**Terms of Reference for CCWG Breakouts in Dublin**

**Community Decision Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of Group</th>
<th>To describe a method of consensus-style decision making that will replace the voting system in the Second Draft Proposal.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Requirements     | - Based on objections from SOs and advice from AC  
                   - No single SO or AC should be able to capture decision-making through a veto right or through lack of broad support/participation  
                   - Flexibility for SOs or ACs to participate in any particular issue, or on all issues  
                   - Recognize that RSSAC and SSAC are appointed by board |
| Deliverables     | - Rules for decision making  
                   - Analyze corner cases  
                   - For each community power, do we have different participation requirements and thresholds for consensus?  
                   - Final step after decision: discourse with board |

**Enforcement Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of Group</th>
<th>Compare how PTI separation review team and IRP decisions would be enforced under the Single Designator / Single Member models, and recommend a model choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Requirements     | - Enforcement process begins only after community decision process has run thru and conflict with board remains.  
                   - Compare only Single Designator and Single Member.  
                   - CCWG lawyers compared enforcement mechanisms for SD and SM, on all 7 required community powers  
                   - Test against requirement for enforceable powers:  
                     - Need to enforce Separation RT recommendations  
                     - Ensure Board is bound by IRP default judgments  
                   - Process should aim at simplicity and efficiency  
                   - Court action should only be last resort, and avoided if it can be avoided |
| Deliverables     | - Fully described escalation process, starting with Board refusal to follow community or IRP decision.  
                   - Recommendation and logic (SD or SM)  
                   - Key pros and cons for each model, to make it very clear to the CCWG what these are |
### Removal of Individual Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of Group</th>
<th>Describe a process to remove a Board member (Nomcom or SO/AC appointed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Requirements     | ● Preserve the rights of the SO and ACs WRT their appointed directors, while maintaining the independence of board members.  
                       ● Informal consultation before initiating a removal petition  
                       ● Petition phase (and associated participation threshold)  
                       ● Discussion phase (incl. explanation of reasons & reply)  
                       ● Decision phase (and associated threshold)  
                       ● Could a Community Decision override an AC/SO?  
                       ● Limits on the process (such as maximum # of removals) to avoid using this to recall most/all of Board |
| Deliverables     | Description of process, incl. thresholds and description of limits to the process |

### Budget / Operating Plan Veto

| Purpose of Group | Look at risks associated with veto of annual budget and exceptional expenditures  
                       Identify existing and proposed mitigators to address public comment concerns (e.g. decline in revenues) |
|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Requirements     | ● Meet CWG requirement to ensure that PTI is funded  
                       ● Avoid mission creep / unagreed initiatives  
                       ● Ensure financial stability  
                       ● Consider scenarios where revenues have declined  
                       ● Assume that Community Decision process happens first |
| Deliverables     | ● Use Cases raising concerns with veto of budget and operating plans  
                       ● For each use case, a description of how they would play out in the current proposal  
                       ● Clarifications of existing mitigation measures and/or recommendations to address the issues |