

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi**  
**April 10, 2018**  
**8:00 am CT**

Coordinator: The recording has started.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much, Teresa. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the NPOC Charter Review call on Tuesday, the 10th of April, 2018 at 1300 UTC. On the call today we have Joan Kerr, Gangadhar Panday, Juan Manuel Rojas, Raoul Plommer, and from staff we have myself, Maryam Bakoshi and Terri Agnew.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Joan and Raoul.

Joan Kerr: Great. So welcome, everyone. This is the charter call. We've identified a number of issues that we want to address and so we're going to be dealing with today. Poncelet did give regrets or said that he doesn't want to work on it because he thinks it's fine. And so we have his blessings but we'll still need to get that later. And Sam is in China and I have not heard from Olevie so let's get to it then. Go ahead, Raoul, please.

Raoul Plommer: Okay, so I think we could work on the last part which we haven't done. If we – I think elections could be next. That's something that we haven't really gone through, have we? At least in terms of...

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: Might I suggest something, Raoul?

Raoul Plommer: Uh-huh.

Joan Kerr: If we could deal with the issues that we've identified and then send the – both documents to (John Moore) and ask him to you know, an election, he's just going to sort of transfer it into the new document, right? There are no issues around I don't think any administrative or policy issues around the elections per se. And then when we have that document and identify all the issues then we can send it off because otherwise we're going to keep identifying things and it's never going to get done really.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, it's just we have like the last four sections from elections to amendments. And I think those are really quite short; they're like basically...

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Raoul Plommer: ...(2A-4) in all.

Joan Kerr: Okay. Okay, where do you want me to go to?

Raoul Plommer: So if we start with elections that's 8, the tab or the sheet – sheet Number 8.

Joan Kerr: Eight, there we go. Can you see it?

Raoul Plommer: Hang on. Yes, yes, I can. Okay, so yes, because I think, I mean, we could send it to (John) but I think we should go like finish the last four and then we can send it off because that's really the end of the first phase.

Joan Kerr: Right.

Raoul Plommer: I think we got like maybe 10 issues here at the moment. We might be able to go through them as well but, yes, if we just start with elections and see how far we get to by five o'clock let's say.

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Raoul Plommer: This was just a one-hour meeting, was it...

Joan Kerr: That's right, I was just going to say.

Raoul Plommer: Right.

Joan Kerr: So the- so a lot of these issues, the content in the old charter is, you know, it goes from the EC to the membership committee to like the – just the whole procedure is onerous so what we've done is actually, in terms of functionality, we're looking at it from the EC, right calling the election...

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: ...and then it's much easier. So the – a lot of the procedures, for example, details a process. You know, we don't have the tasks, the communication committee anymore. We're going to make the decision that it goes on the Website. Do you understand what I mean? Like the same as the – there is no

request for nomination form, never has been. This is Number 10 on the content. There never has been, I mean, I've done the election for the last three years so what we do is have the active updates where we – which I'm working on right now. So that's gone. And the membership committee is just a coordinator that the actual active database goes to staff and Maryam gives us a list or – of who has sent their updated information at the end of the period. That's all that happens. Much, much easier.

Raoul Plommer: Right. So is this related to – to the elections section?

Joan Kerr: Yes. Number 8.

Raoul Plommer: Right, yes. So we should have that for the EC instead of...

Joan Kerr: That's right.

((Crosstalk))

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I think we've had a membership committee reviewing the request for nominations on the old charter.

Joan Kerr: Yes, we don't – we've never had that.

Raoul Plommer: Right. Yes, that's actually the – oh I just – we just wrote that EC there about the membership committee.

Joan Kerr: Yes, I put it in.

Raoul Plommer: Okay, okay, yes, yes, right. Yes, and others?

Joan Kerr: Now the other thing that we had talked about was the 60 days which is 8.2.1...

Raoul Plommer: Oh yes.

Joan Kerr: ...that it should be at least 60 days' notice which I think it should be, but there was – we were talking that we would reduce that so we may want to do that here.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Raoul Plommer: ...to 30.

Joan Kerr: Yes, so but then if we do that, I just want to point out, if we do that then we have to reduce the other days as well of so there is the – there's three things that happens, there's one the notification goes out via – it should be posted on the Website so that's the first thing. We've always posted it on the discuss list as well, which I think we should do both 60 days beforehand. And there are instructions – 15 days for – is given for them to update their information to all the members and then after the 15 days they – those are the members that will be issued a ballot at the very end.

So then – then there's call for nominations which they can self-nominate or whatever but then they have to give information about themselves. So if we're going to reduce the 60 days, all I'm saying is we may have to end up reducing the nomination period as well or we could leave it at 15 so that it's open.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I think 15 would be...

((Crosstalk))

Raoul Plommer: ...for nominations.

Joan Kerr: Yes, I think Number 2, yes.

Raoul Plommer: Shouldn't be shorter anyway.

Joan Kerr: Yes, we have to change the wording because there is no nomination form so we have to say what that information has to say is that – I'm going to write this down because it's that – email is sent out to – for members to become active. This is where the good standing happens. So Maryam and I can work on that wording.

Raoul Plommer: Right. And is it that, you know, we need to give the notice, 60 days, or 30 days prior to upcoming election. Does that mean that the nomination can be happening in the later part of the – like the 15 days...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: ...of that 30 days, yes?

Joan Kerr: Right. So it'll be 15...

((Crosstalk))

Raoul Plommer: Basically we give notice one month before and then...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: ...after 15 days people can start nominating?

Joan Kerr: Right.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. So then it like the period shuts off at the same time. I think that would make sense.

Joan Kerr: And then what happens 15 days and 15 days right, 1.4 after the notification so the notification is 30 days is what we're saying, correct?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, from the day of the vote.

Joan Kerr: Okay. Right. So notification is 30 days, 15 of those days is for people to enable – to update their information and then...

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: ...the other 15 is for nominations which includes them giving information. I have that all written down by the way. And then you need one more – you need a day for – it's got to be – if it's 30 days we need at least one day for the voting. Now we did 30 days before for the voting, that's why it was 60...

Raoul Plommer: Yes that's a bit extensive.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: But I think 15 days for the vote would be fine.

Joan Kerr: So the nominations then – if it's 15 days for the voting then...

Raoul Plommer: Okay so basically 30 days before the voting starts we let people know that there's going to be election in one month. Then after 15 days we tell them that, okay, now you can nominate for the next 15 days before the election starts. And then the election would go for 15 days...

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: So that's 45 days.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, all together, yes.

Joan Kerr: Yes, that's what I'm trying to figure out. We can't say 30, it's actually 45 days. So we've taken off 15 days.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I guess it can't really be much shorter than that. Unless we made a notice of the elections. It could make sense to just have like a 15 days' notice from the elections and you could start nominating straight off the bat then we wouldn't even need to make another notice about the nomination; we can just say it when the notice from the – of the election comes and we can make that...

Joan Kerr: We don't have to do more than one notice. We only do one. All we do is like Maryam and I did it in the past as well, just a reminder but it wasn't a new notice. All – the notification that goes out spells it out right at the onset.

Raoul Plommer: Okay, okay.

((Crosstalk))



Joan Kerr: But I wanted to suggest something, 15 days may be we can cut that down, the 15 days, for updating your information. We may want to cut that down to seven.

Gangadhar Panday: Hello, this is Gangadhar. May I say something?

Joan Kerr: Go ahead, Gangadhar.

Gangadhar Panday: Does the candidate get an opportunity to withdraw their nomination? Do we have some time for that?

Joan Kerr: What was the question?

Raoul Plommer: I didn't catch that, yes.

Gangadhar Panday: Does the candidate get an opportunity to withdraw the nomination, take it back?

Joan Kerr: To withdraw – any candidate can withdraw at any time.

Gangadhar Panday: Do you have any (unintelligible) to do that?

Joan Kerr: They just withdraw.

Gangadhar Panday: Yes, okay.

Joan Kerr: If they – you don't have to have any policies around anybody withdrawing. They have to give you notice that they've withdrawn but that's it. But that's a personal decision; that's not – we're only dealing with things that's our decision. Somebody withdrawing is not our decision.

Gangadhar Panday: Yes, no (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Sorry? If you are speaking...

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: So Gangadhar, we can't hear you. Sorry. But did that answer your question?

Gangadhar Panday: Yes, yes.

Joan Kerr: Okay. So the question is do we want to go 45 days or are we – so the first option is are we happy with 45 days? So that's 15, 15 and 15; 15 for the updating, 15 for the nomination process and 15 for voting. Or do we want to reduce those days? That's the question.

Raoul Plommer: Well I think we could – we could let – when we make the notice about the elections I think we could – there and then say that okay, you can now start nominating and you can also if you want to be active in the elections you have that same 30 days to do that like before they...

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: ...do that anyway – people do that anyway but we can't do that because we – if somebody nominates someone that is not an active member then that becomes an issue for us. We're opening the door for issues.

Raoul Plommer: Okay, so okay so maybe we then it's like 38 days before the elections and we say that the election is – no sorry like it would be 38 in all but three weeks so 21 days before the election we let know that okay, election starts in 21 days.

The first week you can like activate your membership and take like participate in the elections. If you do that like you have that one week to do that. And then the next two weeks it's already nominating period and then the election starts.

Joan Kerr: So the notification says – I just want to be clear. “How many days for...”

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: “...for a member to become active?”

Raoul Plommer: Like seven days. That's what you suggested, right?

Joan Kerr: That was just an option yes, seven days. And then 15 days for the – once we have that then we have 15 days for...

Raoul Plommer: The nominations.

Joan Kerr: ...nomination process and then 15 days for voting. So that's 30...

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: ...that's 37, 37.

Raoul Plommer: Okay right.

Joan Kerr: The other thing we could do is make it 7, 15 and 7.

Raoul Plommer: Just one week for the elections.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: Well if was a month and it was two weeks, I think that would be quite a big change already.

Joan Kerr: Okay. And so...

((Crosstalk))

Raoul Plommer: If people are like somewhere on their holidays or something, I don't know...

Joan Kerr: It gives them time.

Raoul Plommer: ...then one week does seem a little short.

Joan Kerr: Okay, so 7, 15 and 15, 37 and then we have to add at least two days in between so for the seven days then we have to do plus one to make the database is updated, plus one or two, I'll figure that out. Then 15 days and then for voting and then staff needs, I would say, at least two days for the ballots. So that's 37 and 40. So I'm going to work with a 40-day period, how's that?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, it sounds good.

Joan Kerr: Yes, which would add those two days as well.

Raoul Plommer: Although, come to think of it, I mean, if we have sort of 15 days for each of these periods then maybe it would make sense to also have 15 for the – for the opportunity to show your like – that you're active again.

Joan Kerr: So 15, 15, 15, it's easy.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. That would – I guess that would keep it really simple, 15, 15, 15.

Joan Kerr: Okay. All right so I'll scrap the other one because then it makes it easier as well then we don't have to remember, right?

Raoul Plommer: Exactly.

((Crosstalk))

Raoul Plommer: Then it can – it's just 15, 15, 15 and everybody knows, you know.

Joan Kerr: Yes, okay so and then I will add the other two days, okay. Sounds good. So no one can say, oh I thought it was seven days for this and whatever, okay...

Raoul Plommer: Yes, yes, yes.

Joan Kerr: All right so we're required to give them 45 days but the actual dates it's going to end up being 47...

Raoul Plommer: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: ...in our favor, they get more days from our side so they can't complain so.

Raoul Plommer: Okay.

Joan Kerr: All right. So is everybody in agreement? Any questions, objections, inputs, comments?

Gangadhar Panday: This is Gangadhar. The time laid out 15 plus 15, 15 – plus 15, that is okay for me.

Joan Kerr: Okay, thank you. Juan? Juan, you're on mute probably. I see you're trying to speak. Yes, you might be on mute, Juan. No, we're not hearing you. Do you have it on mute? Just let us know if you have any objections by – objections or comments or agreements either by Skype or I'm just going to put down Ganga and you're on – so Ganga, Raoul and myself have agreed. Okay, all right next. Let us know if your phone – if you can speak at some point, Juan. Okay so that's the one I wanted to point out. We had...

((Crosstalk))

Raoul Plommer: Yes, that's good to be...

Joan Kerr: Go ahead.

Raoul Plommer: Yes I was just going to say that it's good to have it that kind of simple thing so that people don't get confused, including myself.

Joan Kerr: Yes. So now the next thing that I see is...

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: Oh go ahead, Juan.

Juan Manual Rojas: Okay, no, no it's testing (unintelligible) check. I'm back.

Joan Kerr: Okay. So you're in agreement with the timeline for the elections?

Juan Manual Rojas: Yes, yes, I was proposing that seven days but better 15 days each.

Joan Kerr: Yes, it just makes it easier for us. Never mind about them.

Juan Manual Rojas: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Yes. So thank you.

Raoul Plommer: And it gives nicely like enough time for each of the phases so...

Joan Kerr: Yes, yes. The other thing that I had an issue with for the elections was we talked about the membership committee is not – doesn't review it but we don't need the forms for formal acceptance so we can remove 8.2.3 all together.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Okay and so now...

((Crosstalk))

Raoul Plommer: What about this that no position shall have more than four candidates?

Joan Kerr: Yes, what do you guys think about that? I mean, why – I didn't understand why it was limited.

Raoul Plommer: Nor do I really.

Joan Kerr: I mean, I think for me the more the better, that shows a lot of interest.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. Yes, I don't think there can be too many candidates.

Joan Kerr: Later somebody else might say, well, we need to change it again but I don't think we should ever limit the number of people that apply for something.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. Yes, it seems unnecessary.

Joan Kerr: Yes, so we can remove that. There was another one the - I - oh, so the Number 8.2.1 we now have to change 60 days to 45 days.

Raoul Plommer: Right.

Joan Kerr: And take out the request notice of - request for nominations. Oh no, we have to do that anyway, that's what we're saying in the notification. That's not the one I wanted - sorry, it's the forms - 8.2.3 we're removing that all together anyway so that's - that takes care of that.

Raoul Plommer: Right.

Joan Kerr: And 8.1, I didn't double check this unfortunately, is the - that position, are they defining 2.2 or is it another section?

Raoul Plommer: Sorry, 8.2.5?

Joan Kerr: No, 8.1, it says, "All candidates for elected office must meet the qualifications of the office position they seek as defined in Section 2.2." Is it...

((Crosstalk))



Raoul Plommer: No, I think that's changed.

Joan Kerr: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Raoul Plommer: Look that up.

Joan Kerr: Yes, I think if...

Raoul Plommer: Three point six two says that run for or nominate another member to positions elected by NPOC members by complying with the election procedures.

Joan Kerr: Right. Okay.

Raoul Plommer: Three six two, yes.

Joan Kerr: Okay. And we can remove 8 point – yes we did say that, remove, remove, yes. Yes. Wow. Now are we going to remove 8.2.4? Yes...

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: Yes, we'll remove it because we're not putting any rules to it.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, we don't need a limit.

Joan Kerr: No, okay, just want to always double check to make sure we're making the right decisions at this. Okay so 8 point – that's removed anyway so that's good, we don't have to deal with that. Okay. Okay. All right, looks good. I think we're good for the – for this for now.

Juan Manual Rojas: Hello?

Joan Kerr: Yes, go ahead, Juan.

Juan Manual Rojas: Hey guys, can you hear me?

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: Yes go ahead please.

Juan Manual Rojas: Yes, I'm sorry. I spoke with my mute in – no, I was reading 8.2.5 and I was wondering if you are going to separate voting and election on – or maybe we are (unintelligible) all together in just one section.

Joan Kerr: The election? It will be under a heading called Elections.

Juan Manual Rojas: Just one section called Election and Voting as Raoul said in Puerto Rico?

Joan Kerr: Yes it will be all under the same.

Juan Manual Rojas: Okay.

Joan Kerr: Organized under the – yes.

((Crosstalk))

Juan Manual Rojas: Okay. Okay thank you for clarifying.

Joan Kerr: Yes, because right now it's under two sections and then it's also under the duties of the EC and then it's also under the membership...

Juan Manual Rojas: Yes, is just...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Juan Manual Rojas: ...one procedure right?

Joan Kerr: Right, right.

Juan Manual Rojas: Okay, okay no okay.

Joan Kerr: So we'll try to get the end document to look like.

Juan Manual Rojas: Yes it's easiest...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Juan Manual Rojas: ...easier to read okay, understand.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Juan Manual Rojas: Yes okay.

Joan Kerr: Okay great. Where to now Raoul?

Raoul Plommer: Yes I like the sound of that end document.

Joan Kerr: Yes. We are getting there.

Raoul Plommer: Well I think that's really clear. I think we went through all the old rules and like noticed that it's somewhere in the new rules or it can be removed.

Joan Kerr: Right. So the elections will be defined and then the voting procedures will be under that as well as opposed to being separate. So okay...

Raoul Plommer: Right yes.

Joan Kerr: ...where would you like me to go to now?

Raoul Plommer: We can - we could mention that to Juan as well if...

Joan Kerr: Yes we will.

Raoul Plommer: ...he's mixing these up.

Joan Kerr: That's right.

Raoul Plommer: Okay so the next one is voting.

Joan Kerr: Voting okay all right.

Raoul Plommer: So I guess it's really about do we want separate elections for the policy committee or at least its chair or do we just keep selecting it like we have done just altogether with the rest of the EC?

Joan Kerr: I think it's - and then we - because we actually identify - the chair actually has to identify the policy chair. So I think it should remain that the committee does that because they're actually representing NPOC EC as the chair.

Raoul Plommer: Right but the thing is like do we want to have election like at the same time with the rest of the EC elections...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: ...because if you have a look at the Section 911 it says Executive Committee officer elections and then 912 is election of committee chairs. So we can just have that as one election where the...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: ...policy chair is also elected.

Joan Kerr: Right. So they have to state that's what they're running for.

Raoul Plommer: Yes exactly. Like...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: ...all the rest of the positions.

Joan Kerr: Like we do now yes.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: So we can remove 9.1.2 actually because there's no committee chairs' it's just officers.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. We are really getting there.

Joan Kerr: The end document is at the end. We can see the light.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. So then that's the EC election is the only election isn't it?

Joan Kerr: That's right.

Raoul Plommer: All right. And I guess the NCSG EC seat is decided by the EC or...

Joan Kerr: That's right yes.

Raoul Plommer: I think it's good to leave that as other matters can be...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: ...as identified by the EC. So then we can vote for other stuff too.

Joan Kerr: That's right, that's right. We should always leave it open.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. Yes actually we should check if that's in the new charter. Can somebody find that?

Joan Kerr: I have it - I thought I had it open. But what number do you want me to go to voting?

Raoul Plommer: No well I don't know if you need to move with the shared screen but like on the new - I mean the...

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: Go ahead.

Raoul Plommer: The charter is 0.9.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: We'd need to look for a voting. And if we have the sort of if the EC has the right to make voting about anything.

Joan Kerr: Yes. If I change it goes - because I'm sharing my screen so take a look at those changes that...

Raoul Plommer: All right well...

Joan Kerr: ...so I'm writing down - what did you say in the new charter does voting, does EC have...

Raoul Plommer: Like the right to...

Juan Manual Rojas: Joan, Raoul...

Raoul Plommer: ...kind of make ad hoc elections...

Joan Kerr: Right.

Raoul Plommer: Go ahead Juan?

Juan Manual Rojas: Yes I am reading that you wrote a NCSG EC seat but I think is seats. We have two seats there right?

Raoul Plommer: Oh seats.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: Oh that's right yes.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: You can correct that there.

Joan Kerr: Yes. Perfect. Okay, okay yes so I wrote down I'll look for that. Okay next.

Raoul Plommer: It doesn't really sort of say explicitly that we can make votes about different things but is that really necessary to spell it out loud like?

Joan Kerr: No because we have the right to – it does actually set it out somewhere else. I'm trying to figure out where it was that, you know, if somebody is – it has all the rules around if somebody, you know, you have to remove someone. And then how do you I think it's in the chairs responsibilities how they go about doing it. It is somewhere else. But we need to have that...

Raoul Plommer: Okay.

Joan Kerr: ...ability. But you still have to go through the membership to point it out that it has happened.



Raoul Plommer: Right.

Joan Kerr: Like we couldn't arbitrarily make those decisions it's just giving us the right to do it.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Now the one thing I think that's missing and I think I brought it up before is decision making process. We should have a - I know we think I do believe that we say consensus right?

Raoul Plommer: Sorry could you repeat that?

Joan Kerr: Yes. I don't think we have a section that categorically says what our decision making process is if there's a dispute. I always I think like could be spelt out. And I believe it - so far it's been running by consensus. I think that's how everybody runs it and then everything goes on the chair if there is an issue. But I mean I don't know I guess I believe in democracy. So...

Juan Manual Rojas: Yes but I don't think that we need to be that I don't know how to say it an in voting section about...

Joan Kerr: No, no...

Juan Manual Rojas: ...yes?

Joan Kerr: No, no, no.

((Crosstalk))

Juan Manual Rojas: Is not necessary there.

Joan Kerr: Yes okay. I just saw a quorum so that's why I brought it up but good point.  
Okay, okay so anything else you guys?

Raoul Plommer: Let's see...

Joan Kerr: (Unintelligible) with interest there.

Raoul Plommer: Oh here is says all member organizations shall have an equal voting share of one vote. We have something else don't we?

Joan Kerr: We do. Okay so the first part is good. The EC will then determine whether or not – that's good. So then we can just copy that section that we give the rights. Maybe that's a question we should be asking on our applications as well, you know?

Raoul Plommer: The right I mean...

Joan Kerr: No not the right. I'm just identifying things functionally.

Raoul Plommer: Oh the size.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: Yes because we have two categories.

Joan Kerr: That's right.

Raoul Plommer: We have category one...

Juan Manual Rojas: We have that before. We have that before...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Juan Manual Rojas: ...the (unintelligible) of the membership.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Juan Manual Rojas: So if they are members they have right to vote.

Joan Kerr: Yes. But if there are a large member they have more than one vote.

Raoul Plommer: Yes they have three votes. In fact...

Joan Kerr: Right.

Raoul Plommer: ...I think all of our members have at least two votes with the new charter.

Joan Kerr: Yes, yes.

Raoul Plommer: Yes two votes for small organization and three votes for large ones.

Joan Kerr: That's right over a certain – and we have to identify what that is.

Raoul Plommer: Yes I just added that 3.8...

Joan Kerr: Yes, yes.

Raoul Plommer: ...is the section in the new charter. It's about fees and member voting categories.

Joan Kerr: Right good catch. Okay and by the end of it we'll be really good at this.

Raoul Plommer: I know, I know we'll be like masters of our charter.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: Oh the quorum that's...

Joan Kerr: Yes that's what I was saying earlier. Okay on this – this is for voting for an elected position. I'm missing a line (unintelligible).

Raoul Plommer: It's talking about amendments. But we talk - we have a whole section for amendments...

Joan Kerr: Yes. It's almost...

Raoul Plommer: ...or actually we used to.

Joan Kerr: The quorum is actually for the executive meetings.

Raoul Plommer: Right.

Joan Kerr: It's not for voting. So there's the decision making I was talking about earlier. It's at least 1/2 plus one so yes that's a democracy vote.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: I like that. Okay so the quorum is about the meetings it's not about the voting. So that actually goes into the EC meetings.

Raoul Plommer: Yes because it's talking about amendments.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: And then it in 9.2 in the new one it says bylaws amendments shall be passed if at least 2/3 of the votes cast...

Joan Kerr: Right.

Raoul Plommer: ...in the election favors adoption provided a quorum of at least of 40% of more of the eligible organizational members cast a ballot in the election. And eligible being that active ones right?

Joan Kerr: Right but...

Raoul Plommer: We should actually add that there eligible active organizational members.

Joan Kerr: See I read this 9.4 as a direction for our executive meetings that we have monthly.

Raoul Plommer: Right.

Joan Kerr: That's what it's saying. It's - and then it has two parts to it. It's saying the decision of the Executive Committee. And then it then further says that if you're going to amend anything what has to happen so it's a two part - it's telling the EC if you're going to have your meetings you need to have at least

1/2 plus one. And then the voting is 10% of the total voting members in favor of an amend. So it's...

Raoul Plommer: And it's a minimum of ten members.

Joan Kerr: Yes 10%. So we can actually eliminate the second half because we already covered it later. And the first part ending at quorum should go under the Executive Committee decision making. Man oh man. So just highlight that it shouldn't be there anyway. It...

Raoul Plommer: Right.

Joan Kerr: ...there's no way it should be under voting. So that can be removed to go maybe just a sign EC or...

Raoul Plommer: Yes I put 9.2 which is the amendment.

Joan Kerr: Yes, yes okay.

Raoul Plommer: But all right. Processes...

Joan Kerr: And now it says nine point, I think 9.5 is fine. But it says the motion will be publicized on the NPOC Web site and an email sent to all members no less than 30 days before the vote and we've just said 45 days.

Raoul Plommer: No but this isn't about election though.

Joan Kerr: This is a voting.

Raoul Plommer: Yes this is voting.

Joan Kerr: So see there's two things here. Is it the voting for an amendment or is it voting for the election?

Raoul Plommer: It's both really. It basically lays out like how does the voting in elections and elsewhere happen.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: So with this I think – it says motion shall be made to the EC. It's one favorable vote the EC determines the - more of it should put forward to the NPOC membership. So is that a motion from within the EC or from any member?

Joan Kerr: Yes I don't think they both should be together. We should have voting processes for an election so that's one thing. And then...

Raoul Plommer: Right.

Joan Kerr: ...decision making separate because it's too mixed up.

Raoul Plommer: Right. Yes I tend to agree with that actually. It would make it a lot clearer because this is...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: ...these are really the two really important things that people do check on...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: ...our charter.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: So I mean one of the very most sort of usual ones. So yes I agree that we should have them separately like elections for the EC and no all election that's the only election in it. And then the other voting for decision making that needs...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: ...to include the amendments to the charter and like quorums...

Joan Kerr: (Unintelligible) yes.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: So that's one of the instructions I'll ask (John) to do for us is to do the voting process. And I can work with him for the election side of it because I know that side. And then put amendments under another heading so it's very clear.

Raoul Plommer: Right.

Joan Kerr: Okay?

Raoul Plommer: Sounds good.

Joan Kerr: All right because...

Raoul Plommer: Did Juan want to say something?



Joan Kerr: Juan?

Juan Manual Rojas: No not me but (Ganga) wants to say something I think.

Raoul Plommer: Okay.

Joan Kerr: Oh okay. (Ganga) go ahead. If you are speaking we can't hear you. Hello.

Raoul Plommer: Hello.

Joan Kerr: I can't hear him. (Ganga) we can't hear you? New charter - oh he's asking if the active member is defined? It is. We okay anything else? See a lot of the 9.4 onward is about the amendments I'm just going to write that down. 9.4. So nine - so we're in agreement with that guys?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Yes okay.

Raoul Plommer: I've read the rest of it. I've read the rest of the parts now and it - that's basically just about making the motion within NPOC.

Joan Kerr: Yes

Raoul Plommer: And that's...

Joan Kerr: Right.

Raoul Plommer: ...something that a member can do. The EC approves and then it's passed to the whole membership...

Joan Kerr: That's right, right.

Raoul Plommer: ...for voting.

Gangadhar Panday: Can you hear me now?

Raoul Plommer: Yes a little bit.

Gangadhar Panday: Yes I just I put in my points we can just go through that.

Joan Kerr: Where did you type it?

Gangadhar Panday: In the new charter 6.2.2 (unintelligible) where acting member is. But I feel that we should add some similar (unintelligible) in point three membership also because 6.2.5 specifically covers the whole thing. And but amendment (unintelligible) we need to have some definition who an active member is. And this been going point three number two.

Joan Kerr: Was this in – is this in the voting?

Gangadhar Panday: Yes because 6.2.2 only covers for the voting part but amendment and other agenda issues we don't have any problems who in active member is because when we are talking about quorum we need to know who actual member is.

Joan Kerr: We don't have to do it twice as long as it's defined somewhere. We're trying to make the charter shorter. As long as we can refer to it...

Gangadhar Panday: Okay.

Joan Kerr: ...somewhere as long as it's written somewhere. It's like in the public domain as long as it's written somewhere and we can refer to it. I think that's what happened in the last time is that they put information from one thing to the other and it becomes confusing.

Raoul Plommer: Yes and it's basically the it says in the new charter 625 it says members who respond to the NPOC check-in process are deemed...

Joan Kerr: That's right.

Raoul Plommer: ...active members. That's...

Joan Kerr: That's right.

Raoul Plommer: ...it's actually defined right there. So...

Joan Kerr: There's - as long - I know as long as it's defined.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. And it's...

Gangadhar Panday: Yes (unintelligible).

Raoul Plommer: ...going to happen every year at election time. That's when it's sort of...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: ...checked.

Gangadhar Panday: Yes. I just wanted to know whether this is only for voting or for issues like amendments should be covered?

Joan Kerr: No it's global. It's for everything.

Gangadhar Panday: Okay.

Joan Kerr: Someone's that's not an active member should not be participating.

Gangadhar Panday: Okay that's clear to me now. Thank you.

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Raoul Plommer: And of course new members are active...

Joan Kerr: That's right.

Raoul Plommer: ...until the next check-in time.

Joan Kerr: That's right. Okay...

Raoul Plommer: I think that pretty much covers nine. We decided...

Joan Kerr: So we're back to ten...

Raoul Plommer: ...to make a separate...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: Oh yes it's actually quarter past five already.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: I mean yes so we're running 15 minutes late now. But...

Joan Kerr: But we started later but...

Raoul Plommer: Yes. Should we do this again next week?

Joan Kerr: Yes. We're almost on a roll now aren't we?

Raoul Plommer: Yes I think one two hour session should really be enough to hand it to (John).

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: We'll be able to – I mean if you look at the number ten and 11 they are really short. The amendments it's just like three paragraphs.

Joan Kerr: The other thing we can do is tomorrow our meeting is two hours. We could dedicate say 20 minutes to this.

Raoul Plommer: Oh that's right yes. Could do that yes.

Joan Kerr: And then instead of having a separate meeting because it is two hours I didn't think it would go on for two hours what we have to discuss but...

Raoul Plommer: Yes right.

Joan Kerr: ...it is...

Raoul Plommer: No that's a really good idea actually.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, yes, yes.

Joan Kerr: I will set – yes okay. And then that way if now that we know we can just dedicate that on to it. And I'll just do...

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: ...an update to the agenda and put that on okay?

Raoul Plommer: All right cool.

Joan Kerr: Is everybody okay with that?

Juan Manual Rojas: Okay, okay.

Gangadhar Panday: Okay. I have just a quick point to make.

Joan Kerr: Okay go ahead.

Gangadhar Panday: It's (Ganga) for the record. I just want to know how transfer of the job happens from one treasurer to another treasurer. I have seen in the charter there is nothing mentioned about it. And there's one treasurer has completed his tenure a new treasurer n is appointed (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Gangadhar Panday: Hello.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Gangadhar Panday: How did the handing over of the charter happen from treasurer old treasurer to the new treasurer? And should we have something specifically about that in the charter?

Joan Kerr: No they're appointed on an annual basis.

Gangadhar Panday: Okay but when a new treasurer is appointed one treasurer should the handover the appointing all the things to the new treasurer? So how does it happen?

Joan Kerr: The EC would make the decision about – and make a decision on appointing a treasurer.

Gangadhar Panday: That's okay appointing the treasurer is fine. Transferring the authority from old treasurer to the new treasurer?

Joan Kerr: Yes then it would be a typical transfer that the EC as in any organization would make a motion that the – if it's a new treasurer would transfer the authority to someone else. And that person the existing treasure would take it to the bank and then a new signature would be – it's I mean every organization does it.

Gangadhar Panday: So should we have something a sentence specifically mentioning that in the charter?

Joan Kerr: Not necessarily. I mean we can. But basically an appointment then has – whenever you do an appointment then you have a direction on what happens next and the person follows it. But it's made in that process.

Gangadhar Panday: Okay.

Joan Kerr: Remember it's an appointment. So the EC has...

Gangadhar Panday: Yes.

Joan Kerr: ...the right to make those decisions.

Gangadhar Panday: So this handing over the charge part of the (unintelligible) is taking the route in the appointment you say?

Joan Kerr: Yes because then they give directions on what happens and how it happens.

Gangadhar Panday: Yes. That's good okay. Thank you.

Joan Kerr: No worries. Okay guys so tomorrow I will update the agenda, send it off and we can spend what half – 20 minutes to a half an hour for this section. Does everybody think that's good?

Raoul Plommer: Yes I think half an hour is pretty much all we need.

Joan Kerr: Okay. I won't put the timeline to it but maybe what we will do is if it's okay with everyone is we do the other stuff first then we do that last.

Raoul Plommer: Yes let's do it that way.



Joan Kerr: Sounds good?

Raoul Plommer: All right thanks.

Joan Kerr: All righty. All right talk to guys in – so tomorrow...

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: ...we will talk again. Thanks a lot everyone. Maryam, I'm calling this meeting to a close.

Maryam Bakoshi: Perfect. Thank you very much. And (Teresa) you may stop the recording and disconnect all lines. Thank you so much.

END