule is applied to a resubmitted motion then could that resubmitted motion be indefinitely be resubmitted?

I guess he is saying, you know, many, many, many, many times. So Mary could you and I see your hand is up go ahead and comment on that as well as anything else that you wanted to say?

Mary Wong: Thank you Anne and hi everybody it's Mary. I'm not in an office so if my connection drops if you can't hear me please type it in the chat so I can see it and either correct myself or dial back in.

So Anne I was actually going to go back to Amr's and Wolf's comments and questions before taking Rudi's. As I typed in the chat I think the first question to be clarified amongst and by the SCI is whether the waiver rule can and should apply to resubmitted motions.

As Wolf noted that seems to be the assumption of some at least of the SCI members. But going to what Amr was saying earlier this was not something that was in our recollection explicitly considered by the SCI.

And by the time we dive into thinking about it the sort of timing with the public comment that Amr brought up had already occurred. So from the staff perspective we think it would be helpful if we could clarify among the SCI that the answer is yes.

In which case then the question of what appropriate language should apply and whether that should go into 3.3.2 or somewhere else as Amr was saying can be considered.

And then to Rudi's question that would be part of the consideration as well and it may be that the way the resubmission rules work the answer is no but we would propose doing it in that order.

And I hope this is helpful in sort of orienting people with where we were and where we are, thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes thank you Mary. I completely agree with, you know, we need to determine whether there is generally favorable consideration. But I thought that Rudi's question was that the answer to that question might affect, you know, where he might be coming out on this issue.

So I was hoping that we could, you know, address his question before kind of taking a little straw poll if you will as to where those on the call stand on whether they favor the applying ten day waiver rule to resubmission or not.

And I think Rudi's question, you know, could - the answer to that could potentially, you know, affect his, you know, vote if you will. So my thought was just looking at it that a resubmitted motion when we say does that mean it could be resubmitted indefinitely if it's subject to the ten day waiver rule I think I see those as independent issues because my recollection is that after a certain period of time that the motion is not actually considered a resubmitted motion.

Mary perhaps you can help me there in terms of how long a period has passed. I think it's in 4.3.4 paragraph 3 and it's the timing. It says a motion will no longer be considered a resubmitted motion once two council meetings have passed after the meeting at which the motion was voted upon but not adopted.

The motion will thereafter be considered a new motion. So my basic conclusion about this and Mary do correct me if I'm wrong is that application of the ten day waiver rule to resubmit a motion does not change the number of times that a motion would be resubmitted that it's an independent consideration. Is that correct?

Mary Wong: Anne I've typed in the chat that yes if you think about it in terms of the second time and the third time and a fourth time that's what 4.3.3 and then 4.3.4 seem to contemplate.

So at that point when we get if and when we get to that point essentially we start over is how we read it.

Anne Aikman-Scalèse: Great thank you and I see in the chat that Wolf-Ulrich and maybe yes Amr has mentioned that as well that they're independent. So Rudi have

we answered your question about this or would you like to ask any further questions before we take a quick straw poll?

Rudi Vansnick: Thanks Anne, Rudi for the transcript. Yes it helps me in having a clear view on what direction we have to go.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay great and could I just ask if generally speaking those on the call are in favor of going this direction of allowing resubmitted motions to benefit from the ten day waiver rule? Could you please click agree?

Avri are you - do you not have an opinion?

Avri Doria: No opinions today thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: No opinion okay. How about could we clear our agrees and then if anybody would like to express a disagreement with this approach or see any problems with it or the other thing I would say is, you know if you think there are unanswered questions in your mind, things that needs to be explored further if we could get a disagree that would also be good.

Avri Doria: I've got a question.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Sure.

Avri Doria: Are we agreeing to some particular (produced) text or just to a statement that's been made? I want to understand if we're doing some sort of formal agreement thing exactly what text we are agreeing to at the moment or is this just a getting a sense of the room?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes this is just getting a sense in the room Avri and I guess my thought was that, you know, we might want to take one or two approaches. I mean there are, you know, members who are not on the call right now.

So we could do I think one of two things. We could either just simply put out a general statement that those on the call were in favor of moving this direction to allow the ten day waiver rule and ask, you know, other SCI members whether they agree with that general approach.

Or we also ask staff to, you know, prepare language that would be associated with that that would be the clearest language that we could come up with and circulate that in the group at the same time that we circulate the general principle.

I don't want to rush things too much. I'm cognizant of the fact that this is, you know, we want to be a group that considers things in a thorough manner. And so does anyone have thoughts on how far we should go in communicating with the rest of the members whether we should ask staff to draft or not?

Mary what are your thoughts on this?

Mary Wong: Hi Anne and everyone. Julie and I were discussing this and so our recommendation is that definitely for the first part that is to have a notification to the whole SCI that, you know, this is the general feeling and that anybody who has a different opinion or objection should raise it.

With regard to the second part the language we could go back and look at - I think Amr had dug up something I had suggested and I think there may have been one or two discussions around things like that.

And recirculate those and have people do a little bit of a think about it. That's one way to proceed with think.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: All right thank you.

Mary Wong: And obviously if re-drafting or, you know, tweaking needs to be done we could then look at whether what we already have is a good starting point or

whether we need to start over and whether that should be the whole group or a subgroup that sort of thing.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I think one thing I will note about the language and this is Anne again is that what Amr had pasted in the chat it says that if the waiver applies that it must meet the requirements of 4. - of 3.3.2 in addition to those detailed in 4.3.3.

I think I would ask staff to take a look at how the term explanation is used in 4.3.3 versus how the term request for consideration is used in 3.3.2 and perhaps try to reconcile the use of those two terms in the event that the ten day waiver rule is going to apply.

How do we deal with explanation which is a different standard or a different requirement if you will from a request for consideration but with that I think I'll just ask everyone again by way of kind of a straw poll?

How many would favor circulating among the members not only the general tendency to agree with or favor this change but also the circulating of some language drafted by staff.

If you would agree that you want both those steps to proceed can you please show me in Adobe chat?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie I'm sorry I've got some noise in the background. Could you just repeat what you wanted me to put back up I apologize?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I didn't ask for anything. And then how many in the chat, in the Adobe believe that we should just circulate the notion of having the ten day waiver rule apply to resubmitted motions but not circulate any specific language, draft language with respect to that?

If you agree with the second approach. So I'm seeing two disagreements. So Amr and Rudi are in favor of allowing staff to go ahead with drafting. And I think Wolf-Ulrich was also voting - Wolf-Ulrich were you saying on the straw poll that you're in favor of allowing staff to go ahead with some drafting on this? Yes he was.

Avri are you going to go with no opinion either way on these things or? No do you not have a preference?

Avri Doria: As I said I don't mind allowing them to draft I just don't see myself asking them to draft. If they've already drafted and they've got it well in mind I'm just not sure that before we figured out what we will do asking them to draft is something we should do.

But yes I'm relatively ambivalent if they want to draft something I have no problem with (unintelligible), thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you Avri. Mary what's your feeling on that?

Mary Wong: Anne, Avri, everybody we can certainly provide the starting point on the understanding of course that it really is just a starting point and hopefully that would help to streamline the task a little bit for the group.

So we can go back to where we left things in the last discussion and we'll certainly look at all the transcription discussions. We'll take on board the comments Anne that you just made and try and circulate something that like I said can be hopefully a useful starting point for everybody.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay that sounds good and I think there is a fair amount of agreement that what this draft would be would be simply just a basis for the discussion in our next meeting.

And I would say that that is going to be a meeting that occurs in person in Buenos Aires based on looking at the calendar. I do think it's important that when we send out just the basic idea of this and a draft for discussion purposes that we do emphasize that it's simply a matter of something that's going to be, you know, circulated for discussion purposes in Buenos Aires.

So does that make sense to everyone? Could I get some agreements on that or disagreements? I think we're supposed to have a meeting set sometime Saturday the 20th. Can I get staff's latest on that whole topic because I don't see us having a call on the 18th?

I know I personally am traveling on the 18th I don't know about others but it seems to me that we should just address this in our in person meeting. And Mary and Julie thank you all for your agreements.

Mary and Julie do you guys know, have any information with respect to our in person SCI meeting?

Mary Wong: Hi Anne it's Mary and I don't have the schedule in front of me but as I recall and Julie can probably either correct me or back me up and I see Wolf has typed something in.

It's our usual early Saturday morning meeting right before the GNSO convenes for the weekend session.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Right I think I have to give a report at the top of that session and then how does that work SCI meets at the same time as GNSO begins its other business or?

Mary Wong: I'm sorry I apologize that I wasn't clear. The SCI meets for an hour or so before the GNSO convenes. So we would have...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Very early, very early right okay.

Mary Wong: ...that's right and then you are first on the agenda for updating the GNSO. So at least your get all your stuff over with at one shot.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Right so theoretically we would be meeting at like 7:00 am or something. So Amr go ahead I see your hand is up.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Anne this is Amr. Yes I was just going to make a suggestion on what we were discussing earlier regarding staff drafting some language.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Amr we lost you. Can others hear Amr?

Amr Elsadr: I would actually be in favor of...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: We're cutting out again.

Amr Elsadr: Can you hear me now?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes can everyone hear Amr? No I can't hear you.

Amr Elsadr: I'm sorry.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: I'm using - can you hear me now?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I can yes.

Amr Elsadr: Yes I'm sorry I'm using the audio on the AC room and I guess it messes up sometimes. I was just going to suggest that instead of asking staff to draft something that we pick up where they left off on sort of a - on what they've already drafted.

And I believe this because I think it was based on at least some discussion that took place on the SCI. I'd also be happy to help Mary and Julie track down some of the discussion we've had both on list and transcripts of calls.

I had already gone through this exercise and trying to track some of this down when I had the discussion with (Ron) about this when the council was voting on the ten day waiver rule.

So yes just wanted to give a heads up that I'm happy to help with that. I already did some of the work already so thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you Amr I do think that that would be good. I guess the only thing it does seem to me that in connection with the drafting that was already done again that there is a difference between explanation as that word is used in 4.3.3 and a request for consideration as it's used in the ten day waiver rule.

And I don't know, you know, if we want to just make that a footnote in circulating this draft or if you want to try to address that with staff when you're working with them but, you know, I do think it does need to be addressed.

I don't know whether that means that there will be both an explanation and a request for reconsideration or whether they will be, you know, considered one and the same but I do think that it's a point that we'll need to discuss in our meeting in Buenos Aires. Go ahead Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Anne. I'm not sure if I'm missing anything but yes I don't see why both the request and explanation should not both be provided. The explanation would be to explain why a motion is being resubmitted but the request would be to waive the ten day rule.

So the way I see it that they would a councilor who is submitting a motion for the second time making it a resubmitted motion then is doing so past the

regular ten day deadline needs to both submit an explanation on why the motion is being resubmitted as well as a request to waive the ten day rule.

So I'm not sure why there may be a problem or a concern with one or either of them. If you could clarify that.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay so you think it's clear that by the drafting that's there that the explanation and the request for consideration are both required because it says must meet these requirements?

Amr Elsadr: Yes as far as I can see unless I'm missing something.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes I'm sorry I probably was just jumping into that because when it says must meet these requirements there are certain conflicting requirements such as the timeframe.

So the ten day advance, you know, must meet these requirements which would be a ten day advance but the waiver rule is 24 hours in advance. And I think I was, you know, potentially jumping to the point of thinking well there is also a potential conflict between explanation and request for consideration.

But, you know, we can as to whether or not that should be clarified maybe it's meet these requirements other than the ten day advance rule that kind of thing. So you see what I mean by that?

Amr Elsadr: I think I'm still missing something. These are both sort of exceptions to standing rules and they apply under a different set of circumstances. And one requires an explanation the other requires a request.

So if both on the sort of exceptions to the standing rules need to be considered I would assume that the prerequisites for each one should stand. I must be missing something but I'd be happy to take this discussion on if others would like that, thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes that's fine. We should probably just discuss it in Buenos Aires and get through, you know, the right language at that point in time. So I'm just, I'm fine with whatever approach you and staff want to take with on the language issue personally.

Anybody else have any comments on that point? Great well I'm hoping then that we can move on with that decided. We are not going to be considering the amendments to motions during this meeting because we decided in our last meeting to take these issues one after the other.

And so I thank everyone again for participating. Is there any other business with respect to this particular call? Great, well thank you everyone and I look forward to seeing all of you in Buenos Aires.

I will be working with staff to put together our report to GNSO council and it will basically just be summarizing where we are and that we're very early in our work.

So thanks again for your participation and have a great trip to Buenos Aires see you all there.

Terri Agnew: Thank you, once again the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day. (Tony) please stop the recording.

END