

# SICOGA 2018

## Interim Report for SI Management SWG

Convener: Pramod Kumar (pramod.servas@gmail.com)

Date of issue: 09 September 2018

Motion No. & Heading	Contact Person for the Motion	Summary of Comments and Queries from SWG	Pros & Cons of the Motion		SWG's Recommendation	Convenor's Comments
			Pros	Cons		
CAN-002 LOI not signed by traveler themselves.	Julie Cormack( <a href="mailto:jjlc5440@gmail.com">jjlc5440@gmail.com</a> )	<p>The motion should be amended to include the following:</p> <p>Interview shouldn't be done by a member of the same family, e.g. a parent interviewing his/her son or daughter.</p> <p>The Servas Handbook shall be updated to reflect this new rule.</p>	<p>It lends an air of openness and transparency</p> <p>Single women feel comfortable traveling with Servas because of the signed and approved LOI.</p>	<p>In some countries, there may not be another key person who could sign the LOI.</p> <p>It would provide only a false sense of security for some.</p>	The intent of the motion is clear and it is ready to go to GA for a vote.	Taking note of the comments in this SWG, the movers of the motion have proposed an amended version of the motion. Some of the "cons" listed here are not applicable to the amended motion.

Motion No. & Heading	Contact Person for the Motion	Summary of Comments and Queries from SWG	Pros & Cons of the Motion		SWG's Recommendation	Convenor's Comments
			Pros	Cons		
				<p>It would add to paper work and delay in the process of a traveller getting an LOI.</p> <p>This motion may not be relevant when LOIs are issued with e-stamps through Servas Online.</p>		

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

Motion No. & Heading	Contact Person for the Motion	Summary of Comments and Queries from SWG	Pros & Cons of the Motion		SWG's Recommendation	Convenor's Comments
			Pros	Cons		
EXE-020 SI EXCO 2015-2018 recommended priorities for SI EXCO 2018-2021			This motion has been withdrawn.			

Motion No. & Heading	Contact Person for the Motion	Summary of Comments and Queries from SWG	Pros & Cons of the Motion		SWG's Recommendation	Convenor's Comments
			Pros	Cons		
EXC-022 SI paid administrator role	Ann Greenhough ( <a href="mailto:vicepresident@servas.org">vicepresident@servas.org</a> )	<p>The motion lacks clarity as to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) the exact scope of work of the paid personnel</li> <li>ii) the exact number of paid personnel</li> <li>iii) the estimated cost of hiring the personnel</li> <li>iv) the recruitment process for hiring the personnel</li> </ul> <p>The recruitment of Servas Online manager be taken up as a part of the motion GRE-004 and this motion be limited to the recruitment of office administrator only.</p> <p>Opinion in SWG is divided on whether Servas members should be eligible to take up paid jobs in</p>	The workload of some of the Servas volunteers has reached unsustainable levels and having paid workers to assist them will reduce the workload of volunteers.	<p>Having paid workers will be a drain on the financial resources of Servas and would call for drawing from its reserves.</p> <p>Hiring of paid workers may not be financially sustainable unless new sources of revenue are found. This is something which has eluded Servas till now.</p>	<p>It would be difficult for GA to take an informed decision on the motion in its present form, due to lack of clarity on several issues. The motion needs to be redrafted to provide as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the exact responsibilities of the proposed paid workers</li> <li>• who they will report to</li> <li>• an estimate (at least a ballpark figure) of the amount that needs to be provided in the budget for implementing this motion.</li> </ul>	The motion in its present form is half baked, lacking in essential basic information which should have been provided, and seems to put the cart before the horse. For example, it says that funding from SI reserves can be used, but does not give an estimate of the amount that would be required. The motion is presented as an amendment to an earlier motion

Motion No. & Heading	Contact Person for the Motion	Summary of Comments and Queries from SWG	Pros & Cons of the Motion		SWG's Recommendation	Convenor's Comments
			Pros	Cons		
		Servas. One opinion is that this would create a conflict of interest, while another opinion is that a Servas member familiar with the Servas processes would be an asset to EXCO.				<p>passed by distant vote (DV) in 2017. This DV motion <b>did</b> include an estimate of the cost of implementing that motion: CHF 15,000 for one year. It is not clear why a similar estimate cannot be worked out for implementing this amendment to the DV motion.</p> <p>While seeking approval for hiring of paid "staff" the motion also asks for a feasibility study to be carried out. The logical</p>

Motion No. & Heading	Contact Person for the Motion	Summary of Comments and Queries from SWG	Pros & Cons of the Motion		SWG's Recommendation	Convenor's Comments
			Pros	Cons		
						<p>sequence would be to <b>first carry out a feasibility study of a proposal</b> and if the proposal is found feasible and financially viable, <b>then seek approval for implementing the proposal.</b></p> <p>Also, the feasibility report is expected to investigate whether or not the implementation of this motion would call for an amendment to the SI Statute. It is not clear why the movers of this motion could</p>

Motion No. & Heading	Contact Person for the Motion	Summary of Comments and Queries from SWG	Pros & Cons of the Motion		SWG's Recommendation	Convenor's Comments
			Pros	Cons		
						not investigate this before submitting this motion. Now, if the motion is passed and then the feasibility report concludes that an amendment to the SI Statute would be required, then the implementation of this motion would go for a toss because, an amendment to the statute would not be possible before the next GA, presumably in 2021. However, to the best of knowledge of this SWG



Motion No. & Heading	Contact Person for the Motion	Summary of Comments and Queries from SWG	Pros & Cons of the Motion		SWG's Recommendation	Convenor's Comments
			Pros	Cons		
						<p>Convener, hiring paid workers would not call for an amendment to the statute. SI has been paying a hired bookkeeper for many years now, without having to amend the statute.</p> <p>It is suggested that the motion be amended to include an estimate of the expenditure involved in hiring an SI paid administrator as was proposed in the earlier DV motion and also the scope of work of this</p>

Motion No. & Heading	Contact Person for the Motion	Summary of Comments and Queries from SWG	Pros & Cons of the Motion		SWG's Recommendation	Convenor's Comments
			Pros	Cons		
						<p>administrator. The hiring of person/persons for management of Servas Online may be removed from this motion and taken up as a part of the motion FRA-001.</p> <p>The motion uses words such as, "paid staff" and "contracts of <b>employment</b>". The word "staff" normally means an employee rather than a contract worker. The motion must clarify whether the intent is to recruit employees or</p>

Motion No. & Heading	Contact Person for the Motion	Summary of Comments and Queries from SWG	Pros & Cons of the Motion		SWG's Recommendation	Convenor's Comments
			Pros	Cons		
						outsource the work to contract workers. An employee would normally be entitled to additional benefits besides the salary, e.g. paid leave.

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

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

Motion No. & Heading	Contact Person for the Motion	Summary of Comments and Queries from SWG	Pros & Cons of the Motion		SWG's Recommendation	Convenor's Comments
			Pros	Cons		
			than the number of hosts found in Servas Online because, many of the hosts are not yet listed in Servas Online.	onboard Servas Online so as to make Servas more efficient and attractive to young persons, hence spending manhours on creating thousands of additional user accounts on Dolphin is not advisable. Those manhours should be spent on improving Servas Online.		Servas Online, and also to enable travellers to obtain host lists with minimum delay, all Servas members shall be given password protected access to Dolphin so that they may download the latest available host lists in pdf format, from the Host List Storage Area. This will also reduce the workload of some key persons as they will not have to download host lists for travelers.

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

Motion No. & Heading	Contact Person for the Motion	Summary of Comments and Queries from SWG	Pros & Cons of the Motion		SWG's Recommendation	Convenor's Comments
			Pros	Cons		
USA-001 Host list information privacy protected in archives	Phyllis Chinn ( <a href="mailto:Phyllis.Chinn@humboldt.edu">Phyllis.Chinn@humboldt.edu</a> )	The motion is clear in its intent.	There are no comments regarding pros and cons of the motion.		The motion is clear and can be sent to the GA for vote.	<p>The passage or non passage of this motion is not likely to change anything.</p> <p>It is indeed generous of the Hoover Institute to provide the resources for preserving Servas host lists for a period of forty years. That offer has already been made, and presumably, will remain valid, irrespective of this motion being passed or not.</p> <p>EXCO has already passed a</p>



Motion No. & Heading	Contact Person for the Motion	Summary of Comments and Queries from SWG	Pros & Cons of the Motion		SWG's Recommendation	Convenor's Comments
			Pros	Cons		
						<p>motion to the effect that each National Group will be invited to send their host lists for being preserved in SI Archives. In the opinion of this convenor, this is a routine matter and does not require a GA approval, more so since, each National Group will be free to accept or decline this offer. There is no compulsion involved.</p> <p>So, all that is required is that all National Secretaries be informed about the</p>

Motion No. & Heading	Contact Person for the Motion	Summary of Comments and Queries from SWG	Pros & Cons of the Motion		SWG's Recommendation	Convenor's Comments
			Pros	Cons		
						<p>generous offer of Hoover Institute through email and by an announcement at the GA and then EXCO may proceed as per the relevant motion passed by them and mentioned in the background information of this motion.</p> <p><b>A motion expressing Servas International's thanks and gratitude to Hoover Institute for their generous offer would have been</b></p>

Motion No. & Heading	Contact Person for the Motion	Summary of Comments and Queries from SWG	Pros & Cons of the Motion		SWG's Recommendation	Convenor's Comments
			Pros	Cons		
						more relevant and meaningful.

Motion No. & Heading	Contact Person for the Motion	Summary of Comments and Queries from SWG	Pros & Cons of the Motion		SWG's Recommendation	Convenor's Comments
			Pros	Cons		
USA-003 Limitations of who sees Servas Online host information	This motion has been withdrawn.					