

**EGA2006 - MINUTES**  
**LATINA - ITALY**  
**APRIL 2<sup>nd</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> 2006**

---

**Zero Day**  
**April 2, 2006**  
**Sunday**

---

Meeting called to order by President, Geoff Maltby

Welcome by Luigi Uslenghi, Past President and Founder of Italy Servas

Eva Meggeneder discussed Membership and National Group Processes Report

Presented Mario Burlando and Anna Flammini, the Italian team, who are in charge of Logistics

Seri from Norway told the Story of the Landscape

Dag Erik Eikeland discussed the Askov meeting

The Moderators were introduced:

Chris Jones, Julie Dotsch and Pat Patfoort

Pat Patfoort asked the assembly to group themselves into 4 groups

Happy/Joyful

Sad

Angry

Surprised

She asked that we begin expressing the feeling of our group not as a song but with sound and look. We were to follow her direction as she pointed to the next group to be added.

Start one by one

Start softly happy group

Add group after group getting louder and louder

Then softly again and louder following Pat's direction.

Paddles were distributed to delegates

Chris Jones led 'role playing'

Actors used terms to be used during real meetings

Chris told actors to freeze

Chris asked Jean to define the terms

Actors resumed the faux meeting.

Freeze

Definitions etc.

Rules of order:

Agenda

Motion

Secunder

Friendly Amendment

Vote

Time Lines

Statutes say

Receive reports \*  
Not vote to accept reports  
Alright to ask questions to report  
If country does not feel report is accurate,  
Delegate may indicate country wants to be so noted in the minutes.  
Sequence of votes when there is an amendment to the motion  
Names on the speakers list  
Having the floor to speak  
Challenging the chair's procedure  
'I don't understand' side of the paddle  
Only delegates have speaking rights  
Tie vote  
Refer back to workshop  
Needs second  
Not debatable  
Must vote immediately  
Abstain / abstentions  
Unanimous  
Carried  
Pause for translator or typists to catch up  
Paddles for timer to show speaker  
    Warning  
    Time is gone  
Stay on topic at hand / focus  
Call for immediate vote when recognized on speaker's list  
Needs seconder  
Moderator and chair person are the same person

Mary Jane made a presentation on Governance

Chris Patterson

    Suggested Exco prepare updated regulations  
    Make them available to all delegates

Announcements:

**2001 minutes** are ready to pick up on your way out.

Vibeke, Marisa and Honora will hand the 28 pages to you as you leave this meeting.

**Workshops**, please sign up for your choices on the lists on the walls

**Home Groups** meetings are at 7:pm every night

**Geoff** , dinner is on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor at 8:30

A request for any items to be put in the conference bulletin for tomorrow.

Give them to Demelza or Alex

**The meeting was dismissed.**

- *Mary Jane Mikuriya approached the General Secretary and asked that a caveat be included in the minutes.*
- *Grant Barnes, accompanied Mary Jane.*
- *Grant wrote the following:*

***You are voting only that you agree to “receive” this report. You are not voting to “accept” the contents or recommendations in the report. If you do not have confidence in the information contained in the report, then you should vote not to “receive” the report. Any recommendation in this report can be discussed in a workshop.***

- *These words were NOT presented to the General Assembly and there was NO VOTE on them so they are not part of the Official Minutes*

---

**First Session  
April 3, 2006  
Monday**

---

**Session started 9:30**

≠

Greeted by President Geoff Maltby

Turned meeting over to Chris Jones to moderate the meeting

One item left over from yesterday

Egypt status report

Agreement to having agenda approved first

Asked for motion

•

Asked to vote on Motion 1

≠

USA: *made a statement but not on the microphone so unable to hear her*

Amended **motion 1)**

**I move that the amended agenda with corrections, as outlined, be adopted.**

Proposed by New Zealand:

Seconded by Netherlands

Unanimous vote for amendment

≠

Unidentified speaker: I think that there is some confusion in that we are not sure what the changes 'as outlined' means.

≠

NZ: I am happy to have Chris repeat all the details but I am reluctant to use too much time using lots of time with details.

≠

Unidentified speaker: I want to emphasize the importance of the quality of the minutes because, when we work seriously, we start from what is written in the minutes and if it is not clear. or if things have been changed, we work on the wrong document, or we come into conflict, so it's very, very important.

Moderator: ask for a vote to vote

Seeing enough he proceeded to the vote

It passed unanimously.

•≠

**Motion 2)**

**to approve the minute takers: David Asher and Elena Paxia.**

Proposed USA.

Seconded Austria.

Seeing no speakers we vote

≠

USA: We should have some idea of the content of the motion.

≠

Moderator: The content is posted. *He is indicating that it is on the front screen*

Vote: *number not given on tape*

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Carried unanimously

•

**Motion 3)**

**to adopt the rules of order as printed.**

Proposed Canada

Seconded France

•≠

Friendly Amendment: for point of order -

**(to draw attention to moderators by friendly gesture raising both arms above head)**

Moved by Germany

Seconded USA

≠

Vote: 41,

Carried unanimously.

•≠

**Return to the original motion:**

Vote

For: 42

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

All in favor.42: unanimous

Additional delegate arrived

•

**Motion**

**Approval of minutes from the last GA in Barcelona:**

Motion proposed: Britain, *Not recorded by Elena*

Seconded: Malaysia *Not recorded by Elena*

≠

**Proposal for statement to Spanish organizers of Barcelona conference** because of bad memories of Spain. Need to distinguish between content of conference and organization of conference. The conflicts were in the meetings. The organization was terrific and we had a lot of fun and we appreciate that.

*Applause*

•

**Minutes correction** from Austria:

**p10, item 6-3 should be Ewa from Poland, not Eva from Austria.**

•≠

USA: Concern about minutes in general from USA ,P2 We don't know what original motions were, not amendments. Therefore she feels that minutes are incomplete.

•≠

France: P19 or P22 line 4 - Changes requested. Did not organize Francophone Africa. She did not do that. There is no Francophone Africa. There are two forms of the minutes in the room.

≠

Ireland: Wasn't present I have no idea whether they are correct or not. Shall I abstain?

≠

Italy: How do I move things forward.

•≠

**Moderator calls for vote that the minutes from 2001, with corrections, be adopted:**

Vote

For: 33

Against:

Abstain:

≠

**Recount the vote** after clarifying that it included amendments

28 in favor

4 opposed includes Germany and USA

10 abstentions

•≠

**Point of order:**

Germany would like their vote recorded against the approval of the minutes: Germany opposed.

USA request vote apposed to the minutes also to be recorded.

≠

India: Has GA approved Egypt as an official member of Servas International.

≠

President: Members asked yesterday to approve the Eva from Austria paper on membership approval this a m; therefore it is suggested discuss after approval. Agreed.

•≠

**India motion:** Happy that things are moving in a peaceful manner so **India agrees to withdraw motion** GA 00-001 submitted number 002

•≠

President's (Geoff Maltby) report:

Suggests will not read out full report as in binder. Wishes to make an additional comment that Spain had made great efforts for the Barcelona conference. He congratulated them on their great effort.

Invitation for friendly discussion in Paris about freezing of stamp payments. Seen as a wakeup call re auditing.

France settled debt in Dec. 2004.

Germany will agree when financial operating procedures paper is adopted.

Servas USA was in default of 2 years stamp fees. Now debt has been settled.

Audit committee report: upset about allegations re Bibendra Pradhananga (BP). Apologies for no development work taking place – due to work on EGA. 100% of our time has been taken to prepare this EGA.

Servas website – accessed 20,000 times.

•≠

Questions:

•≠

Malaysia. Good job done. Some concerns – clarity needed.

Germany stamp fee to be settled after EGA?

If EGA does not accept financial operating procedure, does this mean Germany will not pay stamp fee?

Also, meeting with internal audit committee. Oct 2004: decision made to suspend BP- concerned on why decision based on 2004, when that report was accepted at the Barcelona conference.

≠

Geoff Maltby: When audit report presented at Barcelona, it was accepted.

When presented in 2004, it was the first time as president that he had heard the allegations.

≠

Treasurer: Internal audit: Barcelona accepted a report, also audit report. Audit report says there are problems. So Exco has to accept report.

Moderator: This issue will be followed up later.

≠

France: I think we must be very clear. The internal audit was not approved, as committee prevented from doing so – what was approved was the external audit. They don't go so far into the accounts.

•≠

Treasurer: Will be detailed discussion in finance session.

≠

Moderator: Motion to accept report:

•≠

Indonesia: individual votes as individual budgets.

•≠

**Question: Is vote for reports all at once, or one at a time:**

Show of paddles: Narrow majority for vote one at a time.

•≠

New Zealand: suggestion for show of paddles for each report.

≠

Point of order unidentified speaker: We have already agreed for one at a time.

•≠

Moderator: says vote already occurred – slight majority for one at a time.

•≠

Vote for receiving Presidents report:

42 in favour;

Carried unanimously

•≠

Vice President's (Bibendra Pradhananga) report,

Vice President not in attendance: Report in binder.

**Motion to receive the report.**

Austria proposed,

Seconded by South Africa.

≠

Question: Are we approving content, or just receiving report?

•≠

Singapore: Why do we need to vote as we've received it?

≠

Clarification Britain: to show in the minutes we received report of Vice President.

•≠

Vote on receiving report:

30 in favor

4 against

7 abstentions

•

Why does the count not tally to 42?

Sri Lanka left room

≠

Query: why can anyone not vote for report? We have received the report so I don't see how anyone can vote against or abstain.

≠

Clarification: statutes say receive, not accept.

• ≠

Italy: I have received report, but I do not like the contents.

≠

Moderator: sometimes will not like content, but

• ≠

Germany: would like vote repeated, as I voted to receive and I do not like the contents.

• ≠

Moderator: would have to make new motion.

≠

Moderator: I suggest vote has been recorded in the minutes as received. If you feel strongly about it later in the meeting make a motion to be taken again.

Proposes continue and if still strong feelings, could ask for a new motion.

≠

General Secretary's (General Secretary) (GS) Report:

2 parts to report.

In binder page 23 Charts information from Annual Reports that GS has to receive. Easier to see on internet. Not accurate in binder, as 4 more reports have now been received. Have informed those countries their reports are not in the binder, because they arrived after binder printed, but they are included on the internet.

Also additional booklet.

Cover has some symbolism – yellow dot of hope on the front – more yellow on the back showing the change of attitudes during the term of the current EXCO with the expectation for attitudes by the end of the EGA.

Inside the booklet is detailed information about the activities during her term of office.

• ≠

Moderator: Vote on receiving report:

• ≠

Indonesia: GS did not indicate that the GS refused to work in support of the EGA.

• ≠

GS: indicated that she did not mention her difference of opinion about the EGA in the report as she thought it would be controversial and she knew the topic was coming up later today in the agenda.

• ≠

France: Why do we need to ask questions – should just be about receiving report. The questions are on the content and we are voting that we received the report.

• ≠

Belgium: Numbers of 2005 not completed

• ≠

GS: Some information was not sent. She put down everything that was received and I have kept the full report in my computer.

• ≠

Germany: Included all countries about printing. We did not know anything about the printing. Can you give us the deadline for printing?

• ≠

Denmark: Sent info 3 times – was there a mix up about where to send it?

• ≠

Czech report: I apologize I think we were not before the deadline, but why no info on year before?

GS: All info received was included.

≠

Singapore: Why are we discussing the content of the report?

•≠

Motion on receiving GS report:

•≠

Moderator: Do you wish to vote on calling the question now for an immediate vote.

Show on voting immediately: Carried.

≠

Vote on receiving GS report:

39 in favor

2 opposed

1 abstention

•≠

Point of order:

Britain: If motion for immediate vote should be made straight away.

•≠

Moderating: Rules of order, as explained by Britain 9b to request for an immediate vote.

Motion for 9a, b or c must be voted for immediately. Not on whether to vote or not, but to vote straight away.

•≠

New Zealand: The GA cannot be challenged, there is an immediate vote. No one can stop the debate.

Motion withdrawn.

•≠

Peace Secretary's (PS) (Gary Sealey) report:

In binder, he highlights 3 issues:

1. Diversity produces creativity and tension.

Project created to strengthen and advance projects.

Those groups with more than 1000 to raise hands:

Those supervised by governments raise hands.

Those that have more than 500 hosts -- more than 100 hosts -- fewer than 500.

Those with fewer than 50 hosts.

2. Asked because have different expectations of SI and different needs.

3. When not recognized can give rise to tensions.

As PS he tried to work on tension.

Thanks for Agenda working group. 300 phone calls to ensure were prepared for EGA.

Why we encouraged and supported regional meetings, including Askov and Asia. Other people have done more work to build new Servas:

Pathways: born 21 years ago,

Servas Italy,

then France,

now Germany. Love of nature and being together when in mountains.

•≠

Hilda: UN observer: attended Commission on Human Rights in Geneva;

≠

Ireland: Servas and Pax Christi organized conference last year in Cork: silence for peace at moment that bomb dropped in Nagasaki 9<sup>th</sup> Aug. Important for world peace to recognize this time.

•≠

Turkey: Statement read out about working together for peace



Italy, Slovenia, Austria: Getting together on west part of Alps for walking and talking peace in May / June for 4 years.

•

Moderator: Is this a combined report for PS and UN.

Workshop on Wed evening.

•

New Zealand: **I move we vote to proceed with the vote on the motion to receive PS report.**

Seconded by Canada.

Votes for:

39 in favor

0 opposed

2 abstentions

Can someone abstain from the vote when they move the motion?

Moderator confirms.

•

Germany **moves the motion**

Vote to receive the report:

41 in favor

0 against

1 abstain.

Kyrgystan absent during vote.

**Session breaks for coffee 10:45**

---

## Second Session April 3, 2006 Monday

---

•

**Began at 11:40**

•≠

**Malaysia: Propose that GA receive all remaining reports in one vote.**

Seconded: Malawi along with others

≠

Moderator: Treasurers, host list, youth project report, membership approval report.

Has checked that everyone is willing to be available to discuss reports.

•

Singapore: Can we revote on a procedure. I thought we had voted on doing them one at a time.

≠

Moderator: Yes

•≠

France: Do we consider all reports at same time? Must follow statutes.

About acknowledging reports received, not content.

•≠

Germany: In section 4--Statutes say to review and vote on reports having read reports. It is not receive.

•≠

Vote on Malaysia's motion to receive all remaining reports

41 in favor

0 against

1 abstain--Singapore

Vote carried.

≠

Corrected that this was the vote to vote.

•≠

Vote on receiving all remaining reports:

41 in favor

0 against

1 abstention

Vote carried. The reports are received.

•≠

Austria: Eva

**Moved to accept Egypt as official member group as now have 30 host members.**

Seconded, Botswana.

42 in favor

Motion carried unanimously.

Applause from delegates

•≠

Austria: Eva as member of Membership Approvals Group

**Moved to accept Ghana as official member of SI as now have 39 hosts plus another 8 that will be added.**

Seconded Botswana.

≠

France: is host list available?

≠

President confirms 39 hosts as in the 2005 host list report available electronically in the storage area. They have a National Secretary and a positive membership.

≠

Moderator: I see no speakers I am asking for the vote on acceptance.

42 in favor

Motion carried unanimously.

Applause from delegates

•

Austria: Eva **moved that Ukraine become a member of Servas International.**

Host list has 18 members in 2004.

Problems in not updating since.

≠

Treasurer confirms good contact with group.

≠

Moderator: Asks for the vote

Australia seconded.

41 in favor *not on tape*

0 against

1 abstention

They have a Host List coordinator, but no host list electronically available.

Austria confirms a paper list is available. *not on tape*

Austria: Not proposing other countries. *not on tape*

•

Botswana confirms that there was contact with Cuba 14 months ago.

Problem with hosts not having legal authority to have overnight stays. *not on tape*

•≠

Malaysia: Cuba and Ecuador did not put in applications to join SI.

≠

Singapore: What numbers are we talking about.? How many members in Cuba and Ecuador? Are there any recommendations from South America Area Coordinators. Thank you.

*Answers not heard on tape*

Austria: Not a good time for them to join.

•≠

President: Had correspondence with Ecuador.

National Group for Ecuador is Pedro Puente, living in Peru but doing work in Ecuador. Brought from 6 to 27 hosts. He is not the National Secretary but he hopes to develop it further. He feels they should join now. Up to date host list. Fees coming in. Complying with conditions therefore.

•≠

Treasurer: Ecuador is in contact, but I agree with Austria they have problem they need some time. To be a member means you have voting rights. We have so many countries but have no voting rights or some have voting rights but could not join some reason. Ecuador is a non member country we are sending stamps receiving post rates; they are running but they are not ready to be member.

Cuba, I am working Cuba. They cannot have hosts but they can be traveler. They had 3 travelers last year. So they are contributing as a traveler. They don't have to be members to help and be looked at. They can work for the next GA.

•≠

Belgium: Ecuador –From conversations with travelers to Ecuador, I have the impression that list is very poor.

≠

Moderator: Confirms that Belgium saying that members are not happy with progress, and that host list not accurate. Travelers have not a good response.

≠

Austria: Members group feels they should have a National Secretary before becoming members.

•≠

Britain: Been to Cuba. Knows how difficult it is to be members. Will there be a time when they can be members. If by accepting them in SI it would help, then I would be willing to vote for them. Does Cuba want to be a member? Need more information on how we can help and support our members.

•≠

Moderator: Feels discussion should take place in the workshop.

•≠

Austria: representing the Membership Approval Committee

**Motion that Bolivia should be removed as member from SI.**

Moved: Austria

Seconded: Canada.

≠

Argentina: Bolivia does not have enough hosts.

≠

Moderator: Speaking rights requested by Uruguay Marisa Contini. A non-delegate

•≠

Malaysia:

**Motion that Marisa be allowed to speak about Uruguay can speak.**

Seconded by Switzerland.

≠

Moderator: Motion approved.

•≠

Uruguay: the problem is they are not communicating with SI, the problem is not with the numbers of hosts they have. The problem is they are not communicating with SI. They haven't fulfill requirements of sending reports etc.

≠

The vote on the motion for Bolivia as member. to lose its membership status of SI

38 in favor

0 against

4 abstentions

The motion carries

≠

Austria: Does GA wish to make a motion to Greece lose its membership as a member of SI.

•≠

Germany: **Motion that Greece should lose its membership status as a member of SI.**

Seconded by Canada.

≠

Belgium: It was moved in 2004 by the Area Coordinator to reinstate Greece. Is it too early to remove Greece? Has there been support to continue Servas in Greece?

•≠

President: Was told that Greece is inactive. Problems with National Secretary. Told that NS staying on purely to support through Olympic Games. Now he has made several attempts to contact Greece. Information in Annual Report – no mention of Greece as no one has been in touch. Very disappointed as it is an area of great beauty and culture.

•≠

Turkey: We have been in contact with Greece for 2 years. Now received mail last week. Reason why members do not wish to be members, because travelers are only visiting for touristic purposes. Therefore against removing Greece from membership, Turkey will work with Greece to enable work on improving membership. So I am against removing Greece. We need to work with our hosts.

•≠

Germany: Not a question about removing from SI, but about removing membership status. No host list available last year. They are not offering LOI either. Needs a list to be a member.

•≠

Host List Coordinator: Had a lot of contact with Greece members. No structure now, as no-one wants to be National Secretary. Just members, needing to be coordinated. Needs a coordinator to work. Not saying not good Servas members, but needs to be organized.

•≠

Treasurer: We tried to contact Greece, but members do not want to be organized. Until we can find someone, think they should not be members.

•≠

Moderator: Vote on whether to have a vote.

Agreed to vote on the motion.

Motion:

**Motion for Greece to lose its status as a member of SI.**

Moved : Germany

Seconded: Canada

23 in favor

7 against

12 abstained.

Motion carried.

*None of above motion heard on tape and not on Elena notes*

•

President: Thanks to Chris Jones for moderating.

•

Julie Dotsch takes over as moderator 12;30.

•

Development and Youth to begin with

•≠

Development first:

Mullai from Singapore.

Mullai: No presentation from Singapore. Proposals not quite discussed at last GA. Framework for workshop not quite ready yet. Asks for interested countries to work with Mullai after lunch. Joint workshop planned. Will develop plans for GA session tomorrow. Second workshop to be followed by GA session

≠

**Moderator clarifies that official minutes are being recorded by David, although they are not on the main screen.**

≠

New Zealand: Report is from Development working group. Wrote to all National Secretaries to be involved in groups. Not much time. In develop group, no discussion or consideration. Role of workshop is to give some form for GA decision. Same for all working groups. Consider in workshop then pass to GA.

≠

USA: Are the pages in Section 37 - is this what you mean by development?

≠

Mullai: No, this is what I submitted to the GA because I felt there should be some discussion over all on development especially since it was mandated by the Guatemalan GA and it was discussed very fully in Thailand and then we sort of lost the track over the last few years and there hasn't been a DFC in effect also over the last few years. Again during informal conversations with key persons who have been having problems, I sensed that it was a big issue that needed to be discussed, but at that time I didn't have the time or means to come up with very specific proposals. I put some things in a paper as an umbrella for information; not a proposal as such although there are some hints given.

≠

Mullai: Makes a final request for show of hands to work with Mullai:

Indonesia, Turkey, Britain, Brazil, Guatemala, Spain, Argentina, Uruguay, South Africa, New Zealand, India, USA, Germany, Botswana, Sri Lanka, Costa Rica, also Laura Ragucci, Ann Greenhough and Pablo Chufeni. Meeting in the blue room.

Youth Presentation: Ann Greenhough (AG) and Pablo Chufeni (PC)

≠

AG: Proposals were handed out yesterday. Additional copies circulated to those not having one.

AG and PC are not delegates, but attending to prepare for development workshop.

They have 10 points to go through, upon which need to be voted.

≠

PC: Says hi. He had a good conversation with Mullai last night. Action plan for next 3 years. Also work since Barcelona. Servas Youth (SY) is focused on actions for benefit with Servas worldwide. Have chosen youth as focus. He knows youth means something different world wide. From third world, lot of young members eg Argentina – more travelers. See paper for full proposals. Additional comments made:

1) Servas Youth (SY) network: find someone in each country to work with servas youth in new way,

- 2) Servas needs to be known by other organizations – especially important for young people. Website allows for links. Need by end of the week, please let SY know which organizations could be linked to web page. National groups need to link in to organizations working with young people (yp) saying what's special about Servas,
- 3) should be thinking about smaller activities in countries and between countries,
- 4) Patagonia report, should be an annual event. However all young people have indicated needs to remain part of SI. Power of a youth event is important. In the future we want to have activities such as the Patagonia experience:
  - a. next year Britain, July 2007
  - b. then Turkey 2008,
  - c. 2007 in Britain not just youth, but family, and open to all.
  - d. Further meetings to be discussed this week. Initially European, now International.
- 5) 2009 next GA. Would like to propose a youth event at same time. Would like youth to be observers and involved. In Barcelona young people funded themselves or they were funded by national groups.
- 6) officers at international and national level, having youth supporter or shadow, to help promote new Servas leaders. Once new Exco formed, would like to invite them to draw in young people from their country or region to help out.
- 7) large network within Servas: importance of learning languages. Pablo C developed language project with Servas Brazil. We learn by living in a different country for one month to learn. Now growing to Mexico and Canada.
- 8) how to link young people to what hosts have to offer. Anyone interested in hosts offering opportunities to young people – let SY know by end of week.
- 9) lot of material sent to SI editor. That will continue.
- 10) Youth travel award: Travel for young people should not just be for better off young people. Have already \$1000 to contribute to young people traveling, focused on an event; supported by local group of hosts as with language project. May only be one every two years. Any one can ask about project later.

Pablo: All are invited to the workshop. Proposal based on Patagonia statement, 15 countries and 60 delegates. *Applause*

---

**Third Session**  
**April 3, 2006**  
**Monday**

---

**Started 2:35**

≠

Moderator Julie Dotsch: Moderators met with recall group to discuss timing. Suggestion is to extend to 7pm in order to catch up.

≠

Currently rules of order says moderator must change:

2 options:

- 1) Take a max of 1 hour on recall of officers. Then to Exco and governance. Means workshops start 1 hour later and finish 1 hour later.

2) Stay with rules of order; exco and governance first. Then session on recall of officers afterwards. Not to extend after 6 pm, but this means we would need to make more changes to the agenda because we would not be able to fit everything in.

≠

Canada motion:

**Move to spend up to one hour on recall, then move all items back one hour.**

Seconded Switzerland.

Vote:

39 For:

Against: Not asked since this is a procedural issue

Abstentions: Not asked; same reason

Offer of recording votes on this issue was given, but not taken up.

≠

Moderator changes for next part of session: - Pat Patfoort:

She says she doesn't have English as first language – hoping to encourage others to do role.

≠

Moderator gives Honora opportunity to leave room.

Honora chooses to leave room.

≠

Germany: During the working group on recall items, the question asked was:

What do we mean by recall? It is not written how long officers serve. 4 members of current Exco declared they would resign by 24<sup>th</sup> Jan 06. These 4 had indicated they would no longer hold office beyond EGA. Honora did not indicate this. Honora and Bibendra had not indicated if they wished to continue. Honora sent confusing letters about EGA. This was believed to be illegal, as statutes say 20% of members can call for EGA.

**Therefore I move we call for Honora to be out of office from today onwards.**

≠

France: It is clearly written how long office lasts: 3 months after each GA whether ordinary GA or EGA. Therefore doesn't need a recall.

≠

Switzerland: Asking for a friendly amendments. I do not feel Germany is in a position to question that USA did not nominate Honora.

≠

Germany: Motion for recall only about 20%, not about nomination.

≠

President: first section from Germany: Written motion mentions USA nomination.

Where is it stated about the nomination in the statutes.

≠

Germany: Not part of motion.

≠

France: Article 75: every member has every right to ask for EGA: when 20% says wants EGA, then law says should do it.

Moderator: P30 in binder: Swiss Civil Code Article 75 written.

≠

Australia: opposes motion. Now NS, when proposed I was pleased to hear from Honora because she explained both sides of the situation. She helped us hear both sides to the argument.

≠

Turkey: GS has to act according to the rule. Not to check who is for or against. All she had to do was announce the GA.

≠

Malaysia: No objection from Germany NS when we voted Honora as GS. Feels reason for motion is because of not wanting EGA. Feels that it was a democratic thing that Exco allowed Honora to lobby.

Therefore does not accept motion. We feel it is a very democratic thing for her to express her opinion. We therefore reject this motion.

≠

USA: Only one person running for GS in Barcelona. As no competition, GA did not elect. Honora lives 15 miles from me. Didn't talk to USA at time of nomination. Didn't work for USA in any capacity. She put herself on the nominating committee.

This is not the point. Exco does the work of the Federation of nations. Therefore we tell Exco what to do. Honora did not follow the wishes of the GA. This does not follow the wishes of the GA.

≠

Netherlands: Unhappy about the motion. Should forget about this issue. Did not doubt that Honora has worked for this conference. I will vote against it.

≠

Ireland: Does not understand the allegation.

≠

Moderator: Check if we can vote now.

≠

Vote for proceeding to the vote on the recall;  
38 to vote on the recall vote.

≠

Motion repeated

GA decide if Honora Clemens is out of office from today:

For: 7

Against: 15

Abstentions: 20

Motion rejected

≠

Honora rejoins GA, escorted by Chris Jones, graciously welcomed and seated by Geoff Maltby

≠

Second motion:

Germany: I already explained the reason for recall of Bibendra. One item, action needed because of not submitting receipts as required, or explanation for reasons for matters queried by Audit committee. Exco did not accept reasons provided. Germany can not accept explanation given by Bibendra.

**Motion is to recall Bibendra from today, and take legal action against Bibendra.** Seconded Phillipines.

≠

Moderator: Keep as two motions

≠

Germany: No, as one motion.

≠

Canada: Friendly amendment:

**[That Bibendra not be permitted to hold any office within SI until issues are resolved satisfactorily. This is not intended to change the meaning of amendments.]**

≠

Chris Jones: Friendly amendment not intended to change meaning.

Germany: Accepts friendly amendment.

≠

Brtiain: Ask to learn about lessons from yesterday. Would not wish to negate what happened yesterday. Servas should not condone fraudulent / dishonest activity. I do not know him, only as Vice President of organization. Has to be intent to commit fraud. Has to be not guilty until proven. Are we talking about dishonesty or incompetence. As part of diverse reality. Would suggest restorative justice, not punitive justice. To concentrate on conciliation, restorative punishment and not punitive punishment.

≠



Malaysia: We voted in Barcelona, to accept the account of the Treasurer as correct, and external audit. We accepted the auditors report. We therefore accepted there may have been some irregularity, but when we voted the next day, we accepted as correct. I cannot see how Servas Germany can say --- I see Bibendra as innocent until proven guilty. We accepted all reports as correct; some of you are the same people.

≠

Sweden: Little concerned about taking civil action.

Not able to talk about original – only amendment.

≠

USA : Make it clear, this is not about guilt. It is about principle, about accounting, about money. There are many open accounts, but only 2 that have not been cleared. It is not about guilt, but open accounts where people owe money. We should look at why only 2 are still open.

≠

Ireland: How much money is involved?

Treasurer: 8000 euro.

Ireland: Was accountability requested at this moment, was that the rule then before he took office?

Germany: GA Thailand said we did have to show receipts.

≠

Botswana: When we approved documents, did not accept contents. This has gone on for 3 years. Should have been acquitted with in 3 months.

≠

India: Why was money given to Bibendra without previous accounts being settled? Who has sanctioned the money? Therefore previous NS, GS and Treasurer responsible for the debt. Before take action, why not appoint external audit committee. We need to know actual position. If external audit committee confirms money should be paid, then it should be recovered and action taken.

≠

Treasurer: The budget of VP is frozen after received internal audit 2004. Exco decided to freeze account until questions answered by audit 2001 – 2004. Given 3 months to resolve problem. No documents received. 2 years have passed. He is still not sending proper documents.

≠

India: Do minutes record views of India?

≠

Amended Motion by Canada:

Bibendra not be nominated for, nor be permitted to hold any office in Servas International, effective immediately, until he resolves the outstanding accounts identified by the AC, and the GA approves the motion.

≠

Austria: Does the amendment replace the German motion?

Kyrgyzstan: I do not understand the amendment.

≠

Canada: I should not have called it a friendly amendment.

I should have said we replace the German motion.

≠

Moderator:

**We are voting on replacing the German motion.**

≠

Canada; Reason for amending is that we are Servas. We have not received receipts from someone who should have provided them. This should not go to court, as it will cost too much, but we must send a strong message to everyone that all have to provide receipts.

≠

Germany withdrew her motion

Moderator: Only one - replacement motion from Canada.

Vote:

For: 33

Against: 2

Abstain: 7

≠

Moderator: Are we continuing:

Vote taken: agreed to continue.

≠

Germany: **Motion to take legal action against Marco Kappenberger**

Seconded: USA

≠

Canada

**motion: To replace German motion (broadly the same as for Bibendra): That Marco Kappenberger not be nominated for, nor be permitted to hold any office in Servas International, effective immediately, until he resolves the outstanding accounts, identified by the Audit Committee, and the GA approves the resolution.**

Seconded New Zealand

≠

Germany: Since this motion does not alter the intent, I withdraw my motion.

≠

**Motion: To decide to vote**

Botswana, I call the question

Indonesia: seconded

Vote:

For: 40

Against: 1

Abstention: 1

Motion carried, to vote immediately.

≠

Votes on the amended motion:

For: 36

Against: 1

Abstention: 5

Motion carried.

≠

Julie Dotsch took over as moderator.

Took a moment to stretch.

No break .

---

Next, proceed into  
a workshop on the future of Servas.  
In the same room with all delegates present

---

## Workshop Session April 3, 2006 Monday

---

Pramod Kumar (PK) as a member of the Agenda Group is in charge.  
Purpose is to have more efficient Exco and Servas.

≠

President: I want to be the first to say that this GA is proving satisfying. If we can get through elections, budget etc. OK, the new Exco will have a smoother term.

≠

We can see what happened at Barcelona. Request for EGA not easy. Recall action meant we were working with a team of 5.

≠

Moderator: The original question was, what is the current structure described. Please stay with that.

≠

President: 6 members of Exco. Responsibilities within Statutes. You, the delegates, are the authority of Servas International. Whatever you decided we have had to do. Over the past few years, Exco had member groups of SI reporting and advice from Area Coordinators. Now everything is going straight to Exco – It is not working well without the ACs.

≠

Pramod K: There are 5 proposals, 2 of the proposals are, word for word, the same. Therefore we actually have 3 proposals. Australia, Germany & France, New Zealand.

≠

Australia; we met last night, and came up with a separate proposal. We would like workshop to work it out.

≠

Germany: Want to have a flip chart to show the new proposal.

≠

NZ: Have a number of questions to get feedback on. Need to know what general direction workshop would like to go in. I'm happy for a good start.

≠

France: OK to proceed.

≠

Germany: Uses flipchart.

Original proposal was to reduce officers to 3 (Australia to 4 or 5): "President, VP, Treasurer and GS. Not having Peace Secretary.

Second level of officers-who should be the conveners of committees.

Each convener of committee has power to report to the board. Discussed combining committees. The details can be done in workshops.

≠

NZ: One of the core element of proposal coming out of Barcelona, is to have some general board members who represent, in some way the national groups, so there is a voice directly in decision making between GAs, so not just officers are making decisions. Suggest conveners is a member of the Exco.

≠

Australia: We have the option of what we have had before or we have a number of General Board members. The big picture is that we have them. How we get them is a detail to be decided later.

≠

France: Agrees with the project, as it shows who are the officers. Now we don't know who are officers.  
≠  
PK: Will go into the role of officers later.  
≠  
Ireland: Exco should not fall less than 5 as a minimum.  
≠  
Moderator Julie: thank you to Pramod for leading the session so far. They have asked me to facilitate the discussion about whether to proceed with questions.  
≠  
Germany: This is only to inform you about the items for Governance and the details can be in the next workshop.  
≠  
Moderator: This is to test how people are thinking about the 8 questions they have designed. These are supposed to be clarification questions, 'I don't understand.'  
≠  
USA: Do I understand that it will be the 4 Exco officers plus conveners; are they also called officers and is there a fixed number of conveners?  
≠  
NZ: This is considered a detail and that will be considered in workshop.  
≠  
Israel: Supports main ideas, but would like to see Job Description.  
Needs to be a structure that functions better than before.  
≠  
Malaysia: Could someone clarify, the general board members? Are they officers. How many general board members are you proposing?  
≠  
Moderator: Will be discussed in small workshop.  
≠  
India: Will committee members be elected at GA or selected by Exco?  
≠  
NZ: Both are possible – for small group workshop.  
≠  
Italy: Main issue on Servas is and should be peace. To abolish Peace Secretary role wouldn't be helping Servas for reaching this goal.  
≠  
Treasurer: I agree with you about the job description, but in Exco you don't always do job description as described – all shared the work around Exco. Many tasks beyond Job Description there are many tasks.  
≠  
Canada: Where does the group see the Peace Secretary role going? I need clarification.  
≠  
Peace Secretary: It would be helpful to have stated, what are the principles, the expected benefits and what might be the risks of organizational change?

**Coffee break**  
**4:30**

---

## Workshop Session

## April 3, 2006 Monday

---

**5:00 pm reconvene.**

≠

Questions were prepared by the work group.

1) What responsibilities, activities and tasks need to be the responsibilities of an elected Servas Officer?

1. Correspondence and action with national groups:

(majority agree should be responsibility of an elected officer)

2. Promotion of peace activities:

3. Financial accounts and budgets

4. Meeting process and agendas including GA

5. Host list distribution

6. Overall planning and coordination.

7. Other

*the following two were added later at the request of the moderator*

More efficient Exco

To define officers

2. Who should be responsible?

≠

Moderator: clarifies that the general direction sought from meeting is to guide the workshop the smaller group. We are trying to see which direction we should move: to the left, to the center, to the right. We try to get a general feeling.

≠

CP: What we're trying to do is give the small workshops some direction.

Pramod K: clarifies that statutes may need to be changed once discussion about duties have taken place.

≠

Moderator: Be clear that duties under discussion are about elected officers. We are trying to get a general feeling from the room about what should be done in the workshop

In the new model that was shown here.

≠

USA: All of these things are written in the statutes already.

≠

Pramod K: we are trying to build a new structure and we do not need to follow the current statutes.

≠

USA: Is it about discreet officer duties belong to one and only one person.

≠

Moderator: We are trying to come up with a vision. What could be done in the future. So, we come up with an idea of what needs to be done and then we look to see what does job need to be done by an elected officer.

≠

Israel: All list should be on task list of elected officers all of them. It doesn't mean that they have to do all the work though – up to them how they do it – let someone else do it.

≠

Australia: Need to sort out the 'basket' first, then sort out jobs afterward.

≠

Singapore: Elected officers are responsible for the task.

≠  
Moderator: I want to make it clearer that it is elected officers (plural) and it's not one person.

≠  
Treasurer: What is the reason for the change. I want to hear the benefits.

≠  
Pramod K: I am only a neutral person in this – the reasons should come from France, Germany, Australia, NZ

≠  
Moderator: Who can explain

≠  
Australia: Because of dissatisfaction about the amount of work people have had to do. Also they would like the power to come from GA. Exco elected, but not working by themselves, with committees working for them. That was our idea. We got together and now we have a hybrid draft proposal. We want to make sure Exco are not overworked.

≠  
Germany: At the moment we do not have definitions for officers, other than newsletter editor. Everything is open to new ideas.

≠  
Unidentified speaker: Instead of having empty basket to fill, want a fuller basket to avoid too many committees – some could be joined.

≠  
NZ: The proposal that stands in the name of NZ came out of the workshop in Barcelona. There is:  
1) no learning ground for Exco officers. By having general board members, this is a space for people to learn about running a multi-national, global, volunteer, part time organization – not to mention multi lingual, and multi cultural.  
2) number of officers reduced. Therefore need to decide what tasks currently by officers will not be done by or the responsibilities of officers.  
3) no input to decision making and governance between GA's that is representative of national groups.

≠  
Germany: We are a peace organization, therefore should be on list that everyone should take on the role of Peace Officer, but should not need a separate Peace Secretary – Peace Officer work is for everyone to do.

≠  
USA: expansion of membership is not on the list for everyone.

≠  
Malaysia: What is the opinion of current Exco or former Exco members – if no EGA to prepare for, would you have functioned better with tasks.

≠  
President: Even though no VP in charge of development, I could have put some time into development. Hasn't been done. Only been involved with EGA. Could have been involved with Africa, Caribbean, Central America etc.

≠  
Peace Sec: There is:  
• a problem with the governance of Servas that is not evident to most people. We are trapped into a continuous operation...everyday, everyday, everyday.  
Nothing is ever complete.

• No management cycle – nothing ever gets done.  
No setting of objectives, evaluation of results and celebration of results.  
The problem of a lack of management cycle is a serious, serious concern.

It is a problem of management both at the National groups as well as the relationships with the international leadership.

- The next is a serious problem because it is a main source of revenue and a chief purpose of SI. No voice for travelers, no overview of travelers, no feedback / no evaluation, no satisfaction of results. This is a serious deficiency.

- No provision for paid support. We are running a huge diverse organization with volunteers, but they are not supported by paid people.

- No defined management style of leadership

We all started and did not know each other.

Some had the view we were a working board

Some we are a policy board

Some we just do our job we don't care what the others do this leads to very serious problems of leadership.

- The last problem I mention and its one given great emphasis by the founder

Bob Luitweiler – there is and I think aspects of this proposal mention this

No provision for team building.

≠

Malaysia: Wanted to know, if no EGA, would you have been able to function effectively.

≠

Peace Secretary: No, because of 6 deficiencies just listed

≠

Treasurer:

Need to find out perspectives of travelers. GA should give power to Exco. Also could add interviewers as problem. Servas is complex. Where problems with a country - takes up lot of people's time, need to find a solution.

≠

Moderator: Anyone interested remain in room to continue discussion.

**Workshop ended 5:40**

**Small workshops started.**

*Some of the end of the tape was catching part of one of the small workshops which the Secretariat did not, and was not expected, to record.*

---

**First Session  
April 4, 2006  
Tuesday**

---

≠

**Moderator: Julie Dotsch**

Good morning

This group is amazing. the work that happened in different corners of this hotel until late last night creating the newsletter and also little circles you are proving that Servas is committed to peace and to making this GA work, so I just wanted to say that I am really impressed with everybody's commitment.

We will have a few announcements and then we are ready to begin. And amazingly we are on schedule.

≠

**Anna Flammini announced**

Activities available for next few nights:

Tuesday night -- Bingo

Wednesday night -- Tango

Thursday night -- Italian music night with a guitarist

Friday night -- Farewell party after dinner; cakes from Sicily and wine from Italy.

Group photos are ready. Stop by office to speak with Anna Flammini

≠

**The story of the little bands we are wearing.**

It was Vibeke Matorp's idea.

Two young women, she knew, made 130 and provided them for us.

We officially send our thanks to them.

We want to make a photo showing many arms wearing them and put it on the web site so they can see it.

≠

**Geoff Maltby:** Appreciation to the newsletter group that are doing a fantastic job. It is being put on the website.

≠

**Moderator Julie: This session is about EXCO and Governance -- one hour**

≠

Pramod: Our workshop had a fruitful discussion on this complex issue.

We have come to some agreement that there is a need for a change and restructure.

We want to seek approval in principle from the General Assembly that there is a need for a change in the structure of governance then a committee will work out the details. You have a copy of the proposals. Some of these points will be discussed in other meetings also.

Originators to answer any questions.

**Motion: That the GA make a decision in principle that a statute amendment be drafted to establish a Board for SI of made up of Exco officers, Conveners of Committees and representatives of national groups.**

Once this motion is passed we will make up a committee to do the work.

Moved by India

Seconded by USA

≠

Austria: Establish a board to work with Exco which means there are more people than Exco. Is that correct?

≠

Chris Patterson (CP): Yes

≠

Botswana: No indication for Area Coordinators in new structure should they not be mentioned in the new structure?

≠

CP: We are trying to provide a framework within which Exco can work. We have left it vague on purpose. This is to be a framework for a group of people who can look at a plan. ACs could be part of national group reps.



≠

Pramod K: Question could be answered within group work by the committee.

•≠

Malaysia: What is the decision in principle? Distant vote may be used in this process. Are we saying that a statute amendment could be made in Distant Voting.

≠

Pramod K: Haven't worked out full details of how proposal will work. Details to be worked out by committee. Distance voting could then be used to make the decision.

•≠

Chris P: Only GA can make amendment to statutes. Would not use distant vote to amend statute. Would use distant vote to work on details. This would be used to amend statute. Steps will make it clearer.

•≠

India: Distant vote important to sort out first. Barcelona accepted use of Distant Vote process.

•≠

PK: Distant vote is part of agenda of GA, it will be discussed this year and hopefully will be approved. If not approved, we will not use the distant vote.

≠

CP: Example of how distant vote could be used could be how many members would be involved. Next GA would then make final decision.

≠

Malaysia: Our only concern that I need clarified is that distant vote cannot or will not be used to approve the amendment of the structure. Is that correct?

≠

Germany: That is correct. All details will be worked out by the Working group through distant vote during the next 3 years Next GA will then make decision.

≠

PK: Amendment to statutes cannot be made by distant voting.

•≠

Australia : All we are doing today is getting permission to start the process (of change.) Little decisions could be made by distant voting. Could go to the next GA with something concrete to vote upon.

•≠

CP: Need to carry on filling in the detail. Exco would need to create formal language and obtain legal advice to check if complies with our statutes and the Swiss Civil Code before next GA.

•≠

PK: Can we move to vote, as we seem to have answered all queries satisfactorily.

•≠

NZ: When would new group be functioning.

•≠

CP: Not until next GA. But some aspects of new proposal could be implemented before next GA. Some officers could work with Exco in ways suggested. If the distant vote formal proposal is adopted, then some aspects could be tried out before the GA.

•≠

Moderator: Need to proceed to vote. Agrees to question from Israel.

•≠

Israel: I'm going to support this motion, and would like to comment on process. It is too slow and too long compared with our needs. Would prefer a clear structure now rather than wait 3 years.

•≠

**Motion: That the GA make a decision in principle that a statute amendment be drafted that a Board for SI be established made of Exco officers, Conveners of Committees and representatives of national groups.** Motion repeated

•≠

Vote to have the vote

Seeing a strong support we will have the vote

Proposed by Australia,

Seconded by NZ

≠

Vote:

For: 38

Against: 0

Abstain: 4

Motion is carried

≠

Moderator: Workshop to carry on this after the break.

•≠

Moderator: Next agenda item is on neutral moderator

•≠

Canada: Need to look at motion on neutral moderator in workshop first so I ask that it be put back until the next session. Agreed

•≠

Moderator: **Development workshop** feedback

Chris Jones moderating: Good discussion in workshop on youth. Agreed in the development workshop this should be the first focus. Jean Seymour (JS) (Britain) is to introduce it.

•≠

Jean Seymour: (JS) Please look at the sheet handed out to GA yesterday. Proposal for action plan from Servas Youth Team (SYT). A motion has come from the first development workshop. We'll be dealing with all four pages of the document. We will not be dealing with the budget today (Point c). We will be dealing with points a, b, and d today.

≠

Time was given for the delegates to read the document.

≠

Moderator: Now we will proceed.

•≠

JS: I am pleased to be able to propose the motion on behalf of Servas Britain. I have been involved with Servas Youth since Barcelona, and the wonderful meeting in Patagonia. We had a very good discussion in Development Workshop yesterday, as youth is an important part of development.

**First part is Points 1 to 10 on Servas Youth Team Action Plan.**

There are a few slight changes from document. Points 1 to 9 to stand as written.

•

Motion: **Adopt the action plan from the Servas Youth Team.**

**Ten points of the plan:**

1. **Servas Youth Network**
2. **Links with other organizations**
3. **Support to Area Coordinators and National Groups**
4. **International youth events**
5. **Youth observers and volunteers at the International Conference**
6. **Youth support for SI and National Groups**
7. **Servas Youth Language Experience (SYLE)**
8. **Servas Youth Work Related Experience (SYWE)**
9. **Servas Youth Editors.**
10. **Youth Travel Award.**

**Please look at Point 10: Youth Travel Award.**

**Changes to be made throughout paragraph: Change 'would' and 'could's, to 'wills' as follows:**

**“Using funds raised from sources other than SI reserves, a Travel Award will open up an opportunity to a limited number of young Servas members who have little or no resources of their own to travel from their own country. Such sponsorship will allow a young person to take part in an International Servas event, followed by an extended visit to local Servas hosts e.g to be a volunteer, study, learn a language or pursue a special interest whilst also joining in life in another culture. As well as providing a valuable life-enhancing experience for a young person whilst also joining in life in another culture. On returning home we expect that they will be active in their national group and contribute to developing an ongoing link with the hosting national group.**

**The setting up of such a scheme will need careful consideration in conjunction with the SI Treasurer and Development Fund Committee. The fund will be administered by the SI Treasurer. A Working Group will be set up to establish how such an Award will be managed and to consider how it might be appropriate to raise funds, for example from personal host donations or from special fund raising activities. There will be fair criteria on how to award any available sponsorship. A selection process might include candidates providing a creative piece of work, a method previously used in a Servas Youth Competition in South America. An activity report will be provided by the young person at the end of their experience.”**

≠

Moderator: This is a very lengthy motion. Are there any questions, as it is a comprehensive document.

•≠

Germany: Some parts of the motion do not fit with new structures. Currently no elected ICT is working. It used to be a committee. I would like to have structures that are different from the structure we will be working on. There is too much detail re role of Servas Treasurer – that is part of the work of the working group that will be working up the new structure. They should make allowance for changes.

≠

Britain: Would like speaking rights for Pablo Chufeni (PC) (Argentina) and Ann Greenhough (AG) (Britain).

≠

Canada: Is discussion on motion **or amendment? I want** to understand.

≠

Moderator: Only discussing motion.

•≠

Austria: Is this a decision in principle, or looking at full motion? I don't understand and I sense that there are others who do not understand what we are doing now.

≠

JS: The motion is the full package. When we met, we didn't know about the proposed structure changes. The SYT model will fit in with any new structure.

•≠

Moderator: We have a speakers list. We also have a request for speakers rights. May I have a show of paddles please to grant speaking right to assist with content.

≠

Show of paddles.

≠

Moderator: Speaking rights have been granted to Anne Greenhough (AG) and Pablo Chufeni (PC) to assist in the explanation.

≠

USA: Is it a proposal or is it a motion. It should go up on screen if it is motion. It seems like most of this is discussion.

≠

AG: The motion is as on top of Agenda item page:

**The motion is to adopt the Youth Plan.** It is difficult to know in advance how to fit the proposal into a new way of doing this structure.

≠

USA: The motion is the proposal with 10 titles on Action Plan. Could the motion be the GA adopt the Servas Youth Action Plan including the 10 items.

≠

AG: Yes I thought that was what we were doing.

≠

Botswana: Would like motion to be reflected on power point.

≠

AG: It is helpful to answer whether this is a decision in principle or a final decision. At workshop, it was felt that it is important to get an early decision on the proposal. The proposal is to put the motion to GA on all aspects other than budget. The motion will allow PC and AG to work on details. We also realize the structure will be changed and we can work to comply later.

≠

France: What do you mean by sources other than SI reserves?

≠

AG: Personal sources from hosts, national group donations, some people may like to make a legacy in their will to a specific purpose. We already have \$1000 offered as a legacy. The proposal is to use new resources from Servas members. I doubt if money will be offered from outside Servas, but I think we would not refuse it.

•≠

NZ: I'm proposing a friendly amendment to the motion:

**[Friendly Amendment Motion: Considering that there will be changes to the structure, I move all reference in this proposal to the current structure note the words to start with' be placed in this document. The rationale is to enable this document to go forward.]**

**Moved by: New Zealand**

**Seconded by: France**

≠

Germany: I think the original motion has too much detail. Would like a new motion to refer back to workshop to make it clearer.

≠

Moderator: We have a motion that has been moved and seconded. Cannot therefore agree to new motion. We need to proceed to a vote on the motion we have.

•≠

Britain: Britain is in agreement with the amendment.

•≠

Germany: Not in favor of the amendment. I want it to go back to the workshop.

**I want to move this motion go back to the workshop.**

Moderator: I cannot accept another motion until the vote is finished.

≠

Moderator: Any other questions on amendment, or main motion.

Vote for friendly amendment:

For: 33

Against: 0

Abstain: 7

Motion passed.

40 delegates voted.

Italy absent during vote.

Korea out of the room.

We now return to the debate on the main motion.

•≠

**Motion: Germany would like to move to refer the motion back to the workshop group that is only talking about Youth committees.**

Moved: Germany

Canada: second

•≠

Singapore: Motion has been amended since yesterday. I was at the workshop. Thought we agreed to have 4 motions. One was age, one was the action plan, one was the structure and budget There is some confusion therefore.

≠

Moderator: GA can refer back to workshops to work again on motion. A referral has to be voted now. It is not debatable

Need to vote on the motion to refer back to the workshop. All comments will be made by workshop before it is brought back.

•≠

Motion:

Germany: **To refer back to the Youth workshop**

Seconded Canada

Vote:

For: 21

Against: 16

Abstain: 5

Motion passes

•≠

Botswana: Motion should be brief, not more than ½ a page, with papers attached to explain the motion.

≠

AG: We had prepared a motion. The plan attached, we have already done that, they were attached.

≠

Mod: asks Sheldon to repeat his statement.

≠

Botswana: Motion needs to be brief and comprehensive, with papers attached that explain the motion.

•≠

Moderator: Would ask that GA helps now with workshop preparation as we have time.

•≠

Germany: Need to separate Development from Youth in workshop.

≠

Pablo C: The workshop this afternoon will look at development, not youth. We will re- present the information on youth.

≠

Moderator: Any constructive comments from GA to assist workshops can be made now.

•≠

Malaysia: If we think youth is important. From what I've seen, there are very clear, specific proposals. They have done well in Patatgonia. Needs now some power to make actions from their proposals. I'm sorry that you've been asked to go back to the workshop, don't give up. If we, other secretaries, feel that youth is important, then we need to give some power to make it reality. *Applause*

•≠

Philippines: Question re no 10 in action plan. What is legal status re Servas raising funds? In my country it is illegal to solicit any funds this way if you are not an NGO.

≠

USA: I believe this was a Development committee report. It seems like a Youth Committee report.

•≠

Moderator: Workshop had to decide between youth and development yesterday, and chose to look at youth yesterday. Today, we have decided on doing some of the other work we are charged with.

•≠  
Argentina; Work related experience can be very controversial because of legal problems in working in certain countries. This is a point that must be very carefully treated.

≠  
Moderator: We must be aware of the constraints in some countries. Things may work in some countries, not others.

≠  
Pablo C: Money outside Servas: most of Servas national groups may not be able to raise money. We are not thinking that each National Group would look for funds.

≠  
Mod: You are looking therefore for overall sources of funding. Is that correct?

•≠  
Canada: Many of the ideas are wonderful, but some may not work. Need to come up with general, with a small plan. Suggest need to include 'what do we have to do' in order to achieve aims and then get permission to do other things.

•≠  
Italy: Funding – Servas Italy is a recognized organization. All Servas organizations that are recognized by governments as not for profit organizations, can raise money.

•≠  
Treasurer: Many countries in Servas are not registered with government. If they are collecting money, need to show how they raise funds in order to be accountable to government. Must be accountable.

•≠  
USA: I appreciate all the youth emphasis. Need development work within national groups that are just emerging. Needs to be looked at within development working group. I would like to see something about developing youth in small countries.

≠  
Moderator: Remember to use suggestion box. Process today indicates that GA can help.

•≠  
AG: Preparing something for GA can be a difficulty. Sometimes we plan something simple and we are asked for more detail. We prepared too much detail, and now are being asked to be simpler. I think it would be helpful, by end of GA, to consider and have some advice on how to prepare motions.

≠  
Moderator: Botswana suggestion was a good one.

≠  
Unidentified speaker: The way in which the last workshop presented information could be a good model for how to present information.

≠  
Moderator: Since we are breaking 15 minutes early, I might ask if you could arrive at your workshop groups 15 minutes early.

USA: Announcement, questionnaire on interviewing techniques. Meet in the blue room right after the afternoon meeting.

President: next time we'd like more people in the Exco structure workshop to get more opinions.

**Session finished 10:55 am**

---

**Second Session**  
**April 4, 2006**  
**Tuesday**

---

There was none ----- there were many small workshops

---

**First Session**  
**April 5, 2006**  
**Wednesday**

---

**Meeting started at 9:10 am**

Announcements

Anna Flammini re Pictures

Geoff re: Additional nominations

≠

Moderator: Pat Patfoort

Moderator: Checks with GA about replacement for France delegate. Agreed.

Malawi: Leads GA in song.

≠

President: Calls for nominations for officers by tomorrow morning.

≠

Moderator: First motion from Workshop 'Exco and Officers' for the General Assembly of SI. She hands meeting over to Pramod Kumar (PK) (India) to introduce.

≠

PK: Thanks to Pat Patfoort and Inken for working hard to prepare the motions. Worked long, late into the night. We have reduced them into 6 motions.

≠

First motion to discuss:

•≠

**Motion: That the candidates for each Exco and SI office position should meet job requirements. These job requirements shall be worked out by the relevant committee.**

Proposed Australia;

Seconded Germany

Moderator: Asks for questions / comments:

•≠

Malaysia: What were some of the job requirements that the workshop concluded.

•≠

Australia: Brief was not to work out job requirements, only to be sure there will be specific requirement. Maybe some of the things currently in handbook would not be included, would be worked out by each Committee.

•≠

India: No mention by India initially of the second sentence. Why do we need this part of the proposal? The Barcelona assembly passed the motion to go to the next GA. How can they decide about this at the EGA when only 20% asked for it?

•≠

Kyrgyzstan: Members of working group should neither propose or second motion. Chris and wife proposed and seconded. Therefore needs independent people to propose and second.

≠

Treasurer: There is no action plan in the motion. If SI or Exco does not meet job requirement, what will be the result? I think we need a Friendly Amendment for action.

•≠

Germany: Motion has to be proposed by country who moved it. It was Australia and India who initially proposed. Therefore appropriate that they propose and second. However Germany will second if necessary.

Australia: It is a formality as who proposes and seconds

•≠

Sweden: a person who seconds a motion can even oppose it. . It is not a question of being biased

•≠

Ireland: Wants to move to a vote.

USA seconded

•≠

Moderator asks for show of paddles on whether to move to vote.

Majority indicate should now move to vote.

•≠

Vote on motion:

For: 40

Against: 0

Abstain: 1

Motion is carried

Italy absent during vote

•≠

PK: Read out second motion:

**Motion: That there is a recent posting on the website of the International Servas about all persons in charge who are the Exco and the president with their names and pictures and brief biography of him/her, to give the International Servas website more official and credential way for any interested person who is looking to join**

Proposed Germany,

Seconded Botswana.

≠

PK: Proposal was originally from Egypt. As the originator is not present, workshop did not feel entitled to amend. So it is given as originally presented.

Moderator: Questions?



•≠  
Ireland: Feels it should be optional if photographs on internet.  
Should there be a rejection of the proposal?

•≠  
President: The wording of the motion is not understandable. Could someone put a friendly motion to allow for amendment by distant voting? Egypt could then amend.

•≠  
Sweden: The spirit of the motion is fairly clear. It is just asking for information on who Exco is be on website. It is difficult to find information on Exco – what they look like and their background.

•≠  
Britain: Agrees with Sweden, but GA should be tolerant of motions and wording. In Patagonia, a member put on email details of participants and their photos. Not a big job. We should know who Exco is. GA should be totally positive and encouraging of new initiative. I feel President does not have the right to propose a friendly vote because he had already spoken.

•≠  
South Africa: Do people want photos on internet? Have they a choice?

•≠  
Austria. Could motion be changed, by putting an “eg” or the words “if possible” about photos on website – so it is not mandatory.

•≠  
Botswana:. If you are willing to run for Exco you should be willing to put your picture and biography on the website.

**Friendly Amendment: [that there be a posting on the website of the International Servas about all persons on the Exco with their names, pictures and brief biography.]**

≠  
If you are willing to run you should have your picture there.

Second Switzerland

≠  
*He was asked to repeat several times.*  
I’ve just taken their words and stripped it down.

≠  
*A very long pause on the tape*

≠  
Moderator: Comments on amendment?

≠  
Canada: Needs a comment on website. Need permission from individuals to put their information to do so. Elections are tomorrow. People who are running for office need to know. It affects whether they wish to run or not.

≠  
Ireland: Servas is a voluntary organization. It may not be a good idea for all persons to have their information on website. 99% may feel OK, but 1% for whom it may be a difficulty may not want information to be on. I think we should leave it optional.

≠  
Kyrgyzstan: I agree with Ireland. Brief introduction only is needed, not full biography.

≠  
Kyrgyzstan: if you don’t want your picture don’t run for office. Replace biography with introduction.

•≠  
Malaysia: A picture means a 1000 words. If you look at most association websites, executive committee members have their pictures included. I don’t think we don’t elect officers because of being handsome or pretty. We are looking at a picture to know or identify who the person is. Servas Malaysia supports this motion.

≠

Moderator: Wish to close questions.

•≠

Vote :

For: 31

Against: 4

Abstentions: 7

Motion accepted

≠

Moderator: Confirms that the vote was on the main motion not the preceding friendly amendment.

•≠

PK: Reads third motion.

**Motion: To amend Article 111 of Statutes of SI (“Officers”) to add the following sentence: ‘SI officers are defined as the members of Exco, Conveners of Committees, and the SI News Editor.’**

Proposed Germany,

Seconded by Australia

•≠

Moderator: Questions? This will need a 2/3 vote because it is affecting the statutes.

•≠

USA: Currently officers do not include the SI newsletter editor. Statutes say SI newsletter editor shall also be elected, it does not say the editor shall be an officer. This is a major change.

•≠

Canada: It takes a long time to change the statute so I think we should do it now. I support the motion.

•≠

Britain: Not clear who are we voting for. Where does it leave the ICT team and the two Servas Youth Coordinators and possibly other people on this list. I’d like some clarification.

•≠

Treasurer: Same question for Archivist and SI newsletter editor. Are they officers or not?

≠

Malaysia: Taking the conveners of committees, using the current structure e.g. Appeals, ICT, Development Fund Committee, Audit Committee, does this mean chairs of committee, who are currently appointed, will be officers in future? Do they have voting rights on Executive, shall we call it, Board now?

≠

Germany: At moment, only 6 executive officers are officers. Statutes say no more than 25 officers – written currently that only current Exco are officers. Idea is to clarify this. Suggestion is that conveners of committees shall be officers, but not other members of the committee.

There was a question, where should we put it. I think it should be the first sentence of this article.

≠

Kyrgyzstan: What benefits do officers get? Would have thought working group would have sorted this out.

•≠

Germany: To clarify, at the moment, our statutes do not make it clear who officers are other than the 6 EXCO positions.

≠

Moderator: **The minutes are not on the screen** (*indicating the work of Elena at the front of the red room*), **they are being taken over here** (*indicates area where David is writing and Honora is monitoring and assisting*). If you want to see if they are correct you should go and see later. Also it is important to know that we are being recorded. Everything that is said is being recorded. Thank you for understanding the work those people are doing because it is not easy. It is a lot they do. Also everything is being recorded.

•≠

Kyrgyzstan: It is not clear what the definitions of officers are, what their rights or duties or liabilities and responsibilities are. I think there is more work that needs to be done by the group before it comes here.

•≠

Germany: Do you want to refer the motion?

•≠

Kyrgyzstan: If the working group is not clear, it needs to go back to the working group.

≠

Moderator: I heard that as a comment for people to vote afterwards. That's how I heard it, so we go to Singapore.

•≠

Singapore: DFC and Audit committee are totally autonomous. Committees elect their own conveners. That has been the precedent.

Also, in terms of Rules of Procedure it was said on the first day, people could only speak once. The GA is not keeping to rules of procedure. Could moderator notice if someone wishes to talk twice? Otherwise we don't respect the chance for all GA members to speak.

≠

Moderator: I completely agree and I apologize for not seeing that there are countries. Thanks Singapore for reminder about Rules of Procedure.

•≠

Netherlands. Are there serious consequences if an officer or not? Maybe it would be better for less important committees not be necessary for conveners to be officers.

•≠

Moderator: There is a lot of work to still do this morning – suggest we move on. I ask for the list to close with the last name recorded.

•≠

NZ: As I read the statutes they currently summarize the duties and responsibilities of officers very nicely written. If we are to introduce conveners and SI editor as officers, I would suggest the working group write up the responsibilities of conveners officers. **Therefore I suggest it go back to the workshop for a definition of the responsibilities of officers.**

≠

Moderator: There is no speaking on a motion of referral. It has be voted right away.

Canada is seconding

•≠

NZ: I am not making an amendment. I am making a comment that we turn it down. If you turn it down it probably will go back to the group of these officers to be included in the statutes.

≠

Moderator: You are suggesting to go back to the working group?

≠

**Motion: To refer motion back to the working group**

Proposed by New Zealand;

Seconded by Canada.

≠

Vote:

For: 32

Against: 4 including Germany and Australia

Abstentions: 6

Motion carried.

Moderator: Confirms Germany and Australia wish to be named as voting against the motion to refer back to working group.

Canada: Suggest GA moves to go to next group of motions, as now over schedule.

Moderator: Does GA wish to continue until current motions are finished?  
Show of paddles by GA.

Ireland: Wish to check if vote about to carry on with current motion.

•  
Canada: Point of order. Agenda has been prepared carefully, so that each of working groups gets their fair share of agenda.

•  
Moderator: Vote is whether to continue with current motions.  
Show of paddles by GA. Majority agree to continue.

•≠  
PK: Reads out next motion.

**Motion: To amend Article V11 of the Statutes of SI (Duties and Responsibilities of Officers) by inserting the following at the beginning of item 1. All SI officers must, as a minimum, submit an annual activity and financial report to the president of SI or the General Secretary to be forwarded to all National Secretaries.**

Proposed by Germany;  
Seconded by New Zealand.

≠  
Moderator: Questions?

•≠  
USA: This was passed by the GA in Thailand. The only difference that this does is strengthen its position by putting it into the statutes.

•≠  
Ireland: Calls for vote.  
Seconded by Switzerland  
Show of paddles. Majority for proceeding to vote.

*The vote is not on the tape.*

Vote:

For: 41

Against 1

Abstentions

Motion approved.

*The vote is not on the tape.*

PK: Indicates that India has withdrawn their agenda item: Ind -006, therefore no motion to vote on.  
*not on the tape*

≠  
PK: Reads out next motion.

**Motion: Candidates for SI officers and committee members must first be recommended in writing either by their National Group or at least five individual Servas members. No candidate can nominate herself or himself. This requirement should be attached to all nomination forms.**

Proposed by USA  
Seconded by Kyrgyzstan.

≠  
Moderator: Questions?

•≠  
Austria: I think it has to be clear what is meant by individual Servas members? Is it individuals? Members in Servas are usually member groups. Should it be Servas members who are hosts? I need clarification.

≠

PK: It means individual members, it means a person. Countries are normally known as member groups.

•≠

Israel: Supports motion. Would like to make it more clear how many Servas individuals are equal to National Group support. To my way five individuals are not equal to Servas groups. Individuals should be maybe 10 or more. Thank you.

≠

Unknown male: I wanted to do the same to forward a motion to replace hosts or travelers.

≠

Brazil : What if a person is going for a position and there is no recommendation for him? Maybe they don't know other people yet, it may take some years. Can they not go for a position

•≠

Australia: Proposes a Friendly Amendment –**should be 5 individual Servas persons. Servas members to be replaced by Servas persons.**

•≠

India: For any position, it requires votes from National Groups. Would be better if two national groups supported the candidate for any position that would be better for this.

≠

Turkey: Proposes a Friendly Amendment. The confusion about the national group or 5 individual persons, I want to make a friendly amendment.

≠

Moderator: Not allowed. GA needs discussion on original amendment.

•≠

Germany: Agree it should be clearer that better if SI have experience at national level and are known to the national group. If people do not know anybody we do not want this kind of people in position because they go at the high level of international they should have experience at the national level already.

≠

New Zealand: The distinction of a member is not clear to me. I appreciate that every traveler is a member and every host is a member. I'm not clear why the change is necessary.

•≠

USA: In some countries there are different kinds of members legally. The legality is that we have: host, travelers, and acknowledged contributors who may not be either a traveler or host members at that time. That's why it needs to be a Servas person type.

•≠

Italy: Supports what USA says. Servas groups are subject to various laws, and have different legal status. In Servas Italy, we also have different associations as members. Our travelers have to be Servas members as well. They are not travelers only.

Moderator: Moves vote on friendly amendment by Australia.

Motion repeated: **Replace Servas members, with Servas persons.**

Vote:

For: 40

Against: 0

Abstention: 2

Motion approved.

*The vote is not on the tape. It does agree with Elena's notes.*

•≠

India: Wishes to propose amendment to original motion. **Proposes replacing one national group with two national groups.**

≠

Moderator: Calls for seconder. Confirms no one seconding amendment, therefore to move back to original motion.

≠

Germany: It is now closed, we have voted on motion.

≠

Moderator: Confirms GA has only voted on Friendly Amendment, not amended original motion.

•≠

Kyrgyzstan: No mention of the National Secretary. **Suggest Friendly Amendment that National group be changed to National Secretary.** Also, if a country has only 4 members, would they be disqualified to run for office?

≠

Moderator: To clarify, you wish to make an amendment replace National Group with National Secretary. You have an amendment and a question. Is someone seconding?

≠

Singapore: I don't understand the procedure. Are we going to go through a circus where we amend and keep amending and amending each motion? It makes the process too rigid.

≠

Moderator: Agrees with the need to be aware of time taken to undertake amendments.

≠

Moderator: Checks whether any seconder for Friendly Amendment from Kyrgyzstan.

No one seconding, therefore move forward.

≠

Turkey: Proposes Friendly Amendment. **To replace National Group with 10 Servas members from the national group.**

≠

Ireland: Is it 10 individuals of member group, or any Servas members of the world organization.

≠

Turkey: 10 members of the nominees national group from my country.

Turkey: Agrees to withdraw Friendly Amendment,

•≠

Malaysia: Wishes to make a clarification. The Nominations Committee have been sending out requests for nominations. At the last GA, there were lots of candidates who were not suitable or not enough candidates. I think any individual should therefore be able to self nominate.

•≠

Switzerland: Calls for a vote.

Seconded Indonesia.

≠

Moderator: Calls for show of paddles. Majority agree to proceed to vote.

≠

Amended Motion repeated: **Candidates for SI officers and committee members must first be recommended in writing either by their National Group or at least five individual Servas persons. No candidate can nominate herself or himself. This requirement should be attached to all nomination forms.**

Seconded Ireland

≠

Vote:

For: 32

Against: 1

Abstentions: 9

Motion approved.

*The vote was not on the tape. It agrees with Elena*

≠

PK: Reads out next motion:

**Motion: If an officer violates her or his duties or brings Servas International into disrepute as determined by the majority of Exco officers, the remaining officers are authorized to replace or otherwise sanction such officer.**

**Exco shall develop appropriate procedures including procedures for a sanctioned officer to appeal, and submit them to the National Groups for review.**

Proposed: India,

Seconded by Ireland

≠

PK: Tried to incorporate 3 proposals into 1 motion.

≠

Moderator: Questions?

•≠

NZ: Proposes a Friendly Amendment. [Insert 3<sup>rd</sup> line 'remaining Exco officers']

Seconded Ireland

≠

Moderator: Questions?

•≠

Austria: Amendment suggests an offense by only Exco officers, but should apply to other officers

•≠

Vote on amendment to motion:

For: 17

Against: 10

Abstention: 15

Amendment accepted

≠

Netherlands Friendly Amendment: [To postpone discussion on motion until after distant voting.]

Moved: Netherlands

Second: *none indicated*

≠

Vote:

For: 22

Against: 13

Abstentions: 7

Motion approved

≠

**Break for coffee 11:00**

≠

## **Workshops from 11:30**

**All outstanding business to be moved to next session.**

≠

Claudio announced all papers can be seen on the web site.

---

**Second Session**  
**April 5, 2006**  
**Wednesday**

---

There was none ----- there were many small workshops  
beginning at 11:30

---

**Third Session**  
**April 5, 2006**  
**Wednesday**

---

**Start 2:45 pm**

Moderator: Pat Patfoort  
Session on Finance and Administrative Motions

•  
Motion F-01-01 : **It is moved that the General Assembly approve Version 2.0 of the Financing Operating Procedures.**

Proposed by Canada;  
Seconded by USA.

Moderator: GA agrees to defer motion to tomorrow to enable reading of copy of procedures.

Motion F-01-04 No 1: **It is moved that people nominated for the position of Servas International Treasurer must have financial management or accounting experience.**

Proposed by Canada;  
Seconded by USA *this line not on Elena notes*

•  
Moderator: Agreed to proceed to vote.

Vote:

For: 39

Against : 0

Abstain: 1

Motion carried

Ireland and Czech Republic are missing

•  
Motion **F-01-04 No 2: If the Servas International Treasurer or Exco believe that the Treasurer cannot meet his/her commitments, a member of the Audit Committee will take over the role and step down from the Audit Committee for that year.**

Proposed by Canada;



Seconded by USA.

NZ: Confirms the accounting year is from Jan 1<sup>st</sup> to December 31<sup>st</sup>.

Britain: Are we asking for accounting experience for member of audit committee?

Canada: Yes, would need accounting experience.

Moderator: Agree to move to vote.

•

Vote:

For: 38

Against: 0

Abstain: 2

Motion carried.

**Motion F-01-04 No 3: If at any time there is no qualified Servas International Treasurer, then Exco may hire and pay a accountant.**

Proposed by Canada;

Seconded by Britain.

Moderator: Questions?

Germany: How much would be paid to accountant?

Canada: Up to Exco.

India: Why need for motion?

Canada: Working group spent a long time discussing. We would only proceed when no Treasurer.

Question (unidentified): How long would accountant be hired for?

Canada; Would hire for different time scales depending on needs.

Botswana: Proposes a **Friendly Amendment: [inserting word 'temporary' before accountant.]**

Seconded by Britain

Moderator: Move to vote on Friendly Amendment

Motion: To amend motion by inserting '...Exco may hire and pay a *temporary* accountant'

Vote:

For: 37

Against: 1

Abstain: 2

Friendly amendment carried.

Noted that Czech Republic and Ireland missing.

Moderator: Questions on amended motion?

Sri Lanka: Who is qualified for the job? Why hire someone? What about Audit committee taking on responsibility?

Canada: Audit Committee may have too many commitments. Therefore we need the possibility to act to hire an accountant if necessary.

Sri Lanka: Accepts Canada's answer.

Moderator: Moves to vote for amended motion:

Motion repeated: **If at any time there is no qualified Servas International Treasurer, then Exco may hire and pay a temporary accountant.**

Vote:

For: 38

Against: 0

Abstain: 2

Motion carried

Canada: Some time for questions is needed for other motions as they are more complicated.

•  
**Motion F-01-02 No 1: It is moved that the General Assembly ask the Servas International Treasurer, in conjunction with the Audit Committee, to research closing the Swiss bank accounts and opening accounts in a Euro country, and proceed accordingly.**

Proposed by Canada;

Seconded by Switzerland

Moderator: Questions on next motion?

USA: Only should need to use dollars in Euro country.

Switzerland: In Switzerland, can have account in any currency.

Canada: Main reason for motion is point of principle. France and Italy believe bank accounts should not be in Switzerland. It is not about money saving, about principle.

Kyrgyzstan: Why is this required. Are banks in Switzerland going to collapse?

Switzerland: Up to now it's been a Swiss bank. If account in Swiss currency, then accounts will be in Swiss currency. There are high exchange rates, as most money comes in to the account from euros and US dollars.

Treasurer: This is not moneysaving. It is a question of principle. Swiss banks are not transparent banks.

Malaysia: Since motion proposed by Italy and France, hearing about principle about not saving, what are the benefits for changing to a Euro country?

France: Difficult to express. It's linked to Servas foundation. Not about reputation of Swiss banks.

Moderator: It's not about hiding money in Switzerland.

Malaysia: I am not hearing about any benefits of moving.

Moderator: It's about the reputation Swiss banks have within Europe, as many people hide their money in Swiss banks.

Malaysia: I think our money is safe in a Swiss bank!

Germany: We are not talking about open banks.

Italy: Can we move to vote.

Moderator: Agrees to move to vote.

Vote:

For: 23

Against: 3

Abstain: 14

Motion carried.

•

**Motion F-01-02 No 2 It is moved that the General Assembly ask the Servas International Treasurer, in conjunction with the Audit Committee, to research Ethical Banks, identify those to which the SI accounts could be moved, and proceed accordingly.**

Proposed by Italy

Seconded by Britain

Moderator: Questions on motion?

France: This is more the idea of Italy than France

Italy: We don't make a profit from our money. We want to keep our savings to use in a better way, and use principles of an ethical bank. An ethical bank is not profitable, but helps groups with sociable affairs.

Botswana: Ethical bank is one that does not invest in the military.

Swiss: There is one ethical bank in Switzerland, but it is a very small one.

Britain: Would support motion. Ethical banks do not support the arms trade. Good example was with South Africa due to apartheid, when people moved banks where they had investment in South Africa.. Ethical banks do not exploit 3<sup>rd</sup> world countries.

Denmark: What they do also is support micro credit schemes in 3<sup>rd</sup> world countries.

Moderator: Proposes move to vote.

•

Vote:

For: 33

Against: 0

Abstain: 6

Motion approved.

Israel, Ireland, Czech Republic absent during vote.

•

**Motion F-01-03: It is moved that the address of SI in the Statutes be recorded only as 'Zurich, Switzerland'.**

Seconded by Canada

France: Concern behind the motion, is about address listed may become inaccurate.

Moderator: Questions?

Canada: Motion is based on lawyers advice.

Switzerland: Proposes a Friendly Amendment: an amendment of the statute.

The first sentence in the statutes:

Need to change to 'the legal seat :currently at Zurich Switzerland.

Peace Sec: It was suggested to the Peace Secretary that the legal seat might be in Geneva rather than Zurich as we do not have any resources or Servas person local in Zurich.

Moderator: Can someone else propose an amendment?

Switzerland: It would depend on what sort of resources or people you mean. We are in the French part of Switzerland.

Peace Secretary: Hilda is in Geneva; also Welcome Centre makes it more easy for NGOs to be registered than any other canton in Switzerland.

Moderator: In order to follow procedures, we need to go to amendment.

•

**Friendly Amendment to Motion: Change 'the legal seat currently at Zurich Switzerland'.**

Proposed by Switzerland;

Seconded by Austria

•

For: 38

Against: 0

Abstain: 2

Amendment carried.

Moderator: Any other person willing to move PC's amendment?

Peace Secretary: 2 years ago we did research on Switzerland. Geneva was concerned about outflow of NGOs from Switzerland. We have not registered changes to statutes for 20 years. We need to do this. The Welcome Centre is attached to the UN. Hilda is local and willing to help us. Therefore it is advantageous to be in Geneva. The lawyer concurred.

Singapore: Amendment was carried. What said by Peace Secretary is relevant. However don't believe it is relevant for this motion.

Moderator: Peace Secretary is proposing a different city.

Austria: We are already registered.

Switzerland: Associations do not have to be registered. Not optional in the commercial register, but in case of NGO it is optional. Some organizations do not have registration. There is a lot of confusion about it. SI is not registered in commercial register as far as I'm concerned.

Germany: Need to vote on amendment by France. If anyone brings anything else in should be looked at later.

Peace Secretary: The statutes were registered in 1972, and there have been many changes since. We need to update registration, also, appropriate for reasons given, it would be more convenient to be in Geneva.

Moderator: Are you suggesting we need to change the city from Zurich?

PC: Yes.

Turkey: Move to vote by Turkey

Germany: Move to vote on amended motion.

Moderator: Show of paddles to move to a vote:

Majority vote to proceed to vote.

Vote on amended motion;

**Motion F-01-03 repeated: It is moved that the address of SI in the Statutes be recorded only as 'legal seat currently at Zurich, Switzerland'.**

For: 32

Against: 2

Abstain: 5

Motion carried by more than 2/3 for

Sri Lanka missing.

•

**Vote to adjourn meeting.**

Proposed by Canada;

Seconded by USA

Vote:

For: 21

Against: 9

Abstain: 0

**Session finished 3:40 pm**

---

**First Session  
April 6, 2006  
Thursday**

---

**Start time: 9:10**

≠

Moderator: Julie Dotsch

Moderator: Announcements

Moderator: Thanks to the people who prepared for the GA.

To Exco for their work, especially, to Gary.

Thanks to the Askov group who helped prepare and organize Day Zero to help EGA be a peaceful event.

Thanks to the Agenda Working Group who prepared for the EGA and organized it.

Thanks to all of the Subject Working Groups, that prepared a method of combining subjects.

≠

Informal preparation for EGA: some actions in meetings worked more than others in achieving a peaceful EGA. Lot of work was needed to heal some of the hurt, but there are lots of examples of working one by one with each other. Thanks therefore to all those making compromises and making peace with each other.

≠

Some groups have been working over the past year between conferences to make the EGA happen.

≠

Malaysia: Thanks to the moderators as well.

≠

Moderator: Thanks to all of the Italian team for finding the venue, and making it a smooth conference.

≠

Moderator: Thanks to Pat Patfoort for her excellent presentation on conflict resolution this morning.

≠

General Secretary: Thanks to the Secretariat – Laura Ragucci, Vibeke Matorp, Marisa Contini, Elena Paxia and David Dasher.

≠

Moderator: Show of paddles to give Chris Patterson (CP) (NZ) speaking rights.

≠

Show of paddles confirms.

---

*Below this line, to the next line and statement this information was not heard*

Moderator: Presentation by CP on Distant Voting (DV)

**Distant Voting Motion 1 for GA Latina 5<sup>th</sup> April 2006**

**This motion, part of Agenda item NZE-002, is to amend the Servas International Statutes to establish Distant Voting as a procedure for decision making by the member groups of Servas International between meetings of the General Assembly.**

This amended version of the motion reflects changes agreed in the Distant Vote workshop. The changes to clauses 4) and 7) and some minor word substitutions have been made following the legal advice received by Exco on the Distant Vote motion. Italy has confirmed that the motion incorporates the intent of agenda item ITA-009.

The amendments to the motion are shown like this: **additions** and **~~deletions~~**.

The second motion to adopt an initial set of **Servas Regulations for Distant Voting** has been considered and revised by a subgroup of the workshop and will be presented if this motion is adopted. A copy of Motion 2 and the revised Servas Regulations for Distant Voting follow after Motion 1.

### **Motion 1:**

**Move that the motion as amended be adopted:**

That the Servas International Statutes be amended as follows:

- a/ That section VI of the Statutes be renamed "**Voting at Meetings**".
- b/ That the following be added to the Statutes as a new section VII **Distant Voting**

"VII Distant Voting

- 1) The member groups of Servas International may **make decisions** ~~pass resolutions~~ affecting Servas International between meetings of the General Assembly using the following Distant Voting process.
- 2) Each member group of Servas International shall have one vote on each **motion resolution** to be decided by the Distant Voting process. Votes may be cast by post mail or electronically using a verifiable voting process.
- 3) The Distant Voting process shall not be used to amend the Statutes or to vote on the dissolution of Servas International.
- 4) **In each calendar year between each General Assembly at least one Distant Vote shall be held to vote on the annual accounts, auditor's report and any changes to the budget.**

**At least one Distant Vote shall be held each year, the Annual Distant Vote, to vote on the annual accounts and auditor's report.**

- 5) The Distant Voting process may be used to vote on:
  - a) ~~urgent~~ matters ~~that need~~ to be decided ~~resolved~~ before the next meeting of the General Assembly;
  - b) a motion ~~resolution~~ to suspend or remove from office any officer of Servas International;
  - c) the election of officers to fill Executive Committee or other Servas International vacancies by secret vote;
  - d) motions ~~resolutions~~ arising from decisions of the General Assembly.
- 6) No later than two months after a General Assembly the Executive Committee shall publish a schedule of proposed Distant Votes up to the next General Assembly. The closing date for the votes shall be determined as follows:
  - a) the first Distant Vote cannot be earlier than six months after the General Assembly;
  - b) the next Distant Votes shall be at least four and no more than eight months after the preceding Distant Vote;
  - c) the last Distant Vote cannot be later than six months before the next General Assembly.

**A scheduled Distant Vote shall be cancelled if no motions have been received.**

An additional Distant Vote may be held between Annual Distant Votes. The closing date for the vote shall be at least four and no more than eight months after the preceding annual Distant Vote and at least six months before or after any meeting of the General Assembly.

- 7) A motion for inclusion in the next Distant Vote may be submitted to the President when requested by at least one tenth of the member groups (represented by their National Secretaries), or by any member of the Executive Committee. All motions submitted by member groups must be sent to the President at least six months before the scheduled closing date for the vote to be included in a Distant Vote.

The Executive Committee shall determine items to be voted on under Sub Clauses 5a), 5b) and 5c).

- 8) In addition to Clause 7, the General Assembly may specifically authorise a committee or working group to prepare and submit motions ~~resolutions~~ to be voted on by the Distant Voting process.
- 9) The Distant Voting process shall include three voting options for each motion ~~resolution~~, "support/yes", "against/no" and "abstain".
- ~~10) Resolutions to be decided by the Distant Voting process as well as the voting procedure to be used must be distributed to member groups in writing at least three months before the closing date for the vote.~~

- 11) **Motions shall be declared adopted as if they have been passed by a meeting of the General Assembly if they get a double majority:**  
**a) when the majority of the votes cast are "support/yes",**  
**b) AND when the "support/yes" vote is at least four tenths of the number of member groups allowed to vote in the Distant Vote.**

Resolutions receiving a majority of "support/yes" votes and "support/yes" votes from at least four tenths of the member groups eligible to vote in the Distant Vote shall be declared adopted as if they had been passed by a meeting of the General Assembly.

- 12) The procedures for the conduct of the Distant Voting process shall be governed by the Servas **Regulations Rules** for Distant Voting. The Servas **Regulations Rules** for Distant Voting may be amended or replaced by a majority vote of the General Assembly."
- c/ That the current sections VII to IX of the Statutes be renumbered VIII to X and any references to them adjusted accordingly.

CP: I move to adopt amended Distant Voting motion as circulated. Deleted text is indicated, and new text is underlined in paper.

He described the second motion:  
details of who does what,  
when it needs to be done.

He described the third motion:  
gives authority to someone to have authority to run distant voting until next GA.

CP: Does anyone not understand the distant voting process?  
(no indication from GA)

Moderator: Motion No 1:

Motion: I move that the motion as amended be adopted  
**Distant Voting Motions for GA Latina 5<sup>th</sup> April 2006**

**These motions, Agenda Item NZE-002, amend the Servas International Statues to establish Distant Voting as a procedure for decision making by the member groups of Servas International between meetings of the General Assembly.**

**Motion 2 adopts regulations for the Distant Voting process.**

**Motion 3 provides for the appointment of an initial Distant Vote Administrator.**

Procedural Motion: That Chris Patterson be given speaking rights for the presentation of the Distant Voting motions.

These amended versions of the motions reflect changes agreed in the Distant Vote workshop. The changes to clauses 4) and 7) and some minor word substitutions have been made following the legal advice received by Exco on the Distant Vote motion. Italy has confirmed that Motion 1 incorporates the intent of agenda item ITA-009.

Note: The original Motion 1, with amendments shown, and the revised Servas Regulations for Distant Voting have been printed and distributed to delegates.



**Motion 1:**

*Note: This is a statute amendment and must receive "an affirmative vote of at least two thirds of those present and voting" to change the statutes.*

**Move that motion as amended be adopted:**

That the Servas International Statutes be amended as follows:

- a/ That section VI of the Statutes be renamed "**Voting at Meetings**".
- b/ That the following be added to the Statutes as a new section VII **Distant Voting**

"VII Distant Voting

- 1) The member groups of Servas International may make decisions affecting Servas International between meetings of the General Assembly using the following Distant Voting process.
- 5) Each member group of Servas International shall have one vote on each motion to be decided by the Distant Voting process. Votes may be cast by post mail or electronically using a verifiable voting process.
- 6) The Distant Voting process shall not be used to amend the Statutes or to vote on the dissolution of Servas International.
- 7) In each calendar year between each General Assembly at least one Distant Vote shall be held to vote on the annual accounts, auditor's report and any changes to the budget.
- 5) The Distant Voting process may be used to vote on:
  - a) matters to be decided before the next meeting of the General Assembly;
  - b) a motion to suspend or remove from office any officer of Servas International;
  - c) the election of officers to fill Executive Committee or other Servas International vacancies by secret vote;
  - e) motions arising from decisions of the General Assembly.
- 7) No later than two months after a General Assembly the Executive Committee shall publish a schedule of proposed Distant Votes up to the next General Assembly. The closing date for the votes shall be determined as follows:
  - a) the first Distant Vote cannot be earlier than six months after the General Assembly;
  - b) the next Distant Votes shall be at least four and no more than eight months after the preceding Distant Vote;
  - c) the last Distant Vote cannot be later than six months before the next General Assembly.

A scheduled Distant Vote shall be cancelled if no motions have been received.

- 7) A motion for inclusion in the next Distant Vote may be submitted to the President when requested by at least one tenth of the member groups (represented by their National Secretaries), or by any member of the Executive Committee. All motions submitted by member groups must be sent to the President at least six months before the scheduled closing date for the vote to be included in a Distant Vote.
- 8) In addition to Clause 7, the General Assembly may specifically authorize a committee or working group to prepare and submit motions to be voted on by the Distant Voting process.
- 9) The Distant Voting process shall include three voting options for each motion, "support/yes", "against/no" and "abstain".

~~10) Resolutions to be decided by the Distant Voting process as well as the voting procedure to be used must be distributed to member groups in writing at least three months before the closing date for the vote.~~

- 11) Motions shall be declared adopted as if they have been passed by a meeting of the General Assembly if they get a double majority:
  - a) when the majority of the votes cast are "support/yes",

- b) AND when the "support/yes" vote is at least four tenths of the number of member groups allowed to vote in the Distant Vote.
- 12) The procedures for the conduct of the Distant Voting process shall be governed by the Servas Regulations for Distant Voting. The Servas Regulations for Distant Voting may be amended or replaced by a majority vote of the General Assembly."
- c/ That the current sections VII to IX of the Statutes be renumbered VIII to X and any references to them adjusted accordingly.

### **Regulations for Distant Voting**

The revised version of the regulations reflects changes needed to accommodate the revisions made in the motion to add the Distant Voting section to the statutes.

The revised regulations have been distributed to delegates.

**Motion 2:** (to be considered if Motion 1 is accepted)

That the **Servas Regulations for Distant Voting** as revised and circulated be adopted.

### **Appointment of a Distant Vote Administrator for the Transition Period**

**Motion 3:**

**That the General Assembly authorize the Executive Committee to appoint a Distant Vote Administrator to be responsible for organizing the Distant Voting process during the transition period until the next General Assembly.**

•

Netherlands: **Move to adopt Statutes as presented.**

Seconded by Sweden.

*Above this line the tape was not heard*

---

*At this point the tape for this day was able to be heard for the first time.*

*Some voices were not heard or they were very weak.*

*Happily, Julie's voice was quite good, but not as strong as usual.*

≠

Moderator: Is discussion required? Is GA ready to vote on this motion?

•≠

Canada: Thought we were going to have questions.

•

Ireland: No 6) Is this for things coming up in an emergency, or foreseen?

•≠

CP: Reason for changing to a published schedule of published votes is because it is hard to say when they are. We (all contributors) did not see this as being a fast process. We built into it time to distribute information to member groups before the vote. Maybe one in March / April, one Sept / Oct. this allows notice, as with GA.

•≠

Ireland: Assumed would be for things not able to wait to GA.

•≠

CP: Typically six opportunities a year.

*To this point voices could only be heard occasionally, and they were weak.*

•≠

Kyrgyzstan: By giving support to distant vote, do I understand it will be superior to GA? What is the use of a GA, if there is a distant vote.

•≠  
CP: Distant vote is not superior to GA: It cannot be used to change statutes as in 3). Cannot be used to wind up Servas. Distant vote, as in 11), has the effect of a decision of GA if a majority of votes cast for the motion, and 40% of member votes have voted for the motion. Therefore there is a high step for a vote to have the same power as the GA.

•  
Germany: How long a time frame from beginning to end of voting process?

•≠  
CP: 2 steps: Information about DV sent out 3 months before vote.  
Advice from lawyer says 1/10 can support DV to request a vote.

Kyrgyzstan: Question not answered.

Moderator: Repeats question

CP: Invites Kyrgyzstan to read answer.

Kyrgyzstan: This doesn't answer

≠  
Moderator: We are not getting arguments of whether to support or not.

•≠  
CP: 5 b and c. Distant vote is equivalent to GA if the vote is strong enough. If the number of members groups voting for motion is high enough, then it will be the same as a GA. Most of decision as EGA, where 39 / 40 people are supporting, would be carried. Where votes have been 20 /25, would not have the same power as GA.

•≠  
Germany: Important deadline is how long vote will be open from beginning to end because a very important decision.

•≠  
CP: Those timetables are set out in the regulations in the second motion. These give the information.

≠  
Moderator: Additional copies will be circulated.

•≠  
Malaysia: Need to clarify 11 b). How did working group come to 4 /10s of vote as opposed to the usual majority.

•≠  
CP: Have proposed a double majority. Two questions:

First test simple majority, which is a

Second test is 40% or 4/10s of member groups in total.

In DV, delegates do not have to attend a GA, so need to have a test that a large enough number of member groups are voting to have meaning. Therefore decisions will be the same as GA.

No. 11 only applies to motions to give same weight as if passed by GA.

≠  
Argentina: What if 40% are for and 55% are against.

≠  
CP: If simple majority. If more votes for than against, test one. Second test to ensure that proportion of all member groups is counted, as well as simple majority.

•≠  
Singapore: Same point # 11). Some confusion – would be helpful if there was an example. A number example.

*Tape very weak*

•≠

CP: Take 100 countries as an example. If 70 sent in their vote, of those 36 said yes, and 34 said no. Not passed, as a majority, but doesn't pass second test of needing 4/10s. Would need 40 or more to ensure motion is carried to ensure good level of support. If 50 voted for and 20 were against, it would be passed. It will be up to Exco to decide if there is sufficient support or not on any DV. If 35 people voted, and 1 said no, Exco would see strong support from those voted. But it would not be the same as a GA vote, as not over 40 people who have voted. But, Exco would see strong support, and would prepare a motion for the next GA. *Tape fading in and out.*

≠

Austria: Is it passed in last option.

Moderator: It passes test a) but not b). Statutes say that member groups must follow motions of GA. As wouldn't follow b), it would not be the equivalent of a GA decision.

•≠

Singapore: If the real objective test is part b), there is clarity that it has passed. I do not see the necessity of point a) unless.....

≠

CP: If all 100 voted, and 41 voted for, and 39 against, do not have a majority.

•≠

France: Who is going to say what is 40% if not clear how many people as members?

*Tape fading could not hear CP answer*

Moderator: Reminder look at motion number one.

•≠

Netherlands: It took a lot of time to understand in workshops yesterday.

•≠

Denmark: Point 7) If one member of Exco can call for a Vote, isn't reason for going solo, and need.

•≠

CP: Distant Vote has a schedule.

≠

Moderator: I'm just trying to be sure that everyone understands. She read #7

≠

Canada: 7) Is it one member of Exco can request a DV?

≠

Denmark: It should be a majority of Exco members.

≠

Moderator: Reminder that CP represents a workshop. A reminder that motions were not developed by Chris alone.

•≠

Germany: It is important that questions are answered such as Canada's

•

CP: Because Distant Vote is used to receive accounts, will be DV each year. May be a second DV. Doesn't say can call a DV, but saying can put an agenda item on DV. Right is same as for EXCO members as putting item to

GA. It is the same rule for a DV as a GA. The principle is that of the statute.

•≠

Britain: Will be supporting motion. Likes the double check, it fits in with more democratic processes. It fits in with securing 2/3rds majority for important decisions. Already have firmly embedded concept that 2/3 is important. The Askov group looked at the DV; was very confused at first when reading, but motion now makes it very clear. Will vote for the motion.

•≠

Botswana: We need more clarity. CP gave verbal explanation of time frame. But this is not in document, in motion. Would be helpful to have this information shared, so clear what time frame will be used. *Very weak*

•≠  
Moderator: Need to hear from speakers, and then to make sure people have time to discuss, as an option we could leave to after break.

≠  
Argentina: Majority of 4/10s requirement: Could be put as needing 80% participation in order to validate the vote. Could be more understandable.

≠  
CP: The reason for 4/10s is to follow legal advice. Can it be used within GA for those members not able to attend?

•  
Hungary: I think we should include 80% of participation, 80% of countries should vote to carry the motion

•  
CP: Only for use in DV, not for use in GA.

≠  
Moderator: First time “we don’t understand” so now Singapore may speak.

•≠  
Singapore: Wished to object about high majority needed. It looks good on paper, but experience is that countries don’t communicate.

•≠  
CP: We agree it is an issue, originally we had 50%, and then dropped it to 40% to be in line with numbers at the GA. Could easily changed the number if necessary.

•≠  
Treasurer: 2 points. Friendly amendment to motion 1) to change may, to will.

•  
Singapore: Point of order. Treasurer asking for an amendment – only delegates can do that.

•≠  
Treasurer: No 7) If members not paying fees, members ship drops.

•≠  
CP: Prefer not to change wording from may.  
Member groups decided at GA. Therefore DV cannot decide if a member or not.

Treasurer: In statutes, that can decide between GA.  
Unknown: 80% majority – discussed in working group. Discussed that 80% should participate, and agreed this was a very high hurdle. Therefore 4/10s is a smaller hurdle than 80%

≠  
CP: Agree with Treasurer that does need decision of GA to decide on who is a member, and who can vote.

Ireland asked; Could Distant Vote be used to admit or refuse a member.

CP: Answer is yes, if vote threshold passed. Will not have to wait until GA for new member to join.

•≠  
Switzerland: it is very difficult to have all the groups participating. 40% was a compromise in the group.

•≠  
CP: it is a decision of the GA in regards to membership. Ireland has asked if the distant vote could be used to admit a new member. The answer is yes.

Kyrgyzstan: *could not be heard on tape*

•≠

Turkey: Calling for vote.  
Seconded by Indonesia.

•≠

Botswana: Point of order. No answer to question about time frame about amendment.

•≠

Moderator: Motion is on the floor. Check if accepted.

Show of paddles for voting for motion.

≠

Vote.

For: 38

Against: 0

Abstain: 3

Motion is carried.

Malawi absent

≠

CP: Carried in terms of statutes amendment. We clearly have 2/3 vote.

Applause

≠

A copy of the Regulations being distributed by Gary Sealey

•≠

Moderator: Second motion: **Regulations for Distant Voting process.**

Netherlands proposed motion.

Sweden second.

Moderator: Questions

•

Germany: Friendly Amendment (FA) **to clarify time for voting process, in order to set specific time for vote to be move.** Suggest 6 weeks when all votes be returned.

≠

Moderator: Need for CP to make presentation. We have motion but no second.

•≠

Moderator: Need to give CP permission to speak for Distant Vote Working Group. Friendly Amendment is delayed.

•≠

CP: Second motion relates to regulations – the detail of how DV will work. Regulations are more detailed.

--First section gives 7 principles on how to conduct DV. Principles will guide how to interpret regulations. Similar to GA. A Distant Vote Administrator (DVA) is to be elected:

- must not hold any other SI post.

- General Secretary will receive information about who in member countries will receive and cast the member vote.

- responsibility of member group to decide:

  - how to decide how member group votes.

  - time line, and operation for secret vote, and

  - someone who is not part of Servas to receive and count the vote.

  - appeal process,

  - description of when a vote is invalid, and

  - report on each vote.

    - How each member voted on each item to see

    - who voted for what.

It is the same process as the GA

≠

Germany: Why not have elections after break at 11:30? We can continue tomorrow.

≠

Moderator: After the break we will come back to next topic – host list.

Chris Jones : Will circulate list of candidates and the voting procedures. after break. Report from Nominations Committee. Agrees to circulate before the break.

≠

Moderator: I have been told the workshop convener is unable to create a motion. Does anyone want to make a motion to continue current motion and change the agenda

≠

Netherland: **Moves to change the agenda to continue DV .**

Seconded: Turkey

≠

Canada: what are we voting on

≠

Moderator: Motion is to continue current discussion after break, and delay election of officers.

≠

Vote

For: 8

Against: 24

Abstain: 11

Motion not carried.

*Though the count is 43, the reason was not addressed on the tape.*

≠

Moderator: Singapore has something important to say before elections.

Please bring this up after the coffee break.

≠

President: Does anyone have any problems with publishing the names of the participants on the website?

**Coffee Break 11:00**

---

**Second Session  
April 6, 2006  
Thursday**

---

**Session resumes 11:40**

≠

Moderator: Chris Jones

Moderator: Section 6 of Statutes lays out election procedure.

•≠

Singapore: I asked to speak before the election. This was agreed.

Draw attention to GA that a statutory requirement before election, referring to statutes. Section 4, 3c).

It is important the GA review and pass two things. One being the financial statement by EXCO treasurer, and Audit report. Why is it important? It is a Statutory Requirement, and also to resolve issues that need to be resolved before election. *Tape very, very weak*

≠

Moderator: I must rule and if my ruling is not to your liking you may challenge. I don't see in statutes, that this is stated in statutes. I understand the sentiment and point. I rule we need to proceed with the agenda.

≠

Any challenge? Process is before vote taken on. Then challenger and chair.

•≠

Singapore: Delegates of GA have certain inalienable rights. Rules of procedure *more words were spoken but could not be heard*

•≠

Moderator: Why is the ruling not correct. Statutes do not specify whether before or after the election.

•≠

Singapore: Have taken 5 years to resolve problems. We need it for common sense. Are we going to talk about lawyers at this stage?

≠

Moderator: My ruling is that I'm bound by the statutes. I see no specification about timing, about election timing and presentation of reports.

•≠

Vote on supporting ruling of moderator to proceed with election.

≠

Vote:

For: 29

Against: 8

Abstain: 5

Motion passed.

≠

Moderator: Does everyone GA have access to Procedures on Voting?

≠

Germany: Many people have applied for several different posts. How do we know who wishes to go for each post before voting.

≠

Moderator: We will allow new people who have been nominated to speak for the nomination and we will not proceed to the vote for the next position until I announce the results.

•≠

Moderator: Positions: A list of committees first. Some work has been done on which committees to be elected, which appointed.

-SI statues say elections are to be by secret vote.

-When a tied vote, President will not use his casting vote. If we had a tied vote, and President vote used his casting vote – GA would know how he voted, so not secret.

-If tied vote, then would meet with them and see if we can have a solution.

-Candidates have already had details posted, and on power point.

-Any additional candidates will be asked for, by three calls to GA.

-Then we will ask for candidates from bottom of list to top, if they wish to stand to allow for removal of name.

-All candidates will be given time for 2 minute presentation.

-If not present, someone can speak for them.

-If only one candidate, can be elected by affirmation.

-If no candidates receives more than half vote, top two will be voted for again.

-Pat will be assisted by Claudio and Wynn (Australia). *The balloting committee*



- Counting will be done in the next room.
- Every candidate can appoint a scrutineer to ensure fairness.
- The Balloting Committee will have the final decision.
- If instructions are clear on form, instructions are to count it in.
- When a balloting decision is made, I will announce it in GA as soon as I can without interrupting a nominee's presentation.

Questions?

≠

Sweden: A motion passed that candidates for EXCO meet job requirements.

≠

Moderator: Will ask candidates what their qualities are that meet job description.

≠

Moderator: Power point does not have additional names. Will be asked.

≠

Canada: Are we appointing conveners of committees?

≠

Moderator: I am unclear as to which are to be appointed or elected. Will need to decide as we go through.

≠

Botswana: How many members on each of the committees.

≠

Moderator: After we have worked through list.

≠

Australia: Is what we have decided so far to be considered?

≠

Canada: Can we assume for this election, we have the same Exco.

≠

Moderator: Can chair of nominations committee have speaking rights

Show of paddles for Frits Stuurmann (FS). He has speaking rights

≠

FS: Put Pramod Kumar on screen as General Secretary.

≠

Moderator: Lets add positions as we go through.

≠

Germany; Why is Bibendra still on the list?

≠

Moderator: Anyone opposed to removing Bibendra from the list?

Show of paddles if opposed. No one opposed,

≠

Singapore: How are some decisions relevant, and others are not. When do they apply?

≠

Moderator: I think this body decides makes the decision when a thing is relevant or not.

≠

Botswana: The understanding is that changes to the statutes don't apply until next year.

≠

Moderator: Any additions for nomination as President. Calls three times.

≠

Nominations closed. Vladimir you will have 2 minutes to explain why you are the best person for the job.

≠

Vladimir: I accept nomination for position to be President for some friends and also because of strong feeling of Servas was managed very difficult and we spent too much money for it. Feel that done by

people. Now understand by rules of GA and Assembly. Still have a vision that we can cancel this model of development of Servas. Don't understand why the organization which rules that I can explain in interview in half an hour, has to have such difficult rules. I would like to stop building like a house with many rooms, and would like to put the ruling of Servas to be in a house like a tepee tent. Like tepee tents around the world. And I would like to lead it. I understand it is hard work to do now, but maybe you will vote for me because I have beautiful long hair, a symbol of motion against war and establishment.

≠

Peace Sec – Gary Sealey: Thanks to nominators. I believe in this project. In EGA and the future of the Servas project. I believe in respect, diverse community, and in good projects. Work hard, have fun. Several candidates have been seen. I welcome all of them to work with me for success. For 15 years I've worked in the community field. I can work at community and at the international level. I would like to help promote respect for community, avoid time wasting squabbles, and celebrate success, expand buddy system, and help volunteers. The first task after election is to talk. Please help me deliver!

≠

Moderator: Asks for ballot papers to be distributed.

≠

Moderator: Number of delegates counted for the record:

42 voting delegates in the room.

Please ignore space on ballot paper to record name of country.

≠

Moderator: Checks if everyone has had the report from the Nominations Committee

≠

Moderator: Has everyone had their ballots collected?

≠

•

Moderator: Move to vote to receive the report of Nominations Committee

Proposed by Canada

Seconded by Kyrgyzstan

*There is conversation from the floor that can not be heard.*

≠

Vote

For: 42

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion unanimously carried

≠

Moderator: Vice President nominations.

Moderator: Reads out nominations

John Kinene

Abbay Shaha

≠

Moderator: Any further nominations for position as VP from the floor.

≠

Vladimir removes his nomination.

≠

Asks GA three times. No response. Nominations therefore closed.

•≠

Moderator: Election result

Gary 35,

Vladimir 7.

Gary Sealey elected. Long applause

Moderator: Thanks to people who have put their names forward. Thank you Vladimir.

≠

Moderator: asks to confirm that all candidates are still willing to stand.

≠

Austria: 2 candidates also are only candidates for Treasurer. If one gets elected, then only one for Treasurer. Could we ask if they have a preference?

≠

Botswana: Unfair question – cannot ask candidates who are not here.

≠

Moderator: Can GA agree to approved candidates as listed?

GA approves.

≠

Moderator: Asks for nomination papers on screen.

Is anyone speaking for John Kinene.

≠

Moderator confirms that he should go in reverse order. He apologizes.

≠

Moderator reads out nomination paper for John Kinene.

≠

Abhay Shaha: Hello! I have been a member of Servas since 1992; my family have hosted. My sons have attended conference. I have been a coordinator for my state for many years, also a delegate for Barcelona. I was on the Development Fund Committee for 3 years. I am active in Servas, and have time for social activities. I work with young people and old people. I feel I can be an officer to be good team member with Exco members. Election is a difficult task for you, but you have to choose one of the three. In Barcelona, I was nominated for PC, but now I ask for your vote.

*Tape very weak.*

≠

Anna: Taking the point that Eva (*from Canada*) made, asking about more than one position, I could be better in the other position, so now I withdraw as VP for this position.

≠

Kofi from Toga: Does anyone know him? No response.

Moderator: Reads out nomination form. Thanks Kofi for his nomination.

≠

Moderator: Confirms that Vladimir has withdrawn.

≠

Treasurer Omer Ozkan: Withdraws his nomination for VP.

≠

Moderator: Next candidate Mary Jane

*There is tapping on microphone as if checking to see if it is working.*

Mary Jane: I'm from US Servas. You have received my nomination paper. I've never seen so much goodwill as at this EGA. I will need a lot of willing workers if elected, in order to strengthen nation groups and regional meetings. I have organized mentor ships between national groups. EG South America. Role of President is to have willing volunteers. I have a willing team around the world who I have met here. Thanks for your consideration.

*It was not working. Something was not working none of above was recorded on tape.*

≠

Alex Dali: I can use my skills better in finance. I withdraw my nomination.

*Tape very weak here.*

≠

Moderator: Election for VP has four candidates: Abhay, Mary Jane, John, and Kofi.  
Ballot papers distributed.

*Moderator is heard but not a strong signal on tape.*

≠

Nominations for General Secretary.

Bibendra and Pramod

≠

*A comment from a woman was so very weak it is not heard as words only a murmur.*

Malaysia: Suggesting some interference in the election process. A formal complaint about election process that interference forced some candidates to withdraw. *Not heard on tape though there was blank space it might have occupied.*

Pramod: Good morning friends. Two minutes is too short for a new candidate to say what I am. You should feel free to talk about my nomination paper. My actions speak about me at the EGA. Some of you have seen me as Convener of Subject working groups. The result has been before the EGA. I have worked with teams in a harmonious manner. Differences have been resolved. If elected I would like more young members. More young people in the organization are needed. *Part of this on tape*

•

Vote for Vice President

John 1

Abhay: 15

Mary Jane: 26

Mary Jane elected as VP

Devendra from Kyrgyzstan: I have opened up new Servas chapter in 2003. Details in nomination paper. Half of members have not attended because of visa problem. I would want to work on this, and how Servas operates.

Moderator: Two candidates therefore, ballot papers circulated to GA

Moderator: Move to Treasurer. Two candidates listed. Calls for any more nominations for the position three times. No response. Nominations closed.

Alex: I have been working in Servas for 8 years. I have courage in decision making. It is clear that finance rules are important. I have a Business Administration degree. I do accounting in my company. There is a deadlock in financial operation procedures. Servas money should be used for Servas purposes, not for cronyism. There is a need for good hand over of software from one Treasurer to another. GA receives a financial statement each year. It should be properly audited externally and internally. Language is important between banks. I can speak in Spanish. Finally, I'm still working very hard on the audit committee and to me. I want to make known that Marcus and Collette were responsible for introducing a better procedure.

Omer: I know all of you. A difficult two years. In beginning really start. So many problems and difficulty. Alex help and Marcus and Collete. But really difficult. First EG. Tried to do my best, but haven't been able to do all task because of problems. Sometimes I work as VP, sometimes ICT. Tried to give positive attitude throughout all Servas. Thanks for all those who have supported me. If not elected, I will help Alex. *Very weak sound.*

≠

Vote for General Secretary

1 blank vote

8 for Devendra

33 Pramod

Pramod is elected as GS

≠

Ballot papers distributed.

Moderator: Peace Secretary.

•

Singapore: Wishes to make a formal complaint that some pressures were used for this post for people to withdraw.

≠

Moderator: Your comments have been registered.

Moderator: Asks for any further nominations for posts. Asks three times. No response.

≠

Abhay: Regarding Peace, I have come from the country of Buddha and Gandhi. My father was a freedom fighter and worked with Gandhi. I work with trust and tolerance, and feel I can achieve these for the betterment of Servas. *Very weak sound*

Nandee: No faith leaders All faiths say good unto others. Didn't know was being nominated, but accepted. Background, I have been involved in liberation, and have privilege to \_\_\_\_\_. I worked in World Bank as consultant on development. I am work in peace. I know what peace is. I hope you have confidence in me.

•≠

Results of election for Treasurer

Alex: 19

Omer: 23

Ballot papers distributed for Peace Secretary and collected.

Host list coordinator:

≠

Moderator: John Kinene and Anna Flammini. Calls for further nominations three times. No response.

≠

Anna: I decided to withdraw from other position, as fortune to be in contact with a lot of people. Have verified that help is at hand. Not just important that we all communicate. "want to stress importance that even if I don't know all technical aspects, I know help is available. I also always reply to emails.

Moderator: Reads out John Kinene's nomination paper.

•≠

Vote for Peace Secretary

John: 1

Abhay Shaha: 11

Nanda 27

3 blank votes

Election of SI Newsletter.

≠

Moderator: Asks 3 times for additional nominations for post. No response.

Nominations closed.

≠

Michael Johnson: I have spoken to Jane, and would like to work with her as a graphic designer. She has been doing a great job, and I would like to support her. I withdraw my nomination.

≠

Jane: SI news, I have been doing for last couple of years. Hope you have liked what you have read. Please, anyone doing this needs SI news, please let us know numbers required, and addresses. I brought 2006 letters, one per country.

•≠

Results from Host List Coordinator  
Anna 42 votes.  
John: 0  
Anna elected as Host List Coordinator

Election of Archivist.

≠  
Germany: We nominate Grant Barnes. He has worked in area of international human rights.  
Moved by Germany  
Seconded by Botswana.

≠  
Any additional nominations. Asked three times. No response.

≠  
Grant Barnes (US): I have been a member of Servas since 1997. Board member or legal adviser since 1986. My current position is Board Chair (or Nat Sec). I have a long term perspective on Servas. I would like to work with Antonie Fried. With ICT committee to ensure electronic record of important documents, including minutes to ensure complete transparency. Also consult with university archives and ≠human rights organization to ensure a permanent home for Servas 50 plus years of history. I would like national archives to include as complete history of Servas International.

≠  
Honora (US): I have many of the same comments as Grant. Antonie Fried has been doing the job forever, maybe not quite forever. I checked with her three times to be really sure that she wished to give up the position. This is my third General Assembly. My wishes are the same as Grant B. I have checked with Claudio and Omer re concerning having all the past documents digitized and put on a web site, and having a good search engine, to be able to find information when needed. I am a consummate organizer, and I love doing it. I really see no reason why Grant and I could not work well together. I would like to go into the history of Servas, and consolidate the writings of past and present leaders. I am a published writer. I can travel to chase this information using frequent flyer points and my own resources. I'm retired and have the time to do the job.

≠  
Ballot papers distributed.

Singapore: Committees haven't completed their business yet. We should not proceed.

•≠  
Canada: **Moves that GA approve ICT 2 nominations.**  
Seconded Norway.

≠  
Austria: Omer is second person on ICT and he has been elected Treasurer  
Motion withdrawn.

•  
NZ: **Propose that GA can make appointments to any positions that are vacant at the end of GA.**

Moved New Zealand  
Second Australia

≠  
Botswana; GA doesn't always make decisions about convener and how many people can be on the committee. There are two things we don't know.

≠  
Singapore: We voted to continue election. How can we agree to suspend election?

≠

NZ- Intention not to abandon elections. would like to continue. Motion is in case of not completing election.

•

India: I want to know why no election for youth coordinators.

•

Moderator: Motion not to postpone election, but if do not complete, that EXCO can appoint to fill them.

•

India: Point of order---How can we stop the GA.

≠

Moderator: We are not stopping. We are closing the session. I hope we can come back to the committee structure.

•

Vote on motion.

For: 31

Against: 5

Abstentions: 6

Motion carries.

•≠

Argentina: Thanks to Exco members who have worked so hard, and to all those who have contributed.  
*Long standing ovation.*

•≠

Result of election for Archivist.

Grant: 24

Honora: 17

Blank ballot paper: 1

≠

Moderator: asks for motion to go on with election or go on trip.

•≠

Turkey **propose continue with election**

Seconded India

≠

Moderator: removes motion, after clarifying that pm trip has been paid for.

≠

Moderator: Confirms Agenda Working Group will look at timetable to ensure elections can continue.  
Will advise GA after trip.

**Adjournment for lunch at 1:45.**

≠

Announcement:

≠

Claudio; Send Papers of workshops to:

[Egapapers@googlegroups.com](mailto:Egapapers@googlegroups.com)

•

Singapore: point of order.

---

**Tour**  
**April 6, 2006**  
**Thursday**

---

No meeting  
Took pre-planned tour

---

**Fourth Session**  
**April 6, 2006**  
**Thursday**

---

**Session started 7:10.**

≠

Moderator: Chris Jones

≠

Moderator: Next item is Appeals Committee.

We have enough members to start the meeting. He asked for absent members to be called to the Red room.

≠

USA: Job description from Thailand should indicate who can stand. Believe it shows that members should have held high positions in Servas.

≠

Moderator: Read out nominations received. Asked for further nominations three times.

Sri Lanka: Wishes to nominate Abhay Shaha (India). Abhay accepted.

Moderator: Closed further nominations.

≠

Australia: Read minutes. Have 3 members Holder of national or international members. should have legal experience. No current office holder

≠

Abhay: Accepted nomination. Didn't accept offer to speak.

≠

Moderator: Read out Danielle Lavallee's nomination paper to GA. Not here. Read from her nomination form as shown on power point front screen.

≠



Moderator: Asked GA if Alex Dali could have speaking rights to speak for Danielle.

≠

Alex: She has UN and UNESCO experience. A teacher. Would like to see her in Development Committee. In Australia would need 2 year membership.

≠

Britain: Speaks for Chris Slader. Hopes to use his experience with Exco and some difficult experiences. These are difficult times. It would have been helpful to him when he was President: Need to be independent from Exco.

≠Moderator: Reads out nomination form for Agnes Ibidunni.

Fritz: Could not communicate with her by email, and did not reply to communication.

≠

Moderator: Gurdev Singh Panu.

≠

Kyrgyzstan: Speaks on behalf of Gurdev. Unable to attend as he is not well. He was a Colonel in Indian Army 30 years. Lots of experience of conflict resolution. Would work hard in Appeals Committee.

≠

Julie Dotsch: Experience in handling conflicts, especially one culture to another, especially when relations break down. I am now the Deputy Secretary for Servas Canada; on board for 2 years. I have worked behind the scenes for 25 years. My skills are the ability to reach compromise in a peaceful way, as demonstrated in the EGA.

Moderator: Luigi Uslenghi.

*Sound too weak to hear words only murmur*

Italy: Luigi was here at weekend till Monday. Co-founder of Servas Italy in 1972. He has been involved since then. He attended many conferences. He has been with Switzerland Pathways. He is a very flexible and reasonable person.

≠

Moderator: SC Sundaraj Is anyone to speak for him? Nomination form on screen.

≠

Malaysia: Nominated himself. Forwarded nomination, I didn't receive a copy. Previously he has been Nat Sec, now Peace Sec. He attended conferences in past. Didn't say why not coming to EGA. I didn't know he was nominating himself until I saw the form.

≠

Moderator: Three ballot papers have been circulated to the delegates. Put one name on each ballot. The three names with highest votes will be elected.

≠

Moderator: Does roll call of delegates. 40 delegates present.

≠

Moderator: Development Fund Committee: read out list of nominees.

≠

Moderator: Asked three times for any further nominations. No response.

Alex Dali: Present Minutes from Thailand cannot have more than one person from same country. Had 5 people from \_\_\_\_\_ *could not hear location*

≠

Moderator: Show of paddles to check if 5 people for membership. Majority votes.

≠

*almost too weak to hear*

Susan P \_\_\_\_\_ from \_\_\_\_\_

Reads minutes from Thailand giving details of role of Development Committee

Singapore: Confirms terms were agreed in Thailand.

Alex Dali: Shows power-point presentation of Danielle Lavallee: Teacher, involved with different projects for UNESCO. Wishes to be involved in developing Servas in countries.

≠

Moderator: Frank Beraur.

≠

Germany: Frank lives in Germany, but is not member. Decision of Servas Germany that he will not be a member of Servas Germany. Unaware if he is a member of any other country.

≠

Moderator: Does anyone know if he is a member of Servas.

≠

Frits: He was only accepted by the nominating committee as he was NS in Singapore, and Area Coordinator even when he moved to Germany because they asked to continue as their AC.

≠

Singapore: There have been issues where Frank owes Servas Singapore money. Have been assured that SI Treasurer would pay. Nothing further to say.

≠

Malaysia. He was Area Coordinator. We had 7 people, but he came in to shake up the country to make it get going.

≠

Moderator: The nominations committee accepted his nomination.

≠

President; Points out that nomination form shows that he comes from Germany.

≠

Germany: No indication where he is a member.

≠

Moderator: GA is aware of situation.

≠

Frits: Form does not say where you are a member. It only asks, where do you live.

≠

Austria: Stipulated we need to ensure no more than one member form each country. We need to know which county he comes from.

≠

Moderator: We have used more than 2 minutes debating on the candidate. Does GA wish to proceed to vote, or decide on validity of nomination. Who wishes to vote now?

≠

India: How can he be put forward if he is not a member of any country?

≠

Moderator: do you wish to vote on validity of this nomination?

Show of paddles: Majority to proceed to vote on rejection of nomination.

≠

Malaysia: Did Frank apply to be a member?

≠

Germany: Yes, we said no. He appealed to GA, and GA said no.

Canada: **I vote we reject the nomination.**

Seconded Ireland.

≠

Vote:

For: 28

Against 1

Abstentions: 11

Motion is carried. Nomination is rejected.

≠

Moderator: Sercan Duyhan He's absent.

*Distant words were said but not heard enough to record.*

≠

Moderator: Shekeen Aderonmu Awe (Gambia): Does anybody know or can speak for him. Nomination form is shown on screen. He read from it to the GA.

≠

Fritz: No contact from Shekeen to answer questions from Nominations Committee.

≠

Sercan: My apologies for being late. Life is possibilities. Coming here was a possibility but now is a reality. Development is creation. Creation should be two subjects. One is technical, the other is money. Committees and groups need team study – understanding and obligations.

Results from Appeal Committee election:

SC 2

Luigi 37

Julie 36

Gurdev 7

Agnes 0

Chris Slader 24

Danielle 0

Abhay 10

Successful: Luigi, Julie, and Chris S.

≠

Michael Johnson: Been in Servas 25 years, NS 13 years. AC 8 years. I have experience to do the job. I've been to 7 conferences. I would be happy to work with all other people who are at the conference, and Judy Shotton, who is a delightful person.

≠

Harald Seifert: many people know me. I've been to many conferences. I'm known as someone to recruit new members, new countries members. I'm involved in the Youth Committee at this conference. I've been a host list coordinator. I've helped revive Servas Russia.

≠

Sheldon Weeks: I also submitted CV. I have met lots of you. In terms of development funds, I have long experience. I raised over a million dollars in Papua, New Guinea over 7 years and doing evaluations, making sure the money is well spent.

≠

Moderator: Checked no one speaking for Dhruba. Read nomination form from Dhruba Prahhan.

≠

Judy Shotton: Anyone can speak for Judy?

≠

Julie S: Known Judy for 8 or 9 years. Done work in Israel. She is a Canadian, who lived in Israel 30 years. She has been very committed in building peace in Israel. Please look at her nomination form.

≠

Israel: Judy is a very distinguished person, very active. I will ask Chris to read what is written.

≠

Moderator: reads nomination form.

≠

Amir (Israel): She is one of the establishers of Servas Israel.

≠

Laura Ragucci: This is my first time speaking not typing. I have been active in Servas Argentina for 9 years as Peace Secretary, then Exco member after my first GA. Now I'm helping other people. I love to work, and love to work for Servas, and to continue working in an area I love, which is Servas.

≠

Ballot papers distributed and collected.

≠

Laura: Recommendation from Workshop was that Youth Project Mentor was not elected.

≠

Moderator: Audit Committee election. I know it's supper time.

≠

Moderator: 3 committee reps. 4 nominations.

≠

Moderator: reads names of nominees for Audit Committee. Asks for further nominations for audit committee.

≠

Question: Any specific requirements?

≠

Moderator: We don't have them. It is your job to select people whom you think would be able to do a capable job.

≠

LV: I have been a chartered accountant for 30 years. I am now working in a company as Accounts Chief. I would like to ensure just and fair accounts to GA.

≠

Florentio Gomez:

≠

Singapore: Thailand indicates Audit Committee is a 5 member Committee.

Minutes say it was 5 people elected in Thailand.

≠

Malaysia- How many people in the previous year?

≠

Moderator: 5 people.

Moderator: Asks GA if can accept all 4 people as candidates.

≠

USA: 3 active members. No numbers on Thailand. We can decide how many numbers.

≠

Malaysia: What are qualifications.

Singapore: This should be consistency. Same precedent to DFC. Needs to be done properly for all committees, not just as you please.

≠

Moderator: As I read the statutes GA is highest body in organization. You need to decide how many people

≠

Moderator: Do you need to hear qualifications for the committee.

Show of paddles to confirm. There is a consensus to hear the qualifications.

≠

Moderator: Anyone to speak about Florentio Gomez (Venezuela)

≠

Laura G: I understand he works for a bank. No idea if does the accounting. He has been active in his own country for a long time. He covers for the National Secretary.

≠

Moderator: Reads nomination form from Florentio Gomez shown on screen.

≠

Moderator: Rita Torsvik

≠

Norway: Rita was at the GA till yesterday. She is an experienced auditor, an experienced member of Servas. Gave strongest recommendation for her nomination. Nomination form shown on screen.

≠

Moderator: confirms she gave assistance to the audit committee before EGA.

≠

Miraslav from Poland.

Poland delegate spoke for him. Fully supported. Been in Servas since 1994. Very helpful and active PD=HD in economics. Speaks English and German.

≠

Alex: I have exchanged emails with him.. I would be a strong supporter of his nomination.

•

**Botswana: moves to accept all four.**

Seconded by Ireland.

Vote to accept all four candidates.

≠

For: 35

Against: 1

Abstain: 5

All four candidates accepted:

•≠

Result of elections:

Blank 7

Laura 33

Judy 36

Ahruba 2

Harold 25

Sheldon 34

Michael 29

Shekeen 0

Sercan 26

Frank 0

Danielle 13

Elected are Laura Judy Sheldon Michael Sercan

•

**Appeals committee**

**votes**

SC Sundararaj

2

Luigi Uslenghi

37

Julie Dotsch

36

Gurdev Singh Pannu

7

Agnes Olabisi Ibidunni

0

Chris Slader

24

Danielle Lavollee

0

Abhay Shaha

10

•

<b>Development Fund Committee</b>	<b>votes</b>
Laura Ragucci	33
Judy Shotten	36
Dhruba Pradhan, Nepal	2
Sheldon Weeks Botswana	34
Harald Seiffert	25
Michael Johnson	29
Shekeen Aderonmu Awe	0
Sercan Duygan	26
<del>Frank Berauer</del>	+
Danielle Lavollee	13

•

**Audit Committee**  
Miroslav Wasilevski, Poland  
Rita Torsvik, Norway  
Florentio Gomez  
L.V.Subramanian  
All accepted

**Meeting closes at 8:30**

---

**First Session  
April 7, 2006  
Friday**

---

**Session opens 9:15**

≠

Moderator: Chris Jones

•≠

Moderator: Open session: Final elections  
International Youth Coordinator election.

≠

Moderator: Calls three times for any additional nominations from the floor. None made.

≠

India: A Compact Disk was given to Omer for Swagata Sanyal.

Nomination paper was displayed on the front screen.

Moderator read the nomination aloud.

≠

Pablo Chufeni: We have discussed proposal groups during the week. We would like these proposals to now take formal shape. This is part of my own developing process. I would like the formal opportunity to continue with what I've started.

≠

Ballot papers distributed.

≠

India: Why not show the CD? You have no time? So you can see yourself

≠

Moderator: I don't believe they have the CD or knowledge of it.

≠

Peace Secretary: We are not aware of the CD.

The CD was found.

CD from Swagata Sanyal was shown to the GA. There was applause by GA.

≠

Ballot papers were collected.

≠

Moderator: International Youth Coordinator election. Calls three times for any further candidates.

≠

Turkey: Doesn't understand what Youth Project Coordinator is.

≠

Moderator: Typing error.

≠

Moderator: Frits reported Candidate yesterday. Committee unable to contact her.

≠

Moderator: Reads out nomination form for Shakeen Aderonmu Awe.

The form was shown on the screen.

≠

Ann Greenhough: I was 25 when I first became a Servas traveler; the same ages as our daughters. Servas has been part of our lives. Reason whole wealth of young people, as in the India CD. I hope these you people can appreciate. Step by step. We hope their involvement keeps the organization going. I've been to many conferences, I know many hosts. I think the way forward is to work with Pablo at bringing young people together as hosts. Please read my nomination form.

≠

Ballot papers were distributed.

Moderator: Results of International Youth Coordinator election.

Pablo: 36

Swagata Sanyal: 4

≠

Moderator: ICT committee.

It is the understanding that 2 persons will be appointed.

Job Descriptions and Statutes Committee

Canada: My understanding is that we need more than one member for ICT, but there is only one member standing. **I move that, as only one person is standing, they are elected by affirmation. Job Description and Statutes committee, they also are elected by affirmation. The nominations committee there are only two so I move that they are elected by affirmation.**

Secunder?

*Germany said something not able to be heard.*

Singapore: At last meeting, there was support for ICT to be elected.

*The voices above are very, very weak.*

•≠  
USA: Is there a ruling that if already on an elected committee, can you be on the Nomination Committee?  
Michael Johnson has been elected to the Development Committee.

Moderator: Result of Youth Project Coordinator  
Shakeen 7  
Ann 35  
Blank 4  
I declare Anne elected.

≠  
Botswana: Would urge YPC and YC to work closely with the two people who were interested in those posts.

•≠  
Moderator: Suggest we suspend elections at this time, move on and come back later.

≠  
Ireland: **Move to suspend elections until can answer questions posed.**

Germany: seconded

•≠  
NZ: Friendly Amendment: Could the proposal for nominations committee be clearer and they then make clear the rest of the criteria for other committees.

No second.

•≠  
President: Sect 3 of the statutes para 2: Reads out. The GA can say to EXCO that they may appoint the rest of the committees. It is up to the GA.

≠  
Moderator: Show of paddles on Ireland's motion.

≠  
Vote on motion:

For: 34

Against: 1

Abstain: 5

The motion carries.

≠  
Moderator: Working Group on SI Committees is considering 6 motions.

≠  
Canada: I am now speaking for Agenda Working Group on SI Committees as well as Canada. Page 10, in the agenda, has details.

≠  
Canada: The first agenda item comes from Canada – Policy Committee. Now Germany will speak to item. Germany was also in GA working group.

≠  
Germany: Reads out motion: USA, Germany and Canada joint motion.

Motion:  
**We direct Exco to set up a Procedures and Operations Committee made up of at least 3 members, within six months, to develop a Mandatory Operating Procedure Manual to include all procedures for the running of SI such as:**

- Financial Operating Procedures**
- Job descriptions for all SI Officers**
- Nomination, election and voting**
- Distant voting**



**-Criteria for General Assemblies  
to be recognized by the next General Assembly**

Proposed Germany,  
Seconded India

≠

India: Checks if it has to do with countries paying stamps.

Moderator:

Moderator: No it does not. Suggests all procedures and motions come to one Committee. If you wish to look at one procedure, it's in one place. Saves looking in different places.

≠

USA: I would like to support this idea because we have to keep going back to the minutes. So, this is a clarification of what this means so you don't have to keep going back to minutes. It's in one central place.

≠

Moderator: so everybody understands that this will be a distillation of every decision that has been taken.

≠

NZ: I would also like to support the motion, and wish to move to motion to vote.

≠

Moderator: I see no further speakers on the board. I'm going to move the vote.

For: 36

Against: 1

Abstain: 2

Motion carries.

There are absences.

*This count is not on Elena notes*

≠

Singapore: Proposes new combined motions from USA, India and Italy:

**Motion E-02-02**

**It is moved that the Appeals Committee be renamed to be the Conflict Resolution Committee, reporting directly to the GA, with a primary objective to mediate, and a secondary objective to arbitrate.**

Proposed Singapore,

Seconded NZ

≠

Moderator: Clarification of mediate and arbitration is not clear?

Mediation is, as I understand it, a process where both parties are consulted separately. They're then brought together and there is an attempt to reach a solution. If the process does not reach a solution and the parties still wish to continue, then the Appeals Committee will arbitrate, make a decision. Pat perhaps you would clarify for us.

≠

Pat: In mediation a mediator tries to help parties themselves reach a solution. If unable to do so, they let a third party make the decision.

≠

Moderator: That's arbitrate. Yes.

≠

Botswana: In mediation and arbitration an independent person is brought in.

• ≠

Vote for Appeals Committee motion above

Vote:

For: 38

Against: 0

Abstain: 3

Motion carries.

≠

Moderator: the motion planned was withdrawn because it will be covered later.

≠

Italy: Introduces motion E.02-05 on page 10.

•

**Motion E-02-05**

**It is moved that the Information and Communication Team be appointed by EXCO and not elected by the GA.**

Proposed Italy,

Seconded Switzerland.

•≠

Moderator: I have Singapore with a point of order.

Singapore: I believe that this motion and the next two motions are irrelevant in the light of what has just been passed. *[More was said – I could not hear it on the tape --HC]*.

≠

Germany: The operating procedures manual needs to be put together as to what has been decided so far. They will not make up new rules.

≠

Moderator: Confirms that the new motion is a change.

≠

Germany: I would like to know the background to the motion? Why do you want this?

•≠

Italy: Because now we have an elected ICT. It is a point of principle. We need a person very skilled. If they present themselves at GA, and we have only one on the list we have to approve them. But we don't know if they are skilled person. So, if appointed by EXCO, who make a good search for a skilled person. So, we think a technical committee should be appointed and not elected.

≠

Canada: Italy said what I was going to say

.≠

NZ: I would also repeat what Italy said, if necessary.

France: Communication is important. It has two parts, the technical part, but also the person. If we vote for the convener so we know the spirit of that man, Exco can then check the technical aspects.

•≠

Treasurer: NZ moved a motion, that if GA does not elect officers it gives power to Exco to appoint if not elected.

•≠

USA: I am looking at the Minutes of Barcelona. The recommendations of ICT were approved in Barcelona. ICT team was felt to be political. It didn't know what kind of information to give out – the information of EXCO or the information of somebody else? So, the content became a problem, and they agreed there should be a 3 person committee, independent of EXCO. I don't know how to put the two parts together – the technical part and the content part because of this situation.

≠

Denmark; Minutes say that the ICT needs to have a clear mandate from GA on what is wanted.

•≠

Germany: I will vote against it. I feel ICT has same status as other committees. I think we are going to have so many changes. I think for the future it is nice if we if we vote yes it will be part of EXCO only. And we cannot decide which way it will be for future. I feel we should leave it like it is now until the next GA. In three years time we will have a new basis for it.

•≠

Netherlands; Can this be a motion accepted by simple majority?

≠

Moderator: I believe by simple majority.

≠

Moderator: Calls for vote.

Motion repeated;

**It is moved that the Information and Communication Team should be appointed by Exco and not elected by the GA.**

•≠

Vote

For: 26

Against: 5

Abstain: 10

Motion carries.

≠

Botswana: I don't understand why, like many other organizations, we do not elect conveners, and then let them appoint committees. We waste so much time going through so much rigmarole when it could be so much simpler.

≠

Austria: Statutes say that the GA can elect committees, but nothing about conveners.

•≠

Moderator: Need to clarify E-02-04 and E-02-06. Withdrawn by Italy.

≠

India: Audit committee appointed by GA

•≠

**Membership and National group process.**

Moderator changes to Julie Dotsch.

≠

Moderator: Membership and National Groups. Is that group ready to make their presentation?

•≠

Canada: Speaking about Membership Group process. In the agenda Page 11, second section M-01.

There are Two motions, M01-01,

two motion M01-02,

one motion M01-03

≠

Germany: Withdraw motion M01.03. About membership fees.

≠

Canada: Withdrawn due to advice from lawyer.

≠

Israel:

Motion:

**It is moved to amend the Statutes of SI Section 11 paragraph 1 to replace the number 10 with number 18. The new statutes will read:**

**“Any national Servas group containing 18 or more hosts (including day hosts) may become, or be reinstated, as a member group of SI by a majority vote of the GA.”**

Proposed Israel,

Seconded Britain

•≠

NZ: Why choose the particular number 18?

What is the status of the member groups who currently have 10 to 17 members? I would move that any member group who fall below the 18 remain member groups, but no new ones.

**Friendly Amendment: (any member group that is currently below 18 members remain member groups. But not new ones)**

≠

Seconded by France.

Seconded because I do not wish to withdraw activity.

≠

Moderator: only entertain 'I don't understand'

≠

NZ: If qualify by giving over the limit, should remain at the limit.

≠

Moderator. Suggests move to FA vote

≠

Malaysia: Please clarify the number.

≠

Moderator: Confirms 18

≠

Germany: Suggests should be 18 hosts. The motion says hosts.

≠

Moderator: Reminds GA of rules of order, and 'I don't understand' means you did not understand the meaning and you need it explained so you can make a good vote.

≠

Austria: I don't understand where this would go in the original motion.

≠

Moderator: Right now we are working on the amendment, afterwards we will go back to the original motion.

≠

Switzerland: Does this fall under 2/3rds vote rule?

≠

Mod Anything that changes our statutes.....

≠

Canada: Only need a majority on FA. Then motion vote needs 2/3 majority.

≠

Argentina: Amendment could be till next GA.

≠

Moderator: If 5 years from now, still below 18. For now we are only using the amendment. Now ready for discussion on the amendment I don't understand the motion

≠

India: What is the verification for hosts in a country.

≠

Moderator: I'm sorry we are only speaking about the amendment.

•

Austria: Replace members with hosts.

Moderator: Only dealing with don't understand.

•≠

Ireland: Wondering if 'currently below 18' is correct. Should it be dated?

And are we trying to raise the bar?

≠

Moderator: Reluctant to do amendment to amendment.

After consultation it is confirmed to stay with amendment.

≠

Kyrgyzstan: Suggests replace 18 with 500.

≠

Malaysia: This is a clarification about the Friendly Amendment. NZ has clarified number is 18. How did you get to 18?

Why not 500, maybe 5? It will help us understand.

•≠  
President Geoff: How low can we go to remain a member group? What if a country has 25 but then drops down to 2? Would they still be a member? No.

•≠  
Netherlands: We should shorten discussion. We should not go into detail.

•  
Botswana: Point of order. Chris said 10 to 17. Not properly recorded.

≠  
NZ: **I move we refer back to the workshop** to sort out the muddle.

≠  
Moderator: Does FA get withdrawn to refer to group  
If you are going to change FA, then it needs to be removed. After consultation, it is confirmed as correct.

≠  
NZ: I withdraw my FA, and move that the agenda item and the whole motion goes back to workshop.

Seconded by

**Motion:**  
**Refer the whole motion go back to workshop**

Proposed NZ,  
Seconded Denmark

≠  
Vote

For: 36  
Against: 1  
Abstain: 1

•≠  
India: How many times can you send it back to the workshop?

•≠  
Moderator: As many times as GA decides are not ready.

•≠  
Motion to amend the Statutes of SI section 11 par 1 to add the phrase 'and three contact persons'

**The new statutes will read:**  
Any National Servas group containing 10 or more hosts (including day hosts) **and three defined contact persons**, may be, become, or be reinstated as, a member group of SI by a majority vote of the GA.

Proposed Israel,  
Seconded Canada

≠  
Canada: Said would take each one of the changes separately. This time, all adding 'to have 3 defined contact persons'. This is because, when new country wishes to join, Exco can have difficulty contacting someone.

≠  
Botswana: I don't understand the word contact person. When we send a host list all persons are normally contactable.

≠  
Canada: Yes it does not have to be an officer.

≠  
Kyrgyzstan: I suggest a friendly suggestion. I think this has arisen, I don't mean to hurt any country, from the fact that there are too few wise men who are controlling these workshops. I find one person into 2 workshops already in the third workshop. I suggest we have it more democratically.

≠

Moderator: Clarifies we need to have a seconder for the motion

≠

Canada: Canada seconds the motion that there be 3 contact people.

•≠

Austria: To me the text is very clear. It would mean an amendment to statutes. To me this doesn't need discussion, **I call for a vote.**

Israel seconds.

Turkey: Mustn't say an immediate vote.

≠

Moderator: Clarifies need for immediate vote. If you think you are not ready you can vote no.

≠

Malaysia: Austria immediately called for a vote. We owe it to the people on the committee not to go straight to a vote.

≠

Moderator: GA agrees to Rules of Order that all agreed upon.

≠

Moderator: Calls for a show of paddles to decide on whether to proceed to a vote on this motion.

Show of paddles shows majority to proceed to a vote.

Vote partially taken because it was obvious there was enough support for the vote.

≠

Moderator: Change of delegate for India.

Moderator: Agrees new vote as change in wording of motion.

Vote on motion.

For: 26

Against: 6

Abstain: 8

USA: Is this a 2/3 vote?

Treasurer: Needed to be 28.

•

India: Point of order 2/3 of 34 needed.

•≠

Moderator: Checks rules of order.

Ruling is that vote is based on members present, regardless of whether for or against, or abstain .

40 people present.

Need 65% vote for.

Therefore motion not carried.

•≠

Speaking rights for Grant Barnes (USA)

Asks for speaking rights, and given.

≠

Grant: Not clear if abstention counts as a vote. GA needs to therefore interpret its own statutes.

≠

India: Statutes are very clear, 2/3 of members present, and voting. Means they make a decision. What matters is whether covered under Swiss Civil Code or not.

•≠

Moderator: Asks for advice as to whether abstentions are counted in a vote or not.

•≠

Botswana: UN operates in Geneva, Switzerland, and they don't count abstentions.

•≠

Britain: Abstentions count in Britain as well: **I move that abstentions count as a vote.**

Seconded by Singapore.

•≠

Italy: Don't know whether my abstention count. Therefore, I want to make another vote.

≠

Moderator: Stopped in order to clarify about abstention.

≠

Ireland: Are we changing the statutes through this vote.

**Broke for coffee at 11:21 before vote.**

---

## Second Session

April 7, 2006

Friday

---

**Resumed 11:55**

≠

Moderator: Swiss Civil Code has been checked with a lawyer in Switzerland. I want to use just 10 minutes to finish this. Agreed.

≠

Moderator: It is up to the GA to decide whether abstentions count or not towards 2/3 majority vote. Do we accept another vote?

•≠

Switzerland: Abstentions are counted towards vote. Those abstaining are counted as giving a vote. Only those not in room are not counted.

≠

Netherlands: Can we therefore leave the room if we do not wish to vote?

≠

Moderator: Confirms this was a serious comment.

≠

India; Point of order. I would like the question repeated.

≠

Netherlands: Abstaining of voting has impact of voting against motion. To abstain, does this count as an abstention.

≠

Moderator: Confirms individual can leave the room.

≠

Australia: If we vote no, are we breaking the Swiss Civil Code.

≠

Switzerland: It is current use, but not the law. All associations use it.

≠

Grant Barnes: It is not addressed in Swiss Civil Code. But the practice of organizations in Switzerland has been to count abstentions. I was told that Servas has counted abstentions in the past.

≠

Vote on British motion.

**Motion: That abstentions count as a vote.**

Proposed Britain,  
Seconded Singapore

Vote:

For: 26

Against: 8

Abstention: 5

Motion carried.

•≠

Moderator: Opens vote.

Motion:

That the vote is started. **Vote again on the issue now that everyone knows what abstentions mean.**

Proposed Switzerland,

Seconded India

Vote

For: 40

Against: 0

Abstain: 1

Motion carried

Moderator: Abstentions now count as part of the vote.

≠

Vote on original motion:

Motion:

**Any National Servas group containing 10 or more hosts (including day hosts) and three defined contact persons, may be, become, or be reinstated as, a member group of SI by a majority vote of the GA. Requires 2/3 vote.**

Proposed Israel;

Seconded Canada

For: 29

Against: 9

Abstain: 3

Motion carries.

≠

Moderator: **Move to Exco and Governance**

•≠

**Motion: Exco to appoint a working group to continue the work of the Exco and Governance workshop and to fulfill the intent of the principles made by this GA and to empower them to use the distant voting process.**

Proposed NZ,

Seconded Australia

≠

NZ: This is essentially procedural. The decision that added a board into the structure. We felt going too far now would not allow us to understanding what other groups were working out. This allows 3 years consultation between groups using the DV so then we can vote on the structure at the next GA.

•≠

India: **Move to put to vote.**

Austria seconds.

•≠

Vote to proceed to vote:

Show of paddles to proceed to vote. Majority in favor.

•≠

Vote the motion:



For: 38

Against: 0

Abstain: 2

Motion is carried.

≠

India: **Move to proceed to Exco and Officers.**

≠

Moderator: Suggest to go straight to **Development and Area Coordinators** as shown on the agenda

•≠

D -02-02 Bot-002

Motion:

**Areas will be defined by Exco in consultation with National Groups of the proposed Area**

Proposed Botswana.

Seconded Malaysia

≠

NZ. Should **suggests it be ‘proposed area’**

≠

Moderator: Checks if amendment can be changed.

≠

Kyrgyzstan: Has Kyrgyzstan’s suggestion, that was sent in 2005, been taken into consideration?

≠

Moderator: Workshops have taken into account all original motions and contributions. If agenda items is not felt to have been included by workshop, Kyrgyzstan has the right to propose a new motion.

≠

Germany: No agenda item from Kyrgyzstan.

≠

Moderator: All items submitted 6 months ago have been included.

•≠

Vote:

For: 37

Against: 1

Abstain: 2

Motion is carried.

•≠

**Motion: D -02-01 The work of Area Coordinators BOT 001**

- 1) Development of Servas in the Area
- 2) Link National Group with Exco
- 3) Link national groups within the area and other areas.
- 4) To organize regional area meetings.

Proposed by: Botswana

Seconded by Philippines

≠

Britain: Does every area need a coordinator?

≠

Moderator: Previous motion talked about proposed area. This indicates some flexibility on defining motion.

≠

India: What is link national group with Exco?

≠

Botswana: If areas doing things, coordinator is the person making the link.

≠

Botswana: For example, problems in communication in between Nigeria and Exco. Two way, Exco also communicates through AC to National Groups. So, both ways.

•≠

France: What will be activity regarding host list?

≠

Botswana: May include Friendly Amendment such as quality of host lists?

≠

France: What will be the activity to the host list? Leave it to the working group to discuss.

≠

Malaysia: I was part of the working group. Would like to clarify when AC links national group and the Exco, does not stop direct communication with Exco. May be needed where language problems, or need to clarify information. Maybe the AC should be the first contact.

•≠

Canada: As our part of the world will not have an AC, we need reassurance there will be communication with all National Groups, not just through AC.

≠

Germany: We also have the DFC. I hope the task of ACs will not interfere with about the same work of DFC. Will ACs have limits, or how will work be divided?

≠

Vote:

For: 38

Against: 2

Abstention: 1

Motion carried.

•≠

Motion D-02-03

**Area Coordinators are needed and should ideally be elected by the national groups of the area and then appointed by Exco.**

Moved by Botswana

Seconded NZ

≠

France: I don't understand how AC can be elected by National Groups and at the same time appointed by Exco.

Botswana: Agree Friendly Amendment as 'confirmed' Exco.

Austria; Is this meant to be by 'the' national groups of the areas? I feel it should be the not to allow some of the national groups.

NZ: Accept suggestion:

≠

Botswana: Accepts changes.

•≠

Malaysia: It was the workshop general consensus that ACs were needed. When have an AC, it may seem your area is in trouble. This is not true. It does not mean you are in trouble.

≠

Moderator: Clarifies this session is an opportunity to clarify ACs.

•≠

Kyrgyzstan; This is not a practical solution. They may have 10 / 15 countries. They may not be able to come to clear decision. It should be left to Exco.

•≠

**Italy: Friendly Amendment: If national groups of the area do not elect an AC, Exco may appoint one person to become an AC.**

Seconded: Austria

≠

Botswana: Is consistent with word 'confirm' , not appoint.

≠

Moderator: Checks if you want this to be an amendment.

≠

Seconded by Austria.

≠

NZ: change should to may. I am concerned we are sneaking back into compulsion.

≠

Italy: confirms it was may. We mis-communicated.

≠

USA: Concern that in the previous motion, there was a very, very important idea that if ACs are needed in some way, if this is identified, then needs an AC. But where in the motion is it said?

Moderator: Confirms need to stick to amendment.

≠

Argentina: Changes grammar of amendment. If NS groups of area don't.....

•≠

Vote on Friendly Amendment:

For: 34

Against: 1

Abstention: 6

Amendment passed.

≠

Moderator: Now back to the original motion.

≠

Denmark: In workshop, there was talk of solidarity of well functioning countries with those not functioning so well. Can be supported if needing support or not. It's possible to be in an area even if you don't feel you need one.

≠

Germany: How can we make if feasible for area like Europe with many, many member countries to elect an AC. I wonder how we can all come together.

≠

Malaysia: You with EXCO define your areas. Therefore Europe would need to define its area.

≠

Botswana: Confirms Malaysia's answer was confirmed in the motion we just approved a few minutes ago.

≠

Turkey: Confused – AC will be elected by national groups of area. DFC was elected by GA. There may be confusion between both processes in the future. That's my opinion.

≠

India: In response to Germany's question. What about using Distant Voting for electing Area Coordinators – was it considered?

≠

Botswana: Not considered, but I'm sure it could be.

≠

Kyrgyzstan: Saying option, on one hand, but not on the other. Germany said what I was to say.

≠

NZ: Intention is to give control to National Groups in the area the appointment of Area Coordinators.

**Calls for a vote.**

Seconded by Denmark.

≠

Switzerland: would like Friendly Amendment added on the board in front. I would like it to be cut and pasted first so we know what we are voting on.

•≠

Voting on amended motion

Vote

For; 34

Against: 2

Abstain: 5

Motion carried.

*David and Elena have different order.*

*This is the order as on the tapes.*

≠

Moderator: Is there anything more from this group.

≠

**Development and Youth issues.**

≠

Moderator: Speaking rights to Youth Coordinator.

Show of paddles. Asks for approval for Pablo Chufeni to present the motion.

≠

Moderator: Delegates are the only people who can make motions

Britain will present the Servas Youth Proposal.

≠

Britain: Went back and worked on youth plan. Same headings on motion plan as from Tuesday.

### **Motion 1. Action Plan**

**Adopt the Youth Action Plan points 1 to 10 (as outlined), as a framework for principles, guidelines and pilot projects for the next three years of Servas Youth Team activities.**

Moved by Britain

Seconded Austria

≠

President: Presume next 3 years refers to when next GA will be?

≠

Turkey: Asks for vote.

≠

Moderator: Confirms straight to vote.

•≠

Vote

For: 40

Against: 0

Abstention: 1

Motion carries

•≠

Motion 2 Youth Definition.

**Adopt the definition of Youth in Servas to be between 18 and 30.**

**Note: Generally age is not a factor which would exclude anyone from participating in youth focused activities.**

Proposed Britain;

Seconded by Botswana

≠

Britain: Debated in Patagonia and at EGA.

≠

Turkey: The problem is we have got children. How many of us have children. Definition is not suitable for me. Why 18 and 30, as youth of 13 and 15 can get permission from their families to participate. Leave decision to families. Propose a Friendly Amendment that age is below 30.

Motion for **Friendly Amendment: [To change to any youth under the age of 30]**

Proposed Turkey;

Seconded by Indonesia.

≠

Botswana: The note on motion takes care of this matter; it indicates that this is not needed.

≠

Britain: We would not accept this as a Friendly Amendment. Note takes care of it. For youth conferences and activities, most countries indicate the need to have a responsible adult with them until they are 18. Servas also indicates minimum age 18 to be a member. All youth all ages would be welcome with their parents.

•≠

Vote on Friendly Amendment

For: 12

Against: 25

Abstain: 4

Amendment not carried.

≠

Moderator: Questions on original motion?

≠

Turkey: Calls for vote.

≠

Moderator: No other speakers so straight to vote.

≠

For: 38

Against: 2

Abstain: 0

Motion carried.

Kyrgyzstan absent in vote.

≠

**Motion 3: Structure**

**Adopt the structure for the next 3 year term as set out below.**

Seconded: Turkey

≠

Britain: This is a way of bringing in excellent young people who stood in election. Everyone will be able to contribute to Servas Youth.

NOTE: To ensure efficient interaction between Servas Youth Team, Exco and the rest of the Servas community we propose the following structure:

A) - International Youth Coordinator - To be elected by GA

Take overall responsibility for promoting interest in youth activities and implementing the Youth Action Plan. Develop a Servas Youth Network for young people and those interested in youth issues.

B) - Youth Development Officer – To be elected by GA

Develop international projects agreed by the SYT and based on the Youth Action Plan. Advise and support national groups in setting up projects and organising local youth events.

C) - Mentor – To be selected and appointed by the Youth Coordinator, if needed.  
Provide advice and support to the Youth Coordinator on wider Servas issues.

D) – Youth working group – To be set up by the International Youth Coordinator and Youth Development Officer.  
Share and develop ideas and provide feedback on youth activities. It should be a representative of the cultural and regional diversity in Servas.

≠

NZ: Includes reference to Servas Youth Team. (SYT) – I'm not sure who is in Servas Youth Team.  
Clarifies it is Pablo and Anne.

Asks to clarify that Servas Youth Team means International Youth Coordinator and Youth Development Officer.

≠

Turkey: Calls for vote.

Moderator: No other speakers, so straight to vote.

•≠

For: 38

Against: 1

Abstain: 2

Motion carried.

≠

Motion 4: **Budget.**

**Approve the need for the Servas Youth Team to have an adequate budget, to carry out its activities. The management of this budget will be directly under the supervision of the SI Treasurer.**

Britain: Draws attention to word need for a budget.

Seconded Australia.

≠

USA: I think the idea of a need for budget is an excellent one. However, I cannot vote on a need I have not identified. Unless a line item for youth.

≠

Pablo C: Need, because, did not have any budget. Important after Barcelona, no was budget allocated as there was no item on budget.

≠

Germany: I see a little interference. In workshop it was agreed to have DFC. I feel in a way I see it must be a part of the function of the DFC.

≠

Netherlands: Would like indication of amount involved. Need to replace SYT with Servas Youth Coordinator and Servas Project.

≠

Moderator: Check if need to change the wording or not.

≠

Britain: Keep SYT, and voting on a need. We are voting on a principle of a need.

≠

Denmark: Youth needs a separate budget so that doesn't need DFC approval. They want to be independent. Isn't that true?

≠

Treasurer: If SYT have to cooperate with DFC will increase bureaucracy. Will have to go to Treasurer anyway. All committees should have separate budget so that is supervised by Treasurer. I agree with Pablo.

≠

USA: I would like to make Friendly Amendment, so that youth program has a budget. If a line item is put in the budget you put money in the line item. It would be clear.

≠  
Britain: Many people don't understand 'line item'. Thinks USA and Britain are saying same thing.

≠  
Moderator: USA agrees not to have Friendly Amendment

•≠  
Malaysia: Calls for vote.  
Seconded Switzerland.

≠  
Vote on whether to vote. We had speakers left on the list.  
Show of paddles. Majority agrees to proceed.

•≠  
For: 37  
Against: 0  
Abstain: 4  
Motion carried.

≠  
Moderator (Chris Jones): Ballots papers from votes have already been counted: A motion is needed to destroy them.

•≠  
**Motion: GA approve destruction of ballot papers**  
Proposed by Malaysia;  
Seconded by India.

≠  
For: 41  
Against: 0  
Abstain: 0  
Motion carried.

### **Meeting closed 1:35**

Amir: Announcements. Photos to be put on website and CD made.

Outgoing EXCO and incoming EXCO to meet tomorrow morning. 8 to 9 a.m. New Committee meetings tonight.

---

## **Third Session April 7, 2006 Friday**

---

### **2:30**

Moderator: Julie Dotsch. Help me gather the people. One to the garden and one the

≠  
Moderator: Asks for motion for Host List discussion to take place for first hour and then move on to the Officers Responsibilities.

≠

Malaysia:

**Motion: Servas Malaysia would like to change agenda to have the host list now for one hour.**

Moved: Malaysia

Seconded: Switzerland

≠

Show of paddles. Confirms majority agree to change of agenda.

≠

Moderator: all in favor of giving speaking rights to Michael Johnson?

Show of paddles approved.

≠

Michael Johnson: (MJ) Speaking on behalf of Host List Working Group.

Servas cannot work without Host lists. Travelers will not find hosts. Working since 2005. Group met 4 times during EGA, including one third of all delegates. We sent out a survey to all countries. 31 replied. 7 offered to be a buddy to help produce others host list. Tried a host list printing centre. Information sent in folder, but now updated here in Latina. Majority of the working group agreed to all points in motion 1. Decided with NS of Italy and NZ. We believe we covered all agenda points except Canada – to be presented later. Then if time we have 9 other motions. Thank you very much.

≠

Moderator: Vote on going one by one and then vote. Majority agreed by show of paddles.

•≠

**Motion 1a:**

**Form a committee with a mandate to work on:**

- **Running a pilot project on distributing host lists to travelers**
- **To establish guidelines for ensuring that host lists are accurate, current and verifiable.**

Moved: Sweden

Seconded: Netherlands.

≠

USA: I am not clear if committee itself would run a pilot project, or is a committee that will write the guidelines. I would like to add that they be secure the data.

≠

MJ: Left wording open, to give permission to group to do the work, or find people to do the work.

≠

Switzerland: Should committee be appointed by Exco? Did you have any idea about that?

≠

Michael J: Because still debating whether committees are elected, we didn't want to specify.

•≠

Vote on motion 1a)

For: 38

Against: 0

Abstain: 3

Motion carried.

•≠

**Motion 1b:**

**Servas should have ONE worldwide host list system. Each country completely controls its own host data, privacy, security and how data is distributed. The data will be accessible by key people.**

Proposed Israel;

Seconded Philippines

≠

Question (unidentified person): What do you mean by 'should'.

≠



Israel: Many ways of distribute, publish etc. with host lists. Each country chooses which system. After much discussion, agreed we should have one very good world wide system

≠

Moderator: Question was on should.

≠

MJ: Group felt if said 'must', would need to be done tomorrow. Trying to be flexible because it can't be done tomorrow.

≠

France: Write to key people – define key people?

≠

Moderator: That's not an understand. We're dealing with 'I don't understand' Wait till later.

≠

India: Which key people – of that country, or all countries.

≠

MJ: Eventually all countries.

≠

Australia: Will there be one format?

≠

MJ: Didn't specify one data base in group. So we didn't get into saying we want one system like the whale and then have it withdrawn from us.

≠

Australia: By the format I meant what it looks like in print or on screen.

≠

Israel: Yes, needs one format. Needs small countries to be able to deal with special requests and other data needs.

≠

Austria: Would this mean it would be a decision in principle to have a uniform system?

≠

Brazil: Is available on internet for travelers?

≠

Moderator: Please delay this question. It may come up.

≠

Netherlands: Is each Group free to choose own system?

≠

France: Motion says key people. Will system prevent access by others?

≠

Israel: Motion talks about key people. Later we will have to talk about hosts and travelers.

≠

China: I belong to Host list group. Thinks using worldwide system could bring great problems of maintenance and administration. Thinks every country and region builds own sub system.

•≠

Turkey: Motion 1b, is defined in 1c, d, e.

**Calls for vote.**

Seconded: Philippines

≠

Moderator: Show of paddles to check ready to vote. Majority for.

•≠

Vote on motion 1b)

For: 32

Against: 3

Abstain: 6

Motion passed

≠

**Motion 1c)**

**This system should be owned and controlled by Servas International and SI will be responsible for financing the system.**

Proposed: Indonesia.

Seconded: Sweden

≠

USA: I would like, before we vote on this, some estimates of cost. It could cost \$40,000.

•≠

Israel: Need to refer to decision of Barcelona. Budget agreed then, but not used.

≠

Ireland: calls for vote.

Seconded: Malaysia

Moderator: Show of paddles. Majority in favor of proceeding.

•≠

Vote

For: 35

Against: 3

Abstain: 3

Motion carried.

•≠

**Motion 1d)**

**The system should be administered by ICT and / or appropriately skilled people.**

Moved by Denmark;

Seconded by Turkey

≠

Germany: I would like to know which country would take care of data privacy?

≠

Israel: We should be able to let ICT members who are skilled to decide which country should have main server. Too much data to deal with now by GA.

•≠

Denmark: As system, think of is a machine. The data belongs to the country. Enter host list data yourself.

≠

Turkey: One of countries must take the date. This will be decided by ICT. I'm not worried about it.

•≠

South Africa: Can countries refuse their host list from being published worldwide?

•≠

Israel: Yes. Will be clear later how to handle this problem.

≠

Moderator: Seeing no more speakers I will ask if we are ready to vote. Ready to vote? Agreed.

•≠

Vote

For: 34

Against: 4

Abstain: 3

•≠

**Motion 1e)**

**Each country should state, on the system, how and when they publish their host list.**

Proposed: Philippines

Seconded: Belgium

≠

Israel: Background - as keepers of the host lists it is important to have one gate. All the answers about host list, and then, those countries that would like to use the world system will use it. The others will define their policy. whatever policy it is, and implement their policy. As key person, each one of us would be able to have all the answers about all the countries host lists he wishes.

•≠  
Austria: Policy refers to how they publish there host lists where will it be clear. When publish – means when they intend to publish their host list; time of the year? Or what

•≠  
Israel: Written under name of country, their policy – either written. Is it a book, or what system. Latest date for being written by March every year. These are just options.

≠  
Michael: There is a slight technical problem. I forgot to say publish and distribute the host list. I need to add it.

≠  
China: Why do we want to build a world wide system? If searching system, then each traveler can search the many options what they want. Then publishing becomes unnecessary.

≠  
Israel: We are talking about options – to decide if we want to use system, then to decide if they want to operate , then about access. Each country can decide. We just want the chance to develop the system and to use it.

≠  
Denmark: System can be high or low tech? Could be read only access on one spectrum by travelers, down to limited access.

•≠  
Moderator: Ready to vote for the motion? Show of paddles majority in favor.

•≠  
Vote:

For: 36

Against: 0

Abstain: 5

Motion carried.

≠  
Moderator: Other motions will be dealt with later. One hour only allowed to deal with topic. We are going back to the agenda. Host list motions will return.

≠  
Moderator changes to Pat Patfoort.

≠  
Moderator: Germany had asked for something to be brought forward. I want you to be sure that we will handle this before we leave. There is a second time for Host lists. We are doing very well letting everyone have their say. Thank you Pat

≠  
Asks for a half hour session until 4:15. It was agreed.

≠  
Moderator: I have been listening about issues and feelings from past and from present. Not good to push things as we are only together for one week. As in my presentation, not easy to express feelings that may hurt. How can we learn from those situations.

I am open in the week after this EGA week until Easter. If you send maximum one page of the issues that are hard to express or difficult. I will give you my email address, and ask for anonymous information. Then I will consider it and I'll write a report. I want to do that.

≠  
Moderator: Recommendation from France or Germany. Together. Oh isn't that nice:  
Agenda items Fra 004/ Ger-007 /Fra008/ Ger- 10

≠

France: It was decided to divide it into 2 Parts. First I do definition and later we then do duties and responsibilities of officers

**SI Officers are individuals who are elected or appointed as the members of Exco and Conveners of Committees.**

≠

Moderator: you mean you are moving that together?

*Quiet space*

≠

Unidentified voice: Where are we and which paper do you refer to?

≠

Sounds like India, but not identified:

Merged them into 1 motion Agenda items Fra 004/ Ger-007 /Fra008/ Ger- 10

**Motion to amend Article III of the Statutes of SI (“Officers”) by inserting the following sentence:**

Moved by: India

Seconded: Australia

Reasons: The present statutes of SI do not clearly define who an SI officer is. Therefore the following motion is proposed to be added to Art III of SI Statutes.

The benefit is that clarity will help the operations of SI to move on smoothly

This definition is based on the current structure; if we have a new structure may have to be revised if there is a change in the structure of SI. we will have to write definition of conveners later. Article III will need this inserted.

**SI Officers are individuals who are elected or appointed as the members of Exco and Conveners of Committees.**

≠

Moderator: Asks for questions:

None.

•≠

For: 40

Against: 0

Abstentions: 1

Motion carried.

•≠

India: Need to define responsibilities of conveners.

**Motion to amend Article VII of the Statutes of SI (“Duties and Responsibilities of Officers) by inserting the following at the bottom of the article.**

**7. Conveners shall:**

**a. be responsible for the teamwork of their respective committees.**

**b. implement the decisions of the General Assembly relevant to their field of responsibility**

*there is no sound on tape here for 48 seconds*

*It is not possible to know what was said or if something was said before the next entry*

≠

India: We are defining conveners as officers. Now need to define what they are required to do. Individual members of teams, are not officers.

≠

Second: Germany

≠

Moderator: No questions.

•≠

For: 37

Against: 0

Abstain: 4

Motion carried with more than required 2/3.

≠

India: Very contentious motion has been passed almost unanimously.

3 similar proposals – one was withdrawn

Remaining proposals 009 /006 merged.

•≠

**Motion: If any SI officer violates her or his duties or brings Servas International into disrepute as determined by the majority of the national groups, then Exco is authorized to replace or otherwise sanction an officer.**

**Exco shall develop appropriate procedures for this, including a procedure for a sanctioned officer to appeal, and submit the procedures to the National Groups for review and approval.**

Proposed India,

Seconded Australia

The idea is that an Exco alone should not sanction an officer. That should be done by the National Groups.

≠

India: Exco alone is not authorized if guilty or not. This is the responsibility of national group.

≠

Kyrgyzstan: Please clarify about SI officer. What if Exco officer is found guilty?

≠

Austria: I think national groups should be replaced by member groups as not all national groups have the right to vote. Need to clarify sanction – it could mean accept and approving.

•≠

**FA: [to replace ‘national groups’ with ‘member groups’, Then replace ‘sanctions’ by ‘initiate action against such an officer’]**

Proposed Austria:

Seconded Germany

≠

Moderator: Now questions, none, vote for this amendment motion:

For: 39

Against: 0

Abstain: 2 *I think, I could not hear it*

Amendment carried

≠

Switzerland: Requires voting of member groups.. Don't understand why not use GA.

≠

India: If an officer found guilty of offence just before GA, can decide there. Can use DV otherwise.

≠

India: It is a voting process of the member groups so I don't understand why it could not be at GA, or through Distant vote.

≠

Singapore: Checks that sanctions only applicable to SI officers, and conveners of committees.

≠

India: Applicable only to officers as defined in previous amendment.

≠

Netherlands: What about other members of committees that are elected and not officers?

≠

Ireland: First, I understand the body that determines whether carried out their duty will be national groups. Therefore will be a lot of material being circulated via email. Lots of allegation about people will

be going out and people defending themselves. And second, the Distant Vote only requires 40% whereas this requires over 50%.

≠

India: The DV would need 40% of the members participating which is the same for this EGA It would not be well to have to wait 3 years if a problem arises.

≠

France: Can we add decide how we vote by DV or the GA?

≠

India: Do not have to mention how we are going to vote every time.

≠

Italy: Call for a vote for the motion.

Turkey: Seconded

≠

Vote to vote on the motion. Agreed

For 39

Against 2

Abstentions 0

Amendment carried.

**Break for refreshments 4:15**

---

**Fourth Session**  
**April 7, 2006**  
**Friday**

---

**Restarts 4:45**

Announcements:

•

**Pat Patfoort** can be contacted at [pat.patfoort@glo.be](mailto:pat.patfoort@glo.be)

•

**Anatoly Ionesov** of Uzbekistan would like you to know that his phone no. is wrong on the address list.

It is 998 (662) 331753

≠

Pramod: Meeting of outgoing Exco and incoming Exco tomorrow morning 8am. Now includes all committee members.

≠

Germany: Would like GA to pass a resolution to support Servas Nepal.

She read an Email sent 26<sup>th</sup> Feb. from Servas Nepal, saying:

that members of Servas Nepal were not aware that Bibendra aware he was Vice President. Had no contact with National Secretary. Would call meetings, but no one aware were being called. Meeting at 3<sup>rd</sup> March get together. Peace Sec on 17<sup>th</sup> March. Bibendra called at end of meeting. 90% not happy with answers. Proposed to have a national convention – pressured and agreed to

have a meeting 26<sup>th</sup> June. Members not aware of Italy conference. Members should be aware of Conference. Had nominated a delegate, but did not inform. Very shameful for all members of Nepal. Hope Exec members will participate in our convention. Please forward this email to others and to Bibendra.

•≠

Germany: Suggests motion to for GA to give mandate to Exco to attend meeting, or ask a representative to go.

≠

President :Exco aware of email. Knew that reps were going to attend. Asked Vibeke to talk to Servas Nepal, and give sense of direction when attend. But no one able to attend. Since then, letter received saying no stamps. Reply – no report, no stamps.

≠

Switzerland: Point of order. We cannot put on agenda. We can only follow the agenda. This is the rule.

≠

Moderator: Agrees to leave there

≠

USA: Is it possible that some people who wish to go, speak to Servas Germany?

•≠

**Motion: To adopt the Financial Operating Procedures developed in Barcelona**

Proposed: USA

Seconded: Australia.

≠

President elect: Exco have been using procedures since 2004 and we have been using them effectively since then.

•≠

Vote,

For 40

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion approved.

•≠

Germany: Have emailed Germany Treasurer to ask him to defreeze stamp fees and pay SI.

≠

Botswana: We have a motion to relax member groups in small and difficult situations.

•≠

**Motion: Move that the GA give EXCO the authority to give annual grants of up to US \$200 to countries that apply for them. Such countries must provide an activity report.**

Proposed: Botswana

Seconded: USA

≠

Switzerland: Has money been changed or is it a mistake?

≠

Botswana: Changed to fit in with SI budget .

≠

France: Would it be fair to ask for a financial report?

≠

Botswana: Not possible in some countries to get receipts for things like email use. Therefore we need to rely on faith.

•≠

Kyrgyzstan: If intention is to get relief, amount is too little.

•≠

Denmark **calls for votes;**

Ireland seconded.

•≠

Show of paddles confirms majority agree to vote.

•≠

Vote

For: 35

Against: 1

Abstentions: 5

Motion carried.

•≠

**Motion:**

**That the GA ask EXCO to research ways to restructure SI income to assure the system is fair and sustainable for all national groups.**

Moved: Germany

Seconded: Brazil

≠

Germany: Only income is from hosts. Some countries have lots of travelers, and can produce host list. Some have no income at all.

≠

Australia: I support the idea, but I'm not sure how to implement it.

Germany: That will be the research

•≠

Belgium: I agree there must be a system.

•≠

Vote:

For: 38

Against: 0

Abstain: 3

Motion approved.

≠

President Elect: One of three motions asking EXCO. Would welcome those people who would like to assist in developing the systems.

≠

Moderator changes 17.15 to Julie Dotsch.

≠

Distant Voting.

≠

Motion 2

**That the Servas Regulations for Distant Voting be adopted by the GA as outlined in the paper we have in hand with 4 pages.**

Moved: Switzerland

Seconded: Austria

≠

Moderator: Questions? None.

•≠

Vote

For: 40

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion carried.

≠



**Moderator: Confirms David keeping a condensed version of the minutes. A record of the decisions are being collected by Elena. Also audio recordings are being made.**

•

Moderator: **Host list continuation.**

≠

Italy: We don't agree to push all countries to one system. Countries will have different systems. Propose each country has possibility to use one system.

≠

Moderator Page 37 and section 21.

•≠

**Motion 2:**

**Each country must have the possibility to use the same structure of data, using an online or offline database.**

Moved Italy,

Seconded Netherlands

•≠

Germany: Why use dolphin? If it is the Dolphin I think it is a good idea to put the name on the system.

•≠

Italy: We do not speak about Dolphin. We speak about a federative system.

•≠

Israel: Federated system is not one world system.

There are advantages and disadvantages but it is not the same

•≠

Brazil: Dolphin is useful. I was here at a presentation.

≠

Argentina: What are the pros and cons of the system you are speaking. Not all present were at the presentation.

•

Speaking rights to Chris Patterson (CP) (NZ).

Agreed

≠

CP: Key words in this motion are using online and offline database. Offline database, offline means your country is on your computer. If online, data elsewhere. Online is like the internet. We do not know where the material is. Best example of a federated system is the Internet itself.

≠

Belgium: We did not compare the two systems.

Netherlands: Better to have two competitive systems then evaluate which is best.

≠

Germany: Why are you talking about two systems.

≠

Netherlands: A unified system has one database. But this system is different the data are in different places . We can use both.

≠

Denmark: Not competitive, but complementary. Important to also have the possibility of off line system. Technology not same over world. Would be like internet. Let us have both. They are compatible to both.

≠

Switzerland: Everyone who has a slow line needs to be able to work offline. Many countries don't have possibility to work on line so we need the offline possibilities.

≠

Italy: System is one, but technically a different way. Solution, is that those countries which want to use online can do so. Can upload offline system without always being on line.

≠

Israel: Calls for vote.

Show of paddles. Majority in favor.

Israel moves

Netherlands seconds.

•≠

Vote,

For: 37

Against: 2

Abstain: 2

Motion is carried.

≠

Moderator: Other motions related to Host Lists?

•≠

New Zealand: Data that supports is on P21

Background to it p37

**Motion 3:**

**That the General Assembly direct Exco to prepare and publish a printed ‘Servas Travelers’ Directory containing Servas contact details for all countries, in particular where Host Lists can be obtained by travelers when they are visiting each country.**

**The directory;**

**-shall be available to all Servas travelers who want it, on a loan basis like a host list**

**-shall be available for down loading from the host list area of the Servas web site**

**-must be available for printing in sections, one per continent or region, so local Servas officers may make printed copies for travelers as required,**

**-shall not be available to travelers one per traveler when they are traveling,**

**-shall not be sent electronically to travelers**

Motion: Canada

Seconded Belgium

•≠

Denmark: [Amendment as wording changed wording slightly:

“hard” to “printed” and “printed” to “printable”.

**Remove the bullet shall not be sent electronically to travelers ]**

Moved: Denmark

Seconded: Belgium.

Vote for the amendment.

≠

Germany; Would object to amendment. As long as we do not have a secure procedure. I would oppose this motion. I don't like it.

≠

Denmark: Just creating possibilities for future. We're not there yet.

≠

Singapore: I would like currently electronic copies of host list not given to travelers. Would this hold true for the directory as well? Servas website, if travelers can key into Singapore@Servas.org, travelers contact directly. So why do we need this?

≠

Denmark: Not related to amendment.

•≠

Canada: Canada is against motion. Nothing to stop being sending electronically if take out the bullet point related to this.

•≠

Denmark: Preparing for future by leaving it out.

Agrees to leave last bullet

≠

Moderator: I want to make sure that the amendment, now that we have fiddled around with it, is accepted.

Vote on amended motion with changes.

•≠

For: 28

Against: 1

Abstain: 10

Amendment passed

Two people are gone from EGA

Krgyzstan not present during vote.

≠

Moderator: Speakers on the full motion.

≠

Brazil: For young travelers, still way behind ways people travel. We haven't had many travelers in Brazil. Internet is the fast way to make contact. This is why we are losing young travelers.

•≠

Italy: Call for a vote.

Singapore seconds.

•≠

Show of paddles. Shows in favor of proceeding.

Seconded: Belgium

Moderator: Australia also seconded.

•≠

Vote for the amended motion

For: 32

Against: 3 Austria and Turkey included

Abstain: 5

Motion carried.

•≠

Canada: Wishes to withdraw the last motion in this list. CAN -002

≠

Moderator: Motion to continue? You have done so well with time.

≠

Israel: **I move to continue with Host list motion.**

Indonesia seconds.

Majority votes to continue

•≠

Israel: Workshop respected all countries that have possibilities of using electronic tools. It will be very easy to not use it. Currently do not find an electronic tool that can be updated.

≠

**Motion 4: National Groups are made responsible for updating or confirming their host lists, at least annually. They may be helped by regional coordinators. Each host may update his or her listing, according to the policies of his / her country.**

Proposed: Israel,

Seconded: by Philippines.

≠

Moderator: Note that Poland and Turkey have changed their delegates.

≠

Poland: Does this mean that the host list accessible to the host. Do they have a right to update it themselves?

≠

Israel: Ideally possibility of host to update their own data.

≠

Netherlands; What are we discussing. Members currently have access to their own data. Are we asking member countries to develop mechanisms to change own data now? Or are we describing an ideal system.

≠

Sweden: Main thing is wording of motion. Mostly national groups are made responsible for updating annually. The other is about the future.

≠

Israel: Servas Israel we can update their own data with Whale. Do not use it currently. Only 12 people have access. But very easy to use. Each country to do when ready. No forcing of anybody to do anything.

≠

Austria: NGs have been responsible for updating at present. Don't know how we can force, through this motion. I don't know how it would be enforced.

•≠

**Motion** Friendly Amendment

**[Remove second part from the motion...'They may be helped by regional coordinators. Each host may update his/her listing, according to the policies of his / her country.' Replace it with NGs are made responsible for updating or confirming their host lists, at least annually."]**

Proposed: Turkey,

Seconded Ireland.

≠

Israel: Not much meaning without full text. I will ask you to vote on full motion.

≠

Moderator: We are talking about the amendment.

•≠

Italy: Calls for vote,

Spain seconds.

Show of paddles to vote on amendment. Majority for voting.

•≠

Vote for the amendment:

For: 20

Against: 14

Abstain: 7

Moderator: Problem: this is not a majority of all people who voted.

Consults with moderator (CJ).

Moderator: It's not a majority of all the people who have voted.

Vote fails because abstentions count. Consulted with Chris Jones.

•≠

Singapore: We have voted for with a simple majority and absolute majority. I am shocked about the confusion about this.

•≠

Moderator: I asks GA for speaking rights to Grant Barnes (GB). Approved.

≠

GB: GA voted earlier that abstentions would count within vote. Nothing said limiting it to just 2/3 majority.

≠  
Moderator: I am upholding my ruling. Motion was defeated as not a majority, counting abstentions.

≠  
Ireland: If motion an amendment, is it different to a full motion in terms of abstentions?

≠  
Moderator: Asks GA - do you support the challenge from Singapore or support the chair?

≠  
Austria: Resolutions are passed by the majority of the members present. We are working to the Swiss civil code. Reads out in English, German and French.

≠  
Moderator: Consults with GB.

≠  
Moderator: Swiss civil code was supporting the Chair.

≠  
Moderator: Would like to give Singapore the opportunity to be able to explain her challenge and to explain if she feels this answers her challenge or if there is more that was not talked about.

≠  
Singapore: I don't understand process where a point of view is treated as a challenge and then have to take an adversarial role.

To clarify, what does 2/3rds majority mean -we clarified this. That is over.

Also where I come, there is a simple majority and an absolute majority.

Out of 40, you would need 21 to pass -- 19 may say yes, 15 oppose and the rest abstain.

If you look at the way we have been working this week we have used the simple majority.

≠  
Belgium: Asks for clarification

•≠  
Moderator: Asks for Chris Jones (CJ) to have speaking rights. Agreed.

•≠  
CJ: Chair has to make a ruling if point of order. If ruling is challenged, then both the chair and the challenger get chance to put their positions. Then GA decides.

≠  
Britain: I too was worried about consistency in voting. Hope Julie can explain consequences of votes taken today.

•≠  
Moderator: Made it clear that I was being consistent with decision re counting abstentions. I took position that you had decided that this counted with all decisions. not just about statutes etc. I took the position that this was related to all the votes.

≠  
Netherlands: Very first day we agreed to create new solutions. Suggest we split motion 1 into 2 parts.

≠  
Moderator: Can't do this. Need to go straight to vote after a challenge.

Must call a vote to support the challenge.

•≠  
Moderator: Explains what the challenge is. On the vote. I used decision about vote which said abstentions were part of the total number of people voting. The other day you said abstentions were part of the whole count.

≠  
Canada: Asks for challenger to make statement.

≠  
Ireland: Are you using part 6 or part 8?

≠  
Moderator: Related to majority of voting. Talking about all voting, which believed included abstentions.

•≠

Singapore: Not have anything to do with abstentions If this challenge continues, I will withdraw challenge.

≠

Moderator: Withdraws challenge. Thank you.

≠

Moderator: Decision on amendment was not carried. Now we need to go back to the original motion without the amendment.

≠

**Propose new amendment: should become two motions, in enable two votes.**

Proposed: Netherlands:

Seconded: Norway

≠

Moderator: Calls for an amendment to divide the motion.

≠

Denmark: Up to each country how the update takes place – either logging on and entering data themselves or other method or picking up the phone and telling someone what has changed.

≠

Germany: Please give the clear words of the two amendment.

≠

Netherlands: Reads out revised motion 4, a) and b).

Revised Motion 4 repeated as split into 2 parts.

•≠

**1A) National Groups are made responsible for updating or confirming their host lists, at least annually. (first sentence)**

Proposed Netherlands,

Seconded Norway

•≠

**1B) National groups may use regional coordinators. Each host may update his or her listing, according to the policies of his / her country. (third sentence)**

Proposed: Netherlands,

Seconded: Norway.

≠

Germany: Why say may, may in second part. You can hold on to it, or not.

≠

Austria: If we divide the motion into two parts, and vote affirmatively on the first part and negatively on the second part, it would be the same effect as having the amended version in the first place.

≠

Italy: 1B *could not hear it*

≠

Moderator: Questions about original motion 4?

•≠

Malaysia **call for a vote.**

Seconded by India

≠

**Vote for motion 4.**

Moved Israel;

Seconded Philippines.

•≠

Vote

For: 30

Against: 3

Abstain: 6

Motion carried

•≠

### **Motion 5**

**Each host entry should show when the data was last updated or confirmed.**

Moved Israel,

Seconded Belgium

•≠

Britain: **calls for vote.**

Seconded: Turkey

•≠

Vote

For: 37

Against: 0

Abstain: 3

Motion carried.

•≠

**Motion not in the series**

**That the agenda amended to consider the decisions that the GA must make according to the SI statutes, and that have not yet been voted on be the first items in the GA session tomorrow. Some people will be leaving after lunch.**

Proposed France,

Seconded NZ.

≠

President elect: Confirms about 9 items which the statutes require to be passed, including budget, accounts, Treasurer's, action plan etc.

We must pass them otherwise we will not have a complete EGA

≠

For 38

Abstain 0

Against 2

Motion is carried

•≠

### **Motion 6**

**Each host may decide what information, if any, they want to be published electronically.**

Proposed Israel;

Seconded Belgium

•≠

Netherlands: Who decides, the host or the member countries?

≠

Sweden: I think the answer is either / or. If the national group has decided certain information be given, each host can decide whether to give this or not.

•≠

Malaysia: Calls for a vote.

Seconded Denmark.

Show of paddles for vote. Majority in favor.

•≠

Vote:

For: 32

Against: 1 *number not heard on tape; number from Elena*

Abstain: 5

Motion is carried.

•≠

### **Motion 7**

**Key persons should use the central system and if they are unable to do so, host data should be stored and distributed safely, avoiding unsafe modes.**

Moved Israel,

Seconded Indonesia

•≠

Singapore: calls for vote.

Show of paddles for vote. Majority approve.

•≠

Vote.

For: 27

Against: 2

Abstain: 9

Motion carried

•≠

### **Motion 8**

**Some people need printed lists. Each country is responsible for producing and distributing printed copies of their own national host lists when requested, or get help to do that from Exco or a Buddy.**

Proposed Israel:

Seconded France

•≠

Moderator: I don't understand?

Moderator: Any questions?

•≠

Austria: Is this situation current in the handbook? I think this will be a substantial change.

•

Israel: if countries don't want to use the worldwide system they don't have to put the data available electronically.

•

Philippines: call for the vote

Seconded: Belgium

Majority agree.

•

Vote

For: 35

Against: 1

Abstain: 3

Motion carried.

•≠

### **Motion 9**

**In addition to the National Groups own printed list, they should make their host list available electronically, preferably on the worldwide system, so that other countries may access their host list.**

Proposed: Israel

Seconded: Italy

≠

Israel: If a country does not wish to use world system. OK. But they need to declare this. Otherwise will be expected to put information on world wide system.

≠

Canada: If they are not on the world system do they still have to publish electronically.



≠

Israel: Yes, have to put on electronically.

≠

Germany: Do we have to provide electronically or not?

≠

Sweden: Does not say have to, actual wording is they should. This means cannot force them to do it.

≠

Ireland: Change wording to very much like them to.

≠

Philippines calls for vote,

Seconded Belgium

•≠

Vote for motion 9

For: 25

Against: 12 including Canada, Austria, Turkey, Netherlands

Abstain: 2

Motion approved.

≠

### **Motion 10**

**When requesting host lists, National Groups should be encouraged to print the copies they need of other countries small host lists (fewer than 50 hosts).**

**Moved: Israel**

Seconded: France

Agree to go to vote. Majority approve

≠

France calling for vote,

Seconded Turkey

Vote for Motion 10

•≠

Vote

For: 31

Against: 4

Abstain: 3

Motion carried

≠

### **Motion 11**

**The system can be made available to hosts and traveler, as a read only file. This may encourage host to host exchanges, letter, visits etc.**

Proposed by Israel

Seconded Indonesia.

•≠

Germany: What is 'the system', and why would it encourage better host exchange.

•≠

Israel: Many options now available. Hosts can contact other hosts without (LOI) Letter of Introduction. Country could open for use.

≠

Austria: Austria would not be ready. We are opposing it.

China: *could not be heard*

Norway: We are asking questions that should not be for GA at this moment.

≠

Canada: Don't understand if this gives Canada access to Canada info, or from around the world.

≠

Israel: First, between Canada hosts. Then if other countries agree can be used by them too.

•≠

Turkey: Friendly Amendment: **To appoint a team to work on this subject. Mandate to work on project.** We agree with Sweden.

≠

Moderator checks with Chris Jones if an amendment or not.

Moderator: A motion of referral has been made. Secunder?

Germany seconds.

•≠

Vote for referral motion to take it back to committee.

For: 8

Against: 17

Abstain: 12

Motion not carried.

≠

Canada: Was decision valid? Using abstention there are 20 vs. 17. You can't make a ruling.

•≠

Grant: The question is does the motion carry or not? Must have a majority to carry. Therefore does not carry.

≠

Moderator: Back to the original motion

•≠

Germany **calls for vote**

Seconded by Indonesia.

Show of paddles.

Majority in favor.

•≠

Vote:

For: 19

Against: 13

Abstain: 7

Motion fails.

•≠

**Motion 12**

Travelers may be given access to the system by password for a limited time and with a limited amount of data according to the policy of the individual country.

**Moved: Israel**

Seconded: Indonesia

≠

Moderator: Open for discussion comments.

•≠

Germany: We vote against this, as we think it is unsafe to give anyone access.

≠

Finland: How many copies can they take from the screen?

≠

Israel: There are different ways to limit. The situation is no more problematic than copying the host list.

≠

Australia: Would we keep changing the password?

≠

Israel: That is a question for experts. Not by us.

•≠

Sweden: The idea is that a traveler would be given a limited access. Given a password, just for one occasion only, issued by the National Secretary or whoever. That limits the data to how much data they can look at and for how long it can be used. The password would become null and void after a few days or whatever you like to choose.

≠

Britain: I don't understand why if we not accepted Motion 11, how motion 12 would operate? Sorry.

≠

Israel: In motion 11 we are talking about hosts. Now, in motion 12, we are looking at travelers.

≠

Denmark: *after checking the tape many times I found it says this is Denmark, but the voice sounds more like Austria or Canada.*

How can we vote on a motion we have already said no to?

•≠

Denmark: We would like to use this, but we don't know if its legal, but would like to prepare for possibility to ensure we will be a community of travelers and young people. We must realize travelers already do copy and scan the lists. We do not have security currently. So, let's not block this because of that.

•≠

Belgium calls for vote.

Seconded by Malaysia.

Show of paddles. Majority for the vote.

•≠

Vote

For: 19

Against: 13

Abstain: 7

Motion does not carry.

≠

Moderator: We are through. You have done very well.

Remember to clear all your papers and your paddle. *because they are setting up for the party.*

## **Meeting finished 7:40 pm**

Tape continued with music Halleluja

Then the tape continued with the President, Geoff Maltby, calling the names of the participants, asking them to come to him and receive their certificate of appreciation. He was assisted by the General Secretary, Honora Clemens.

---

**First Session  
April 8, 2006  
Saturday**

---

**Starts 9:20**

≠

Moderator: Chris Jones

•≠

Announcements:

•≠

Pat Patfoort: Please send no more than a page about your feelings by Easter. *very difficult to hear*

•

NZ: brief result of the survey. *difficult to hear*

•

Anna Flammini: the list of participants is ready and will be distributed. Get your photos too. *difficult to hear*

•

Jane Giffould: Request for contributions to SI monthly news. To fill in language page. *difficult to hear*

•

President Elect: Old and new Exco meeting today. To pull together materials from GA within 6 weeks. Further meeting today. *difficult to hear*

•

General Secretary Pramod: Proposal of putting up names of all participants on SI website. *difficult to hear*

≠

### **Motion 1**

**That the GA receive the un-audited accounts for 2004 as presented by the SI Treasurer** with the accounts labled as interim un-audited statements of accounts and dated.

Moved by: USA

Seconded: Germany.

Singapore: need to look at statutory requirements. First look at Treasurer's report.

Germany: Agree the first motion is incomplete

Singapore: It is not a motion. It is part of requirements of report from outgoing Exco.

Moderator: Asks Treasurer where are reports.

Moderator: Suggests Motion 2 deals with question.

•≠

Moderator: Since the Treasurer just entered the room the motion is withdrawn

Ireland: Where are the un-audited accounts ?

*Comments unheard*

Moderator: there's no explanation or would you like to respond?

Motion 2 speaks to the discussion. If the meeting agrees to table that, I would be open to moving to the next motion with that

≠

**Motion: that we stop talking about motion 1 and move to the next motions.**

Proposed: Canada

Seconded: Malaysia

≠

Moderator: to go to next motion show paddles – majority confirms.

*Motion 2 Cannot be heard*

**That the GA receive the report of the SI Treasurer on the state of the accounts and the auditing of them acknowledging the difficulties encountered and the Action Plan provided to address these.**

Proposed New Zealand,  
Seconded Australia

Treasurer: Treasurer: You have my report. Reads out report.

**Since this is an EGA we have no external auditors.**

Asks GA to approve Action Plan.

Moderator: 'Questions

Singapore: Take comments in good faith. Usual procedure is to present Treasurers report. Why was this not presented to GA on first day, as in other General Assemblies and other organizations? *Cannot be heard*

Moderator: Answer from Treasurer or Agenda Working Group?

Chris Patterson on behalf of Agenda Working Group: We did not manage the statutory part of process. *Cannot be heard*

≠

Treasurer: Day one, a time for Exco officers. Motion passed to received remaining reports in the binder. It was the GA's decision.

≠

Switzerland: Was on the agenda. We approved motion that we received remaining reports in the binder. I propose we just go on. Let's do it now.

Moderator: Any new ground to add to debate. If nothing new I propose to ask you to vote. Please raise paddle

•≠

Motion 2

Vote.

For: 35

Against: 3 (Singapore vote recorded)

Abstain: 3

Motion carried.

•

Motion 3

**That the GA endorse the Treasurer's Action Plan to have the Accounts and Auditors Report for 2006 completed by August 31, 2006.**

Proposed: Switzerland

Seconded: Germany

### **Treasurer's Action Plan:**

- 1. Obtain an updated English Language accounting software to replace the Hungarian version**
- 2. Complete the draft financial Statements by May 31 2006**
- 3. send soft copies by June 2<sup>nd</sup> 2006 for Audit Committee with copies to National Secretaries**
- 4. National Secretaries to indicate confirmation of their having received the reports and to make appropriate comments by June 14<sup>th</sup>**
- 5. Exco confirm appointment of external auditors by May 15<sup>th</sup> 2006.**
- 6. begin the external audit by June 15<sup>th</sup> 2006**

7. **External Audit to send the results to Exco for a distribution to National Secretaries by August 2006**
8. “to have the audited accounts and the auditors reports submitted to the member groups for a vote by first Distant Vote, which will be specified in the distant vote schedule to be prepared by Exco.”

Singapore: Since the GA indicates what the GA should have done. What is the process by which the GA approves this? *Cannot be heard*

≠

Moderator: Suggests use of Distant Voting.

≠

Singapore: Asks for speaking rights from Alex Dali.

Agreed by GA

Alex Dali: Would like to give information. After the Internal Audit, we gave recommendation to Exco for action. 2004 report has been completed with outstanding matters. *Cannot be heard*

Germany: *Cannot be heard*

Treasurer: The financial statement is missing. It needs printing for GA. Includes financial information about assets, income.

Moderator: We don't have those pages. Is it in the binder? Would you like to tell us what it says?

Treasurer: *Cannot be heard*

**USA: Motion to defer discussion until papers are printed.**

Seconded: Malaysia

Canada: Talking about 2004?

Motion don't change fees at this time.

Sweden

Moderator: Correct. Procedural

•

Vote for the motion:

For: 37

Against: 1 (Singapore)

Abstain: 0.

Motion carried

•

France asks for internal audit committee to be added.

Gary Sealey: Can we proceed with other items?

Moderator: Agreed.

•

Motion:

To defer motion

Majority support from GA

Proposed USA,

Seconded Malaysia

•

For: Majority.  
Motion deferred until later.

•  
**Motion: that there be no change in the fees of SI**

Proposed: Sweden  
Seconded: Australia.

•≠  
For: 36  
Against: 0  
Abstain: 3  
Motion passed

Motion

**That GA empower Exco to appoint and pay for an independent auditor**

Malawi proposed  
Seconded South Africa

Singapore: What is point of this motion. GA does not need to do it.  
*Cannot be heard well*

France: Is Exco to pay for internal and external auditor? *Cannot be heard well*  
≠

Gary Sealey: Addressing item 4 in statutes sub item J. Statutes say GA shall or empower committee pay for independent professional auditing. It is a routine housekeeping item.

≠  
Botswana; Independent means external?

≠  
Moderator: That's correct

Motion to proceed  
Carried by majority

•≠  
For 38  
Against: 0  
Abstain: 2  
Motion carried

**Motion: That the GA empower the following members of Exco to sign on behalf of SI:  
Treasurer; President; Vice President; General Secretary.**

**(two signatures required as per Statute)**

**The Treasurer's signature must be one of the two signatures.** Proposed: Singapore  
Seconded: Switzerland

Singapore: *very weak on tape* Do all members have to sign checks?  
Do not feel it is clear.

≠  
Moderator: Statutes make it clear.

≠  
Gary Sealey: GA shall determine which members sign, two signatures.

≠  
Singapore: Which two?

≠  
Moderator: Any two can sign. It's a standard practice.

≠

Malaysia: Should always be Treasurer. **Friendly Amendment to suggest should be the Treasurer and any one of the other three people.**

Proposed Malaysia,  
Seconded Singapore.

NZ: *Cannot be heard*

≠

Turkey: If something is going wrong with Treasurer. How would we get the money? What would happen then?

•≠  
Canada: GA has passed a resolution that a member of the Audit Committee would step-in if that occurred.

NZ: *Cannot be heard*

•

Botswana: Should say normally. *Cannot be heard*

•

Moderator: Alex Dali rights

Canada: Different motion

Vote on speaking rights.

Majority agree

•

Alex Dali: Usually the organization's Treasurer can make signature for small amount. In Servas, the President usually gives the second signature for large amounts. *Cannot be heard*

≠

Moderator: Friendly Amendment repeated **that Treasurer's signature is mandatory. The Treasurers signature must be one of two signatures.**

*Sounds like second sentence added by Canada*

Vote on FA:

For: 22

Against: 9

Abstain: 7

Amendment carried.

≠

USA: propose Friendly Amendment

**FA that the motion have only the roles and not the specific names be reflected in the original motion**

Proposed USA,

Seconded Singapore

≠

Botswana: Most banks need names who will sign checks.

≠

Moderator: Usually take in minutes to confirm who are now officials of the organization.

≠

Canada: Why do we need names?

•≠

Moderator: Statutes say so.

•≠

Vote on Friendly Amendment:

For: 31



Against: 6 (including New Zealand)

Abstain: 2

FA approved.

≠

Gary Sealey: This affect of this motion is to change statutes.

≠

General Assembly: Indicates that statutes have not been changed.

≠

Switzerland: Statutes don't say that officers have to be name.

•≠

Speaking rights asked to Grant Barnes.

GA approves

•≠

Grant Barnes: Confirms the statutes do not indicate names. Names are not defined by name or position, therefore the motion is legal.

≠

Malaysia: **Calls for a vote on the main motion**

Seconded: Switzerland

Signing Authority on behalf of Servas International (Statutes IV, 3, k)

Motion repeated:

**That the GA empower the following members of Exco to sign on behalf of SI: Treasurer, President, Vice President, General Secretary.**

•≠

For: 39

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion approved unanimously

•≠

President (Gary Sealey): Item K says 2 signatures. Previous statutes have been changed, as now requires Treasurer needing to sign.

≠

Moderator: This is not on the agenda so I would prefer we move forward on the agenda.

•≠

Motion:

**That the GA empower EXCO to arrange the next GA**

Proposed: Malawi

Seconded: Australia

≠

Sweden: The next General Assembly will be during the year of the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Servas

•≠

For: 37

Against: 0

Abstain: 1

The motion carried.

We had an absentee

•

Motion

**That the GA empower EXCO to implement the decision of this GA as the Programme of activities of Servas International until the next GA.**

Proposed: Switzerland

Seconded Britain.

≠

Moderator: Seeing no speakers, I'd like to move to the vote now

•

For: 38

Against: 0

Abstention: 1

Motion carried.

Singapore: I propose we do not look at last motion yet.

Moderator: Point taken and I think the GA agrees.

Moderator: Asks if GA wishes to proceed to motion 3 or motion 1?

≠

GA: Show of paddles indicates motion 1.

NZ: **Move GA receive ad interim, dated and un-audited accounts.** *Cannot be heard well*

Seconded USA.

NZ: Should be clearly labeled as interim un-audited statement of accounts

**FA added to motion**

**[Should be clearly labeled as interim un-audited statement of accounts and be dated]** *Cannot be heard*

≠

Moderator: Agrees that Friendly Amendment added to main motion because mover and seconder agree to join them.

Asks for vote on amendment.

•≠

For: 39

Against: 0

Abstain: 1

Amendment carried.

≠

Moderator: Apparently it was not clear what we were voting on, the complete motion or the amendment.

Full motion with amendment:

Motion 1 repeated

**That the GA receive the un-audited accounts for 2004 as presented by the SI Treasurer. Should be clearly labeled as interim an un-audited statement of accounts and be dated.**

Seconded: USA

•≠

For: 34

Against: 1 (Singapore)

Abstain: 3

Motion carried.

### **Motion 3**

**That the GA endorse the Treasurer's Action Plan to have the Accounts and Auditor's Report for 2004 completed by August 31, 2006.**

**Treasurer's Action Plan**

- 1. Obtain an updated, English-Language accounting software to replace the Hungarian version.**
- 2. Complete the draft of financial statements by 31<sup>st</sup> May 2006**

3. Send soft copies by 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2006 for Audit Committee with copies to National Secretaries.
4. National Secretaries to indicate confirmation of their having received the reports by 4<sup>th</sup> June and to make appropriate comments.
5. EXCO confirm appointment of external auditors by 15<sup>th</sup> May 2006
6. Begin the External Audit by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2006
7. External Audit to send the results to Exco for distribution to national secretaries by August 31<sup>st</sup>, 2006.

Singapore: Motion is incomplete, as would fail statutory requirement of SI. Needs to include a statement that GA approved it. *Cannot be heard*

≠

Austria: Implications of Point 4 in terms of dates. The time is too short to allow for NS comments.

≠

Denmark: Did not understand Singapore.

Singapore: Timetable fine. But must be GA vote on accounts to approve. Is a Distant Vote to be used? Must have a definite date. *Cannot be heard*

≠

France: I would like Internal Audit Committee precisely stated.

≠

Switzerland: Friendly Amendment to say **audited accounts shall be submitted to the GA by Distant Vote.**

To be held by first distant vote, as soon as audit is complete. We will need to appoint voting officer first.

•

Amendment.

**Add number 8 'To have the audited accounts and the auditors reports submitted to the member groups for a vote, by the first distant vote, which will be specified in the distant voting schedule, to be prepared by EXCO** *very weak sound --- not sure all is included maybe Dec 31 mentioned*

Proposed: Switzerland

Seconded: Australia

Malaysia **calls for vote,**

Seconded by Sweden

Majority shows paddles for a vote.

Vote

•≠

For: 36

Against: 0

Abstain: 1

Motion approved

NZ: *Cannot be heard*

Main motion 3, including Point 8 above.

Germany: Proposes Friendly Amendment to Motion 3. Sentence 4 ,change date to 14<sup>th</sup> June

•≠

Motion for **Friendly Amendment that in Motion 3 point 4:**

**Change date to June 14**

Proposed: Germany

Seconded: Turkey

Botswana: *Cannot be heard*

Germany: *Cannot be heard*

≠

Vote on amendment

For 35

Against: 0

Abstain: 2

Amendment carried.

•

NZ: Point of order *Cannot be heard*

≠

Voting on main motion 3 with above amendments

Vote 37

Against: 1 (Singapore)

Abstention: 0

Full motion carried.

### **Motion**

**That the GA adopt the Budget as presented for the period up to the next regular GA**

Treasurer: Draft Revenue Budget open to amendments.

•≠

Moderator: Asks GA to defer vote on motion until after break.

**Break at 11:00**

---

## **Second Session April 8, 2006 Saturday**

---

**Restarts 11:40**

•

Gary Sealey: asks for all the notes to be sent to [egapapers@googlegroups.com](mailto:egapapers@googlegroups.com)

It will instead of a lag of months very quickly we can begin working.

Moderator: Chris Jones.

•

Moderator: I believe there are 25-26 delegates in the room and since there is no quorum requirement we can start.

We are returning to the document entitled **Draft Budget**

Someone has been dispatched to get the Treasurer.

•

Germany: point of order.

Go on with other motions.

•≠

New Zealand (NZ) : I would like to move a tidy up motion

**Motion**

**That the GA adopt the statutes as distributed and amended at this GA as the statutes of SI replacing all previous versions**

Proposed: New Zealand

Seconded: Britain

≠

NZ: This would remove all confusion as to what are the current statutes. The idea is to clearly replace all previous versions by the result of our work this week.

≠

Switzerland: Does incorporate further ones?

≠

Moderator: Yes.

≠

NZ: I would interpret as a statute amendment. Losing this vote does not lose previous votes.

≠

Switzerland: Needs 2/3rds?

≠

Moderator: I believe it requires a simple vote.

≠

Germany: Why do it at all? Why vote?

•≠

NZ: Have at times been questions raised as to which is the true and correct version of the statutes. This makes it clear that these are the statutes from now on.

•≠

Vote

For: 31

Against: 0

Abstain: 2

The motion carried.

Motion: Return to the **Draft Budget**

Proposed: Turkey

Seconded: Australia

≠

Italy: Budget is one of the most important documents. I feel it should be prepared by a workshop.

•

Motion Friendly Amendments

•

**1) Move that the GA approved for the 2006 year a budget of 8000 CHF for handling ICT projects**

**2) Move that the assembly approve a budget for 2006 and defer the approval of the budget for 2007 – 2008 -- 2009 by Distant vote**

Moved: Italy

Seconded: Netherlands.

≠

USA: I agree that the budget should be taken care of in a workshop. It is the life blood of the organization. I would oppose this because I have a whole set of 3 year plans here.

≠

Singapore: Not too sure about amendment. Is it because the ICT is not included in this? Why presenting in final hours of the GA is ..... *could not hear*

≠

Italy: Because ICT is not written clearly and we need..... *could not hear*

≠

Britain: Speaks against budget. Many people have made development plans for a 3 year period with serious financial consequences. If it does go through, we will be paying in advance from our own personal funding. We would need an advance, even though self-funding to pay deposits.

≠

Botswana: We have already voted this morning for first distant vote which puts us into 2007. We have throttled ourselves by putting the first DV. Need to be aware of consequences.

≠

Turkey: I agree with the amendments.

≠

Australia: I only agree with the first amendment. *could not hear*—

≠

Assembly indicates agrees to vote on amendments separately

•≠

First Friendly Amendment Vote:

For: 31

Against: 0

Abstain: 6

Motion approved.

≠

Second FA:

Proposed: Italy

Seconded: Netherlands

≠

Denmark: Thinks we should vote for 2007 as well.

Italy: Should vote for 2006. Not necessary to approve budget 2007 until end of year 2006. *could not hear*

Speaker?: *could not hear*

≠

NZ: That question is related to previous amendment, we shouldn't discuss it now.

≠

Italy: We have to empower ICT to amend the budget. *Additional words that could not be heard*

≠

Germany: GA in Barcelona adopted a budget for 2005, 6 and 7 . As we are already in April 2006, I don't think it is important to adopt a budget for 2006. I would like to adopt budget 2007.

≠

USA: Friendly Amendment to this motion as we have an option to vote on a whole budget instead of sending it to the distant vote. We have put together here an alternative budget, so we might want to defer the vote until we discuss this budget.

≠

Moderator: Should vote against this amendment, if wish to have another amendment to be made.

≠

Singapore: How can I decide, suddenly there is an alternative budget it might come into play later on. My decision depends on..... *could not hear*

•≠

Vote:

For: 6 (includes Turkey and Singapore)

Against: 14

Abstain: 16

Amendment doesn't pass.

≠

Moderator: Now we're back to the main motion.

≠

Denmark: **I move that we vote on the budget for 2006 and 2007, and move the budget of 2008 and 2009 to the Distant Vote**

Seconded Botswana.

Singapore: which budget? *could not hear*

≠

Austria: Since we already voted on those, why are we voting on 2006? A revised budget?

≠

Moderator: Confirms understanding is Barcelona approved 2006 and 2007.

≠

NZ: Budget asks GA shall adopt budget up to next GA. Therefore we have to include 2007 although it was covered in Barcelona.

≠

Denmark: Withdraws motion. Botswana agrees.

≠

Moderator: Wishes to clarify which budget we are talking to .

≠

USA: We have a draft proposal here As you look at it there is not. No conference regular income as in 2004. Not clear that there are line items for projects that came from 2006 EGA. That's why this other budget was put together and circulated Servas International budget taking into account decision of this EGA. We have 200,000 dollars in bank account currently.

≠

Canada: We cannot have a Distant Vote before 2007. **We have a budget for 2006, we cannot have a DV until 2007, so I propose we keep the budget from Barcelona to use until we have a DV for the other years.**

**Moved: Canada**

Seconded: Switzerland

Malaysia: I received a Draft paper – from Treasurer (confirms). Then a few minutes ago I have a new circulated SI budget dated 8<sup>th</sup> April. Who is it from? Who is the we?

USA: The we is a group in committee. Where are the items we said we would pay, so we put this together during the break now, based on needs of groups identified working in committee.

Motion:

•

**Move that we keep: approve the budget as approved in Barcelona for 2006 and 2007, and including the budget decisions made by the GA in Italy 2006. The 2008 and 2009 budgets will be approved by Distant Voting.**

≠

Treasurer: SI is not dealing with conference registration for this hotel

≠

Moderator. Keep to amendment

≠

Singapore: If we are speaking to the old budget, we are not talking about the budget prepared for this GA. Does that ..... *could not hear*

≠

Canada: **that we approve the budget as approved in Barcelona for 2006 and 2007 from before. 2008 and 2009 be approved by Distant Vote**

≠

Canada: Should have said approved budget as approved in Barcelona.

≠

Moderator: We are speaking to the motion just outlined.

≠

Argentina: In budget in Barcelona, there was no budget for youth proposal.

Cannot therefore proceed with youth project. Should not use first Distant Vote for such a crucial thing as this for the first DV.

≠

Canada: Wishes to withdraw motion. We did not think of that.

≠

Turkey: Argentina is right. Need to approve youth project budget by including it in Italy.

≠

Canada: Also need to include budget for DV.

≠

Italy: In companies, they make budgets year by year because there are changes. Therefore approve first one, then leave time to approve new situations year by year.

≠

NZ: Point of order – I believe there was also 8000 swiss francs for the ICT.

Moderator: I would like something I can make a decision now.

≠

USA: I do not have the Barcelona budget in front of me in order to see what we are approving.

≠

Britain: I appreciate the spirit of this amendment, but it is getting messy. We voted to approve the youth budget to be adequate.. This reads out expenses of budget, to cover Youth Event 2007. Not sure if I can support this amendment. If you vote this budget there is no figure for the activities planned. We do have a very specific budget worked out for the youth budget.

≠

Moderator: Would it be acceptable for us to include a figure for the youth budget in the Friendly Amendment. Could we then accommodate the ICT and Youth in the 2007 budget.

NZ: (the mover of the motion) I would like to remove the youth budget out of the motion. If that amendment is carried we can then make adjustments to accommodate the ICT and any other items we need to address.

Argentina: (the seconder) I wonder if we could just say including the budget decisions by the GA in Italy.

•≠

Vote

For: 36

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

The Amendment carries.

≠

President Gary Sealey: This is the last time we will be in this situation. We will have a Budget Committee so we can have a more open process which will mean everyone will be able to make a contribution.



≠

Switzerland: I propose a motion to adopt the Youth Budget.

≠

India: Point of order Have already asked for a move to the vote.

≠

Moderator: Have voted on amendment. Apologize to India for breach in rules of order.

≠

Moderator: FA

Moves to the main motion asking it be repeated

≠

**That the GA adopt the Budget as approved in Barcelona for 2006 and 2007, including the budget decisions made by the GA in Italy 2006. The 2008 and 2009 budgets will be approved by Distant Vote. That the GA approve for 2006 a budget of 8000 CHF for handling ICT projects and a budget of 12,000 francs for the Youth Project in the years 2006--2007.**

Proposed: NZ

Seconded: Australia

≠

Netherland: Not clear about figures.

≠

NZ: It was intended for the 2 years was proposed.

≠

Moderator: Amended. The change was for 12,000.

≠

President Elect (GA): We are in an area of micro management because we are not able to be well prepared. Wants this to read to include priority items decided at GA.

≠

Singapore: Unfair on all those people who have not had time to present their to GA, such as development. There is an issue of fairness that has to be addressed.

≠

Elena leaves GA. Round of applause for appreciation of her.

Moderator: thanks to Elena.

≠

Moderator: All agenda items submitted 6 months ago have had workshop time at the GA. Hopes still time to cover any outstanding items.

There has been a call for the vote.

Agree to proceed to vote on the main motion.

≠

For: 33

Against: 1 (Singapore)

Abstentions: 0

Amendment carried.

•

**Denmark: moves that we vote on the 2006 and 2007 budget now and do the future ones by distant vote** Seconded: Botswana

•

Withdrawn

≠

Moderator: End of statutory items that we must cover. Now I would like to move into the area of Membership Workshop Recommendations.

While you are looking for that document I would like to take this opportunity to announce that India has informed EXCO and wishes to inform this GA that they will be making a proposal to host the next GA.

•≠  
Singapore: I would not like to have any GA held in India. I have made 3 formal applications, to the moderators, which have not been addressed or brought into this forum, which specifically relate to manipulation of the electoral process thereby putting pressure on nominees and other things. There seems to be no forum or authority by which I can bring this before the attention of the GA. I would like to make specific complaints against Omer and Servas India and I would not trust any process that takes place without that being addressed.

≠  
Moderator: Suggest if any one has question, I would like to have you to discuss them. with Singapore. We have 6 months of items to handle. I prefer we move to that. There is no formal process on this floor to address that complaint. We will not entertain a point of order on the complaints at this point. The point of order is that you should be allowed to respond well this is I will ask if you not wish India to respond at this point. My ruling is that I will give India 2 minutes.

•  
Moderator: Guidance please. Do not wish to get into debate. Asks GA if they wish India to respond at this time.

Show of paddles.

Those who wish that India not respond at this time. My ruling unless it is challenged I will give India 2 minutes to respond.

India: Would like a point of order on complaint from Singapore. Would like to respond.

India: I wish to know what the complaints are.

Moderator: Will lead to cross fire. Suggest take away from GA. Believes that should be answered beyond later in the agenda.

≠  
President Elect: No process for dealing with this acknowledged. As we have a Conflict Resolution Committee. I suggest this is taken to Committee.

•≠

Vote

For: 30

Against: 0

Abstain: 2 Philippines and Singapore

Motion approved.

•  
Honduras and Czech Republic are leaving

Motion: **That all move to Distant Vote.**

Proposed: Canada

Seconded: Philippines

≠

NZ: That is statutory, so they are not appropriate for membership.

≠

Canada: withdraws vote.

≠

**Membership Group.**

•≠

Motion 3

M-01-01 It is moved to amend the Statutes of SI, Section II paragraph 2 to add the phrase The new “personally confirmed”:

Proposed: Israel

Seconded: Argentina

**The new statutes will read:**

“Any National Servas group containing 10 or more personally confirmed hosts (including day hosts) and three contact persons, may become, or be reinstated as, a member group of SI by a majority vote of the GA.”

•≠

For: 26

Against: 0

Abstain: 3

Motion approved

≠

Moderator: Counts GA members present: 29 delegates in the room

The motion carries

•≠

NZ: Moves a procedural motion that GA finishes promptly at stated time in the agenda

**Motion**

**That this GA finishes promptly at the time stated in the agenda (1.30)**

Proposed: New Zealand:

Seconded: Norway.

•≠

Argentina: This may not allow important items to be discussed such as Development that was well worked in the workshop, so I am not voting for this motions.

≠

Britain: Is there a quorum for the GA?

≠

Moderator: No quorum specified in the statutes.

•≠

Brazil: How are we going to deal with the topics not spoken to today.

≠

Moderator: Exco would decide.

•≠

Netherlands: **Calls for vote.**

Show of paddles is a majority to proceed to vote.

•≠

Vote

For: 16

Against: 6

Abstain: 5

Motion carries.

I believe what we have is 10 minutes, 13 perhaps.

Moderator: Are there items that can be deferred by DV.?

Answer: No

≠

Botswana: **Proceed with all three remaining items in one vote.**

M-01-01 then 4 and the last one.

Moved: Botswana

Seconded: Denmark

≠

Unidentified speaker: We cannot combine them they require different majorities

≠

Moderator: Good point

•≠

**It is moved to amend the Statutes of SI, Section II, Paragraph 1 to add the phrase “personally confirmed and three contact persons” The new statutes will read:**

“Any National Servas group containing 10 or more hosts personally confirmed (including day hosts) and three contact persons may become, or be reinstated as, a member group of SI by a majority vote of the GA.”

Proposed Israel

Seconded: Argentina

≠

Austria: Brought back, now confirms 10 hosts minimally would be personally confirmed.

•≠

Vote

For: 28

Against: 0

Abstain: 1

Motion approved required 2/3 majority

•≠

M-01-01-01 Motion 4

**It is moved that a Membership Approval Committee is established to define the detailed procedures and to do annual verification of whether the requirements for membership are met.**

Proposed: Israel,

Seconded: Germany *Secunder not heard on tape*

•

Vote

For 27

Against: 0

Abstain: 2

The motion passed

•≠

M -01-02 Australia and Israel

**It is moved to amend the statutes of SI Sect V1 to insert a new point 3, and renumber each of the following points.**

- 3) Only delegates from member groups who have met all of their financial obligations to SI within 6 months of the due date are allowed to vote.**

This is to make sure in the DV process only those who have fulfilled the membership requirements are allowed to vote.

Proposed: Australia,

Seconded: Malaysia *secunder not heard on tape*

•≠

Vote:

For: 27

Against: 0

Abstain: 3

The motion carries

•≠

Botswana

**Moves that 5 motions from the membership committee are voted on as a block**

Moved: Botswana

Seconded: Argentina *Secunder not heard on tape*

Vote

For: 29

Against:0

Abstain: 0

It's unanimous that we vote

•≠

The vote on the 5 Development Motions

For: 28

Against: 0

Abstain: 2

•≠

**Germany: I move that the GA agenda items are discussed in the order that they were originally moved at the start of the GA. For the future.**

Moved: Germany

Seconded: USA *Secunder not heard on tape*

≠

NZ: Does not support if means first session of the GA would be about sorting agenda. I believe if that is the procedure we would never pass more than a half dozen items.

≠

**Germany: At beginning of GA, items such as finance etc. I want to be clear, they should not be moved.**

Moved: Germany

Seconded: *Secunder not heard on tape*

≠

Austria: Is this feasible?

I ask that the GA vote

•≠

Vote:

For: 4

Against: 15

Abstain; 10

Askov Group: *could not be heard on tape*

•≠

Germany; Confirms that 33 member countries have signed the resolution to be sent to Servas Nepal as below:

Resolution of Member Countries attending the General Assembly of Servas International 2006:

The undersigned member countries of Servas International, attending the General Assembly of Servas International 2006, request Exco to send an observer to the General Convention of Servas Nepal on June 10<sup>th</sup> 2006 and make a report.

Signed by Servas Germany and 32 other delegates of the General Assembly.

Malaysia; Thanks for present and past Exco, for the moderators and the Italian organizers.

A big round of applause which lasted a long time.

•≠

Pramod: Not be a bureaucratic organization. Probably against the rules. But as GA have decided that you can keep your paddles. He advises he will ensure new ones at next GA.

Moderator: I would like to have people say good bye in their own language going around the table.

Followed by much clapping, happy hollering and good cheer.

And so it was.

**General Assembly closed at 1:35.**

---

Minutes taken and proofread by David Asher

Checked for accuracy by Honora Clemens

General Secretary 2004-2006

- Elena' notes had been checked by the Delegates during the meetings
- I checked David's notes with Elena' notes
- I checked David's notes and Elena's with the tapes---where possible