

Terms of Reference for CCWG Breakouts in Dublin

Community Decision Process

Purpose of Group	To describe a method of consensus-style decision making that will replace the voting system in the Second Draft Proposal.
Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Based on objections from SOs and advice from AC ● No single SO or AC should be able to capture decision-making through a veto right or through lack of broad support/participation ● Flexibility for SOs or ACs to participate in any particular issue, or on all issues ● Recognize that RSSAC and SSAC are appointed by board
Deliverables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Rules for decision making ● Analyze corner cases ● For each community power, do we have different participation requirements and thresholds for consensus? ● Final step after decision: discourse with board

Enforcement Model

Purpose of Group	Compare how PTI separation review team and IRP decisions would be enforced under the Single Designator / Single Member models, and recommend a model choice
Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Enforcement process begins only after community decision process has run thru and conflict with board remains. ● Compare only Single Designator and Single Member. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CCWG lawyers compared enforcement mechanisms for SD and SM, on all 7 required community powers ● Test against requirement for enforceable powers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Need to enforce Separation RT recommendations ○ Ensure Board is bound by IRP default judgments ● Process should aim at simplicity and efficiency ● Court action should only be last resort, and avoided if it can be avoided
Deliverables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Fully described escalation process, starting with Board refusal to follow community or IRP decision. ● Recommendation and logic (SD or SM) ● Key pros and cons for each model, to make it very clear to the CCWG what these are

Removal of Individual Directors

Purpose of Group	Describe a process to remove a Board member (Nomcom or SO/AC appointed)
Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Preserve the rights of the SO and ACs WRT their appointed directors, while maintaining the independence of board members. ● Informal consultation before initiating a removal petition ● petition phase (and associated participation threshold) ● Discussion phase (incl. explanation of reasons & reply) ● Decision phase (and associated threshold) ● Could a Community Decision override an AC/SO? ● Limits on the process (such as maximum # of removals) to avoid using this to recall most/all of Board
Deliverables	Description of process, incl. thresholds and description of limits to the process

Budget / Operating Plan Veto

Purpose of Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Look at risks associated with veto of annual budget and exceptional expenditures ● Identify existing and proposed mitigators to address public comment concerns (e.g. decline in revenues)
Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Meet CWG requirement to ensure that PTI is funded ● Avoid mission creep / unagreed initiatives ● Ensure financial stability ● Consider scenarios where revenues have <u>declined</u> ● Assume that Community Decision process happens first
Deliverables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Use Cases raising concerns with veto of budget and operating plans ● For each use case, a description of how they would play out in the current proposal ● Clarifications of existing mitigation measures and/or recommendations to address the issues