

Updated agenda of the extraordinary general meeting of the DDI e.V.

on Saturday, 09.03.2019 at 11am to 6am at Mercure Hotel Frankfurt Airport Dreieich, railway station 200, 63303 Dreieich including all received requests from the members.

The following topics are on the agenda

1. Welcome and opening of the meeting
 - Election of Assembly Leadership and Election Helpers
 - Presentation of the interpreter and the minute-taker
 - Working arrangements for the meeting
2. Establishing the proper convening and quorum of the General Assembly.
3. Annual Report of the Executive Board for the past year
4. Report of the treasurer/results of the 2018 cash register check/discharge of the cash register and the board
5. Debate on the current situation of the DDI e.V.
 - for example, relationship between DDI e.V. and VDH e.V. and other clubs
 - for example application of the DDI e.V. - reglement
6. First block of votes about members´ requests filed in accordance with the statutes
 - 6.1. Proposal 1 (Katrin Heimsath)
 - 6.2. Proposal 2 (Claudia Moser)
 - 6.3. Proposal 3 (Claudia Moser)
 - 6.4. Proposal 4a (Carmen Heritier)
 - Proposal 4b (Claudia Moser)
 - Proposal 4c (Melanie Felix)
 - 6.5. Proposal 5 (Axel Weber)

Break

7. Elections Board DDI e.V.
 - 7.1. Election of the 1st Chairperson
 - 7.2. Election of the second Chairperson
 - 7.3. Election of Treasurer
8. Decision to revise the Statutes of DDI e.V.
 - Authorization of online voting
 - Collection of proposals on substantive changes
9. Second block of votes about members´ requests filed in accordance with the statutes

9.1. Proposal 6a-c (Sandra Schneider)

Suggestion for discussion 1 (Carmen Heritier)

9.2. Proposal 7a (Sieglinde Bruns)

Proposal 7b (Britta Kalff)

Proposal 7c (Judith Loy)

9.3. Proposal 8 (Verena Verones)

9.4. Proposal 9 (Silvia Stadler)

10. Different topics

The deadline for incoming applications has passed, which is why further incoming applications can no longer be taken into account.

Please register as a participant via the form posted separately online so that we can better plan for the meeting room.

We look forward to a constructive exchange and a profitable assembly,

/Sincerely

Debra Benard (2nd Chairperson)

Jana Lorenz (Treasurer)

Fruzsi Wilhelm (Advisor of the Board)

Katharina Henf (Secretary)

Proposal 1 Katrin Heimsath

Dear board members,

I'd like to apply for the following article being discussed on the general meeting of the DDI e.V. on 9th March 2019.

As the members decision regarding this proposal might influence the election of the new board members, it possibly shall be discussed before the election.

Yours sincerely

Katrin Heimsath

Proposal to include an additional article in § 9 of our Statute

Board members and officials may not be board members or officials of other organizations whose statute or goals are in conflict with the statute or goals of the DDI. If a board member or an official takes a corresponding office at another organization, this step will be interpreted as resignation from his or her office at the DDI. The board is responsible for evaluating whether a statute or the goals of another organization are in conflict with those of the DDI. The person in question may request that the membership votes on the board's evaluation at a general meeting.

Reasons:

Board members as well as members who take over roles for the DDI (e. g. training of judges) are representing the interests of the members, both internally and externally. They are decisively responsible how dogdance develops within the DDI and how the goals of the organization are met. It is often necessary to find compromises and solutions. People who are involved in this process must be free of conflicts of interest which could occur while holding an office at another organization. This is important

- a)for a trusting teamwork in the DDI
- b)for the protection of the people involved
- c)for the protection of DDI's goals

The members must be confident, that board members and officials make decisions in the interests of DDI. This rule will eliminate possible conflict of interests, board members and officials can't be accused of dishonest intentions and reach solutions in an unbiased discussion Decisions are only as trustworthy as there is confidence in the decision-makers. Therefore, there should be a corresponding article added to the statute which protects the decision-makers and the goals of our organization.

Proposal 2 from Claudia Moser

Proposal: New structure of the DDI-Board

One problem with our board members is that, due to different numbers of members in the DDI-countries it most likely always be the case that there are certain countries that will have a higher number of board members than others.

Due to that in the past there had been the unfortunate appearance, that the DDI is mainly organised in Germany and Switzerland (the countries where there is the biggest number of members). But other countries that might be as active but so far don't have as many members don't have so much of a voice when there are any decisions and development of the DDI.

Also due to the recent events I believe that it would be sensible to have more than just 5 people involved in important decisions regarding our club.

Therefore I would like to suggest a rule or statutory change on how the board is composed.

There would be, as before, the **Main Board**, as before consisting of the five usual posts.

New there would be an **extended Board**, consisting of one person per Country.

As before the main board will deal with the normal jobs of the club. But for any decision regarding the statutes, the rules or any other decision with far-reaching significance the full board (main and extended board) will vote together.

This would ensure, that important decisions are not only made by a small number of people and there would also be an international validation.

Also it could be ensured, that the topics and discussions that were discussed in the main board would be forwarded via meeting protocols to all members of the extended boards so all countries remain informed.

In return I hope that the members of the extended board collect topics and problems in their countries and inform the main board so that the flow of information works both ways.

Text of the proposal:

The DDI Board of the DDI now consists of two parts which together form the complete board.

Part 1: Main Board (Chairman / Vice-Chairman / Treasurer / Secretary / Assessor)

Part 2: Extended Board (1 member per DDI-Country)

Proposal 3 by Claudia Moser

Proposal:

At the moment there are no clear „job descriptions“ with rights and duties defined. Also some posts do not have any specific function.

Therefore I propose that all five posts in the board get clearly defined assignments.

Grundbedingung für alle Vorstandsposten wäre aus meiner Sicht:

- Englisch mündlich zwingend
- Englisch schriftlich idealerweise
- Noofficialpost in anotherclub/ association that hasopposite or divergent goals to those of the DDI

Chairman / Chairwoman:

- Administration of the DDI
- Representantion of the clubsinterests
- Call the boardmeeting and itsadministration
- Call the membershipmeeting and itsadministration

Vice-Chairman:

- Translation of all protocalls and informations in German and English, to enable good communication and flow of information within the board and the club

Secretary:

- Writing the protocols of the boardmeetings
- Writing the protocols of the membershipmeeting

Treasurer:

- Accounting
- Budget
- Payments
- Paying out the sponsoringbudgets

At the moment Assessor → New Media-Responsible

- Publishing the boardmeetingsdecisions
- Networking
- Overviewover the Newsletter
- Publishings on the website

All boardmemberscaninvolve additional persons in some of their work (forexample to do the Newsletter, etc) but the mainresponsabilityremains with them, so they must ensure that the work is donecorrectly.

Proposal 4a by Carmen Heritier

Limitation of using DDI rules and DDI judges

I sincerely propose that it should be discussed in how far our rules and judges can be made available to other people, clubs or institutions. In the past, this wasn't an issue at all, but now it seems to have risen due to the newly founded German club that wants to cooperate with the FCI. My personal opinion is to keep our DDI as open-minded and barrier-free as possible. I would like to propose that this item should be discussed and voted for by all members and not just a small amount at this extraordinary meeting. So if Online-Voting is still not possible, I would like to suggest that the issue shall be treated just like the question with the age of class 3 dogs - via an online survey.

Limitations, yes or no?

If we limit our rules and judges to the DDI, the following things are not possible anymore:

- Judges judging the OEC, the Nordic Championships, the World Cup or any other event of another club/institution. Or judges have gained an excellent reputation worldwide and have driven the sport forward in the DDI direction. This would be a shame.
- No more competitions organised by small dogclubs or any person that is member of a dog club other than the DDI.
- no more participation of foreign teams whose mothercountry organises Dogdance under FCI rules (e.g. Belgium) if the DDI openly opposes the FCI.
- In the past, small deviations from our rules have been accepted, such as that specialised funclasses were ranked or that a Pro-DD test with setlements was accepted (Italy) alongside our rules. Now, in Germany, there is one deviation that only allows DDI members or members of literally any FCI club (could be sports, could be breedclub, whatever) to compete at this very specialevent. This probably only concerns a handful of dogdancers. Yet it has caused much trouble. The thing is that beforehand, such deviations were accepted, now members are troubled by them. This means that either we allow deviations in general or we don't. Otherwise we would need a working party that defines how such deviations are treated for each and every competition. This would begin with ring size, incorrect ring barriers, pillars in the ring and end with questions like „is it possible to offer ABC (anything but collies) classes or breed-specific classes such as the BAM (a very prestigious agilityevent just for border collies.) or mixed-breed classes?

So, I propose that all members are able to decide via online voting (or if not possible via online survey) which of these 3 versions they prefer:

1. The DDI will keep its open-mind and aim to be a club whose rules and judges can be made available to everyone wanting to organise a competition.
2. The DDI will only allow rules and judges to be „used“ by DDI members that aren't in anyway members of another dogclub.
3. The DDI will establish a workingparty that decides for each competition individually before it takes place.

Proposal 4b Claudia Moser

Proposal Competition Organisation (to point 5 of the invitation)

Use of the DDI-Rules when organising a competition

As before any organiser should get the possibility to organise a DDI-Competition or DDI-Qualification-Tournament.

But to be allowed to call it a DDI-competition, certain rules must be fulfilled:

- Competitors are only allowed if they have a DDI-Record-Booklet
- The complete set of Rules are applied, especially:
 - o Choice of judges (max. 1 Non-DDI-judge at the judgement)
 - o Anyone can compete (no membership in a club necessary)
 - o All classes are offered complying with the DDI-rules
 - o The package-rules apply unless the organiser has an exemption granted by the DDI-board
- Any other points?

Proposal 1: Change of statutes

To be able to promote a competition as a DDI-competition, the organiser must comply with the DDI-rules and the organising handbook.

Any exemption rules must be approved by the board.

Proposal 2: Change of rules

Clear definition of the points that must be complied with, to organise a DDI competition must be included in the rules.

Proposal 4c by Melanie Felix:

Application for the general meeting of the DDI on 9.3.19

I would like to submit a motion for change of regulations.

Due to the new situation of several Dogdanceclubs, in my opinion the following requirements for hosting a DDI tournament should be stated in the regulations:

1. A DDI tournament must already be clearly recognizable in the tender as Tournament according to DDI regulations.
(In my opinion, the DDI logo should be included in the announcement and registration and scores, in addition, I would find it good if at least 1 DDI banner must be installed on the tournament.)
2. The DDI regulations apply in this case for all Dogdance classes of the event, no individual classes can be excluded.

I consider these points to be very important, as it is often very difficult at the moment as a starter to recognize at first glance whether the advertised Dogdance tournaments are DDI tournaments or not.

In addition, I believe that we should ban the rule that DDI members are allowed to report one day earlier. Unfortunately, we have now noticed how this originally thought as an advantage for the DDI members train is now used by other clubs against us (see VDH DM). I think the rules should be roughly the following:

3. On DDI tournaments, all starters are equally entitled to report. Organizers may not make a starting place based on club membership or other criteria. Exceptions may be made here only on qualifying tournaments for class 3 starters, and in principle for helpers and judges of the tournament, for these starters may give it an earlier registration date.
4. Tenders of certain title competitions (DM, Qualis or other titles) can only be awarded at tournaments under DDI regulations, if they have been previously advertised at the DDI and have been accepted by the board of directors).
5. Furthermore, from my point of view, the title "German Champion" in both the FS and the HTM should be officially awarded by the German Open by the DDI.

Proposal 5 by Axel Weber

Motion for the Extraordinary General Meeting of Dogdance International e.V.

on the 9th of March at the Mercure-Hotel, Dreieich.

Application for the amendment of the regulations:

Herewith I submit the motion that the regulation of the regulation change by the executive committee (see statute § 10 (6), introduced and adjusted at the MM 2016) be withdrawn and the members as before may submit motions for amendments to the regulation to the MM, which then will also be discussed and agreed there.

Reason:

The Board's introduction of the amendments to the Regulations was based on many years of the experience, that requests from members to the MM on this subject often made the agenda very voluminous.

With the introduction of the new change mode, these discussions were disconnected from the MM and more time was available to deal with the further applications.

Critical comments before the vote on the procedure were amongst others the necessary confidence in the board, to conduct the discussions and the vote for the changes in the regulations in the interests of the members. This was granted by the members at the MM 2016 to the former board and thus the procedure was introduced and a change in the statutes was necessary.

Through the events in the club since the MV 2018 and in discussions with other members, I have the impression that the responsibility for 5 people is simply too large and a change in the rules by majority vote of the membership is better accepted and thus has less potential for conflict.

Due to the competition with other Dogdance clubs, DVG and VDH / FCI, we would have a healthy return to the direct way of member participation in thinking about and controlling the regulations, which clearly differentiates us from the other systems.

Axel Weber

Proposal 6a-c by Sandra Schneider

Request for revision of judicial education

(6a) Application 1: Extension of judicial education (shadow judge)

Previously attending a judges workshop, then shadowing at least 50 Fun and 30 Official Dances. This completes the judges education and you can be released as a judge.

Judge education new multi-stage process:

1. Completing 2 webinars with theory as the basis for the judges workshop
2. Study regulations
3. Judges workshop
4. Each prospective judge is assigned an instructor
5. Guided Shadow judge
6. Self-controlled shadow judge

Detailed explanation of the multi-stage process:

Webinars:

Before a judge's workshop can be visited, participation in at least 2 webinars becomes mandatory. So you have more time for practice and detail questions in the judge workshop. The regulations have to be studied independently; in the course of the judicial training the prospective judge will be questioned.

Richter workshop continues to take place according to a proven system.

As soon as a prospective judge signs up for training, he is assigned an instructor. The trainer accompanies the aspiring judge during the entire training and is available to answer any questions. Instructors are judges with the appropriate experience who are willing to assist future judges. In each country, there must be at least one instructor, who can also accompany several budding judges. So there is always a contact person if questions arise during the training.

Guided Shadow judge

For larger tournaments (quality tournaments are compulsory) at least 1 judge will be assigned for the intensive supervision of the judges. The tournament organizer must organize appropriate divisions with the main judge. Different classes will then be looked at and discussed directly with the supervising judge, so questions can be asked during the dance and the points awarded can be discussed and explained in detail. This is intended to ensure the quality of the judges and make the training a lot more attractive than before. After the guided inferior judge there will be an exchange with the instructor to inform him about the level of education of the judge.

The previous amount of shadowing remains and is counted also in the guided shadowing.

If the minimum number of shots has been reached, the trainer gives the judge responsible a recommendation as to whether the candidate should be released or whether there are still some shortcomings that would recommend further shimming. The instructor then exchanges with the budding judge and it is discussed together how many more assignments are still to be recommended as a judge, which classes should be made up or where in theory there is still pent-up demand.

The instructor will then give the judge responsible the OK to unlock the new judges if they have reached the level of a trained judge.

The additional shadowing can also take place via videos in exchange with the instructor, especially in classes that may not be often available regionally (seniors, groups, trio, quartet)

The aim is to achieve a uniform level of education and to keep the quality of the judges high. A judge must, for example, to be able to look at the health aspects, to recognize gait patterns, to read the expression of a dog, to recognize species specific how different the individual elements can be evaluated, to interpret music in other languages and to record and process countless other details during a dance. In addition comes the extensive knowledge of the regulations that every judge should have. At the speed of how our sport is currently developing, the previous training is no longer extensive enough and there is no exchange about the quality of a judge. Currently, a judges level is released, even if it is far from the standard aimed at each judging and completely different than our guide here. There is no possibility of a directing influence, which makes the uniform judging ever more difficult and leads more and more often to the dissatisfaction of starters or even to the avoidance of individual judges.

(6b) Application 2: Restructuring of the judge's responsibility

So far, we have in the DDI a person who is elected as the judge responsible by the members. This person is responsible for regulatory changes concerning judging, the judicial training and coordination of other judges' trainers, the release of new judges, the exhortation of judges in case of violations of the Judicial Code, the updating and extension of workshop materials. This is a very large task for a person, especially since then the human aspect is added if someone with this one person does not get along too well.

Judge Responsibility new split by a panel

1. Judges responsible for the coordination as usual and responsible for training and the standard in judging.
2. From each country there is a representative in the body to represent the interests of the respective country and to be involved in the exchange.
3. Country or region managers are appointed to have contact persons in the vicinity.
4. Changes to the regulations are decided by the committee
5. Violations of the Code of Conduct are dealt with by the Panel and issued by the country's representative
6. Panel must be regularly in exchange, at least once a year for all to define a common booth and to compare the current state. (For example, at the Judges' Congress see application 3)
7. Appointment as a judge instructor

Detailed explanation of the application for a panel

Judge in charge:

Claudia Moser has been responsible for the training of judges for many years and is rewarded with the trust of the members at each election and elected by a large majority. That and her many years of knowledge, know-how and experience make her an indispensable part of the responsibility for the judges. Due to the size of the association and the steadily growing interest, especially abroad, it becomes increasingly difficult to manage the coordination as an individual. Not least because the administrative effort is getting bigger. That is why Claudia should be able to devote herself above all to her core competence and that is clearly our standard in judging and developing the training and further education basics.

Panel:

The main body is composed of 5 experienced judges (from 5 different countries) and is elected to this MV. This body is responsible for general judicial training and its organization. The extended body consists of one judge per DDI country (where there are trained DDI judges). This is responsible for changes to the regulations and their implementation in each country. For Germany, there should be 2 seats in the extended body, at least for northern Germany and southern Germany. Judges who are interested in getting active can apply to sit on the panel. If there are no volunteer candidates, the judges who have already been authorized for judicial training in the respective country are requested. Suitable judges are thus requested by the judge's representative. Furthermore, the committee is supported by administrative posts (EDP, mail coordination, releasing judges, etc.)

These are also named by the Judge's Officer as these posts require close cooperation. Members of the panel may not simultaneously take over or perform educational activities in other clubs. This applies in particular if the other club does not comply with the DDI statutes or if they are not affiliated with the DDI.

Basics for application are:

- Mind. 1 year experience as a judge
- Good command of English as the main language on the board will be English
- Must have experience as a starter

Region Representative:

Contact persons for judges, trainers, tournament organizers, starters etc.

Do not necessarily have to sit on the committee or be judicial instructors. It is only about the direct contact and the opportunity to inform about judiciary issues or to submit complaints. These will then be forwarded to the committee accordingly.

The aim is to ensure a uniform standard across countries.

Members of the panel regularly exchange and work on the issues, issues and concerns they are approaching. So everyone is up-to-date and improvements can be made or positions can be defined more clearly.

In addition, the training can be extended to focus.

These measures are intended to ensure a certain standard that also works across national borders and that changes can be implemented everywhere as quickly as possible and not only every two years at further workshops.

The committee should also be informed regularly with newsletter-like circulars if there are innovations or definitions to unclear points. The flow of information must become faster and less complicated.

(6c) Application 3: education of existing judges

So far participation in a judges workshop at the latest after 2 years.

Judge education also in several stages:

1. 1 webinar per year (basictopicsoradvancedtopics)
2. Judgesexercise Quiz
3. Judges Workshop
4. monthlydiscussionround (forexample in thenewforum)
5. *JudgesCongress*

Detailed explanation of the multi-stage process:

1. Webinars with the basic topics in German and English

- a. Rating
- b. deductions
- c. disqualifications
- d. Healthpoints
- e. Seniors / Handicap

2. Webinars with extended topics in German and English

- a. Body language in general / stress signs in the dog
- b. Racial science and special breed-typical body language / movement types
- c. Gait analysis, gait school
- d. ...

expandable as needed Webinars will be published on www.dogi-box.com, free for all judges, and for all other Dogdancers also available, but with costs. Any money generated can then be invested in further webinars with external specialist speakers.

Judge practice quizzes

Online questionnaires to fill out yourself as a practice opportunity with detailed questions. Here no examination situation arises however a learning effect. There may be questions about the rules, sequences from a choreo with questions about whether situations are recognized correctly, excerpts from gait images, etc. The quiz can always be supplemented with current topics and should show the current state of the judge. The evaluation receives only the respective judge for their own overview and assessment if and where there is need for training.

Judges workshop continues to take place according to a proven system.

Monthly discussion round

Every month there is a current topic from the committee (question, video, tournament experience) on which can and should be discussed. In order to catch current issues, it is necessary for judges to provide feedback to the panel or judge-in-charge when there were discussions in tournaments or decisions were ambiguous. Changes can also be discussed here or requests for changes can be submitted by all judges. Only with a good exchange can all needs be taken into account and all pages illuminated. The more judges participate, the more interesting the discussions become and the more views can be shed light on. This also helps to illuminate topics in webinars more precisely if e.g. on issues of uncertainty prevails. Also, there is such an overview where the focus can be in other countries and whether certain issues arise only in individual countries.

judges Congress

Every year, a judicial congress is held, which is obligatory for the committee and is offered to all other judges and judges as an addition. The Congress is organized by a member of the panel. This also ensures that each country is equivalent to maintaining the judiciary. The judges' congress is intended to ensure that the committee meets annually in person to exchange views. Furthermore, it should give the opportunity to take a closer look at individual topics and, if possible, make them attractive with guest speakers. The themes of the congress will then be made available as webinars for all judges.

Since the congress should be mandatory for the committee and the travel costs can be very high depending on the exporting country, the financing must be finally clarified here. Either there is the re-financing via webinars, or corresponding fees for volunteers. There should be a budget framework for each congress that is supported by the DDI as long as the financial resources are available. Therefore, the Congress is optional in this application and the feasibility is to look at each with the treasurer and need an annual application and release depending on whether the financial resources are available.

The aim is to support existing judges in continuing education and to facilitate personal further education. The exchange should also be promoted more, only together we can achieve a good standard and educate each other. The webinars should make it easier to stay up to date. So far, changes have sometimes been delayed or not properly addressed to other judges, especially across countries. In the workshops there is sometimes too little time to pass on changes, to deal with current topics, to work in a practical way and to train new judges.

Suggestion to discuss 1 by Carmen Heritier

Questions regarding judges (to be discussed, no proposal)

Sadly, I have come across several behaviours of judges that, I think, need to be discussed and made public. (Note: I have contacted those judges myself and then informed the board.)

- 2 judges have not only tried to boycott a competition that uses DDI rules, but have stated that it should not take place at all
- 1 judge has massively attacked 2 members of the board, once in a large Whatsappgroup, and several times publicly on Facebook
- The same judge has openly lied on Facebook about fellow judges.

What happens to those judges? Are misbehaviours simply tolerated? I know that there's our judges' code of ethics and that judges can be admonished - but how do organisers know and how many warnings need to be issued till a judge is no longer a judge? I think this whole system should be made more transparent.

Moreover, I have noticed that judges living in Germany have been accepted to judge DDI competitions without being a DDI judge. Do we have clear rules for that? Is it then also acceptable that a RocknDogjudge judges a DDI competition? We should treat everyone the same here.... And most of all, our members should know and/or be included in thoughts about that.

Proposal 7a by Sieglinde Bruns:

Dear DDI Board,

because I don't know who I have to adress, you all recieve this Mail.

I hereby submit an application for the upcoming members meeting on 09.03.2019.

I ask for that difficulty and content in seniors and handicap classes should not be considered.

Also as an extension of the previous trial procedure.

Sincerely,
Sieglinde Bruns

Proposal 7b by Britta Kalff:

Hereby I request that in senior class (official) the factor DIFFICULTY will be removed permanently from the scoring. I think that this will be beneficial to the health of our seniors and also supports the purpose of this class. At the same time the points in the category TEAMWORK could be taken into account twice. I think this category should get more value in senior class. The factor CONTENT should remain in the scoring, because the creativity and versatility of seniors should not be limited.

Application 7c from Judith Loy:

Dear Carmen, Dear Board of Directors of the DDI,

Unfortunately, since the original regulations regarding the senior class had to come back into force, I would like to put a motion to the board or to the general meeting for a vote:

- (a) I ask for an experience report from the proposed amendment of the regulations
- b) I request to amend the regulations as follows:

When evaluating the seniors, the criterion difficulty and content should be excluded to protect our older dogs.

Thank you for your commitment and effort, all of which you put into our sport!

Kind regards

Judith

Proposal 8 by Verena Verones

As treasurer and administrator for the memberships of the GDS (Gemeinschaft Dogdance Schweiz), I would like to request an optimisation of the collaboration between DDI and GDS

1. I would like to be informed about decisions of the DDI in a written form and timely manner.

2. New registrations of members (there are over 70 members in the GDS, after all) was always carried out via e-mail to the corresponding registration office of the DDI. However, neither the new member nor the GDS ever received any notification of acceptance or rejection of the new membership. I therefore request that each new acceptance or rejection of a member is communicated by e-mail to both the member and the treasurer of the GDS.

3. As treasurer of the GDS I claim to receive on request insight into the member list of the DDI, of course while respecting all aspects of the privacy policy. Checking

the requirements for registration for tournaments is only possible with the insight of such an up-to-date list. Before the right of access to such a list is granted, I am willing to sign a confidentiality agreement, that is obliging the treasurer of the GDS to maintain silence on the knowledge of memberships in the DDI.

Zollikofen, 27February 2019

Verena Verones

Proposal 9 by Silvia Stadler:

Dear DDI Board,

I hereby request that my application for membership be reconfirmed at the DDI in the General Assembly on March 9, 2013 in Dreieich.

On 03.01.2019 I got the message that I was rejected as a member. Unfortunately, there was no reason, so I can only speculate why I was rejected. Also to my request with a reason to send was not responded.

It's also not clear if I was rejected by the entire board or just by a board member.

Yours sincerely

Silvia StadlerKonstanz, 01.02.2019

The translation was done with the help of a translation program.