

Rules of Procedure addition

By David Law (Chairman) (Submission by Executive Board)

January 3rd, 2024

***Context:** EB AB SB not to vote on nominees. Reason: during the recruitment process it has already been approved. All board members combined already make a difference of 15 votes. This way the general members' opinions will be taken into consideration more and the result will have more transparency to it.*

Current article 15 in the RoP:

15.1 After the deliberation is closed or if nobody is asked to speak, the chairman shall formulate the proposal before the meeting and ask those present whether a vote is desired. If this is not answered in the affirmative, the proposal shall be deemed to have been adopted.

15.2 When voting, those present can choose between voting for, against, blank or abstention. In the case of voting for or against, the person entitled to vote shall vote for or against the proposal respectively. In the case of a blank vote, the person entitled to vote is against the procedure and casts a protest vote. This vote will be included in the total votes. In the case of abstention, the vote is not included in the total votes cast.

15.3 A proposal shall be adopted according to the 'half plus one' principle. At an odd number of votes, at least half the votes must be in favor, rounded upwards. rounded off. For an even number, at least half plus one has to vote in favor;

15.4 In the case of a written vote, the vote shall be submitted anonymously to the Secretariat. Votes where the anonymity of the member is not guaranteed, for example, because the member has given his or her name, and votes which are not anonymous shall not be counted.

15.5 The votes shall be counted by the Secretariat. If more votes are than the number of members present, a second vote shall be taken.

15.6 Immediately following a vote, the chairman shall announce the result, indicating the number of votes cast for and against.

15.7 Anyone can have it recorded in the minutes that they wish to be considered as having voted against the proposal.

15.8 It shall not be possible to revoke a vote.

15.9 The chairman may proceed to a further vote at the same meeting if the result of the first vote is not clear.

Paragraph 10 to be added to article 15:

15.10 Individuals or groups presenting a proposal or nominee during a GMA shall be ineligible to cast a vote for that specific proposal or nominee during the voting process.

Reasons:

1. **Maintaining Neutrality:** This rule ensures a level playing field by preventing proposal presenters from influencing the outcome through their own votes. It maintains neutrality and fairness in the voting process.

2. **Avoiding Bias:** Presenters may have a vested interest in seeing their proposal succeed, which could bias their voting behavior. Prohibiting their vote mitigates potential biases and ensures a more impartial decision-making process.
3. **Enhancing Accountability:** It promotes accountability among presenters by preventing them from unduly influencing the outcome in their favor. It encourages them to rely on the merits of their proposal rather than their voting power.
4. **Upholding Transparency:** This rule contributes to the transparency of the decision-making process. Members can trust that votes are cast based on the proposal's merits rather than personal interests of the presenters.
5. **Supporting Diverse Perspectives:** By abstaining from voting on their own proposal, presenters allow other members to assess the proposal independently, considering various viewpoints and making a well-considered decision.
6. **Promoting Active Participation:** This rule encourages greater involvement from all members since it ensures that the proposal's fate is determined by the collective judgment of the assembly rather than the biased interests of the presenters.
7. **Setting a Precedent for Impartiality:** Implementing this rule sets a precedent for fair and impartial decision-making within the association, fostering a culture of equity and fairness in future discussions and proposals.

Counter arguments:

1. **Expertise and Stakeholder Interest:** Presenters often possess in-depth knowledge and expertise related to their proposal. Their vote could represent a specialized understanding or a unique stake in the proposal's success, and excluding their vote might disregard this valuable input.
 2. **Complexity in Implementation:** Enforcing this rule might pose challenges in practice, especially in cases where proposals are collaborative efforts or where it's unclear who exactly constitutes the presenting group. Determining who is ineligible to vote could lead to confusion or disputes.
 3. **Potential for Disengagement:** If presenters feel disenfranchised by not being allowed to vote on their own proposal, it might lead to disengagement or reduced participation in future discussions or proposal presentations.
-

This rule aims to uphold fairness, objectivity, and transparency in the decision-making process by preventing proposal presenters from wielding undue influence through their votes, ensuring a more impartial and democratic voting environment.