

# SICOGA 2018

## Final Report for SI Management SWG

Convener: Pramod Kumar

Date of issue: 30 September 2018

<b>Motion No. &amp; Heading</b>	<b>CAN-002 LOI not signed by traveler themselves.</b>
<b>Contact Person for the Motion</b>	Julie Cormack.
<b>Summary of Comments and Queries from SWG</b>	<p>The motion should be amended to include the following:</p> <p>Interview shouldn't be done by a member of the same family, e.g. a parent interviewing his or her son or daughter.</p> <p>The Servas Handbook shall be updated to reflect this new rule.</p>
<b>Pros of the Motion</b>	<p>It lends an air of openness and transparency.</p> <p>Single women feel comfortable travelling with Servas because of the signed and approved LoI.</p>
<b>Cons of the Motion</b>	<p>It would provide only a false sense of security for some.</p> <p>It would add to paper work and delay in the process of a traveller getting an LOI.</p> <p>This motion may not be relevant when LOIs are issued with e-stamps through Servas Online.</p>
<b>SWG's Recommendation</b>	The intent of the motion is clear and it is ready to go to GA for a vote.
<b>Convenor's Comments</b>	Taking note of the comments in this SWG, the movers of the motion have proposed an amended version of the motion.

<b>Motion No. &amp; Heading</b>	<b>EXC-012 SI elections shall include “None of the Above/Reopen Nominations”</b>
<b>Contact Person for the Motion</b>	Penny Pattison
<b>Summary of Comments and Queries from SWG</b>	There is a lack of clarity as to what would happen if an election results in a win for NOTA. For example, when will the next election be held? Will it be held during the ongoing GA or at a later date? How will better and suitable candidates be found? Will a candidate who has lost to NOTA be eligible to stand for election again for the same post when the second election is held? What happens if the second election also results in a win for NOTA?
<b>Pros of the Motion</b>	Candidates considered incompetent by a majority of the voters will not be elected.  A vacant post resulting from a NOTA win, would be better than a post being occupied by an incompetent person.
<b>Cons of the Motion</b>	It may be difficult to find candidates for some posts which are demanding in terms of workload and responsibility, e.g. President and General Secretary.
<b>SWG’s Recommendation</b>	The motion is clear in its intent and can be sent to the GA for vote.
<b>Convenor’s Comments</b>	The wording of the motion clearly states the intent and purpose of the motion and hence, the motion is ready to go to GA for vote. However, the movers of the motion may take note of the queries raised by the SWG and if possible, amend the motion suitably to allay the apprehensions of possible arbitrariness in the action which would follow a NOTA win in an election.

<b>Motion No. &amp; Heading</b>	<b>EXE-020 SI EXCO 2015-2018 recommended priorities for SI EXCO 2018-2021</b>
This motion has been withdrawn.	

<b>Motion No. &amp; Heading</b>	<b>EXC-022 SI paid administrator role</b>
<b>Contact Person for the Motion</b>	Ann Greenhough
<b>Summary of Comments and Queries from SWG</b>	Taking note of the comments in this SWG, the movers of the motion have proposed an amended version of the motion.

	The amended motion proposes a period of three years for carrying out the feasibility study. This is too long a period and should be cut short.
<b>Pros of the Motion</b>	The workload of some of the Servas volunteers has reached unsustainable levels and having paid workers to assist them will reduce the workload of volunteers.
<b>Cons of the Motion</b>	Since the feasibility study is proposed to be carried out over a period of three years, so the next EXCO will not be able to hire any paid administrators even if the study comes to the conclusion that hiring of paid administrators is feasible.
<b>SWG's Recommendation</b>	The motion is clear in its intent and can be sent to the GA for vote.
<b>Convenor's Comments</b>	The wording of the motion clearly states the intent and purpose of the motion and hence, the motion is ready to go to GA for vote. However, the main objective of the original motion, that is, providing paid administrator(s) to SI EXCO so as to reduce their workload is missing from this amended motion which proposes a feasibility study as its main objective. In the opinion of this convenor, it should be possible to complete the feasibility study in one year and the motion needs to be amended accordingly.

<b>Motion No. &amp; Heading</b>	<b>GER-001 Prioritizing Servas Online</b>
<b>Contact Person for the Motion</b>	Judy Bartel
<b>Summary of Comments and Queries from SWG</b>	<p>Asking for Servas Online to be made the #1 priority does not mean that <b>all</b> the Servas resources should be devoted to Servas Online. While Servas has a lot of money, but it needs to be spent wisely otherwise, it could be exhausted in less than three years.</p> <p>The motion involves the commitment of both financial resources and volunteer resources.</p> <p>This motion refers to the motion FRA-001 for the financial resources that would be required for implementing this motion. Hence, this motion needs to be considered along with the motion FRA-001.</p>
<b>Pros and cons of the Motion</b>	There are no comments regarding pros and cons of the motion.
<b>SWG's Recommendation</b>	The intent of the motion is clear and it can go to the GA for vote.
<b>Convenor's Comments</b>	For estimating the budgetary impact of this motion, it needs to be considered with other motions asking for paid professionals for Servas Online , e.g. AUS-001, FRA-001, GRE-001 and also <b>GER-002 which claims that the budgetary estimate given in FRA-001 is not adequate.</b>

<b>Motion No. &amp; Heading</b>	<b>GRE-003 Enable access to online Dolphin member pdf database to all members</b>
<b>Contact Person for the Motion</b>	Phyllis Chinn
<b>Summary of Comments and Queries from SWG</b>	The intent of this motion can also be served by linking Dolphin's Host List Storage Area (HLSA) with Servas Online and allowing all members to download copies of the host lists from Servas Online, without having to go to Dolphin. This would require less manpower than implementation of the original motion.
<b>Pros of the Motion</b>	<p>Travellers will get faster access to host lists as they will not be dependent on some key person to download the host lists for them.</p> <p>The workload of some key persons will be reduced as they will not have to download host lists for being passed on to travellers.</p> <p>Travellers will be able to contact more hosts because, the number of hosts found in the host lists in dolphin HLSA is more than the number of hosts found in Servas Online because, many of the hosts are not yet listed in Servas Online.</p>
<b>Cons of the Motion</b>	<p>Many of the host lists in Dolphin are old and outdated.</p> <p>Giving Dolphin passwords to all Servas members would involve creating around 15,000 to 20,000 user accounts in Dolphin and this would take up a lot of volunteer time.</p> <p>Since a decision has already been taken to phase out the Dolphin system and bring all members onboard Servas Online so as to make Servas more efficient and attractive to young persons, hence, spending manhours on creating thousands of additional user accounts on Dolphin is not advisable. Those manhours should be spent on improving Servas Online.</p>
<b>SWG's Recommendation</b>	The motion is clear and it may be sent to GA for vote.
<b>Convenor's Comments</b>	<p>During discussion in the SWG, it was found that there was some confusion about the intent of the motion and the mover of the motion had to keep clarifying what the motion wanted to achieve. So as to make the motion, its rationale and the expected benefits crystal clear, it may be reworded along the following lines:</p> <p>In view of the fact that many Servas hosts are not yet listed in Servas Online, and also to enable travellers to obtain host lists with minimum delay, all Servas members shall be given password protected access to Dolphin so that they may download the latest available host lists in pdf format, from the Host List Storage Area. This will also reduce the workload of some key persons as they will not have to download host lists for travelers.</p>

<b>Motion No. &amp; Heading</b>	<b>GRE-004 Professional Servas.org webmaster</b>
<b>Contact Person for the Motion</b>	Ana Maria Fajardo Maldonado
<b>Summary of Comments and Queries from SWG</b>	Opinion in the SWG is divided on whether this motion should be combined with other motions seeking additional manpower for the development of Servas Online.
<b>Pros and cons of the Motion</b>	There are no comments regarding pros and cons of the motion.
<b>SWG's Recommendation</b>	The intent of the motion is clear and it can go to the GA for vote.
<b>Convenor's Comments</b>	<p>The motion template states that this motion “probably” affects the SI Statute. In the opinion of this convenor, the motion does not call for any amendment to the SI Statute.</p> <p>For the purpose of making budgetary provisions, this motion needs to be considered along with other motions such as AUS-001 and FRA-001 which also call for hiring of technical professionals.</p>

<b>Motion No. &amp; Heading</b>	<b>USA-001 Host list information privacy protected in archives</b>
<b>Contact Person for the Motion</b>	Phyllis Chinn
<b>Summary of Comments and Queries from SWG</b>	The motion is clear in its intent.
<b>Pros and Cons of the Motion</b>	There are no comments regarding pros and cons of the motion.
<b>SWG's Recommendation</b>	The motion is clear and can be sent to the GA for vote.
<b>Convenor's Comments</b>	<p>The passage or non passage of this motion is not likely to change anything.</p> <p>It is indeed generous of the Hoover Institute to provide the resources for preserving Servas host lists for a period of forty years. That offer has already been made, and presumably, will remain valid, irrespective of this motion being passed or not.</p> <p>EXCO has already passed a motion to the effect that each National Group will be invited to send their host lists for being preserved in SI Archives. In the opinion of this convenor, this is a routine matter and does not require a GA approval, more so since, each National Group will be free to accept or decline this offer. There is no compulsion involved.</p> <p>So, all that is required is that all National Secretaries be informed about the generous offer of Hoover Institute through email and by an announcement at the GA and then EXCO may proceed</p>

	<p>as per the relevant motion passed by them and mentioned in the background information of this motion.</p> <p><b>A motion expressing Servas International's thanks and gratitude to Hoover Institute for their generous offer would have been more relevant and meaningful.</b></p>
--	---

Motion No. & Heading	USA-003 Limitations of who sees Servas Online host information
<p>This motion has been withdrawn.</p>	