



DEMOCRATS ABROAD

THE REPORT OF THE STANDING
BYLAWS COMMITTEE

MAY 24, 2018

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Tom Schmid, Chair
Ada Shen, Secretary
Aaron Kruse, Member
Josh Van der Ploeg, Member
Katie Solon, Member
Rick Wicks, Member
Anu Naidu, Observer

Prepared for the 2018 Democrats Global Meeting in Tokyo, Japan

PROPOSITION 1

Sexual Harassment / Code of Conduct

ADOPT: During the public hearing, it was brought up that the Code of Conduct is a more appropriate place than the Charter to set out the DPCA’s sexual harassment policies, but there were concerns that the Charter did not specifically refer to a Code of Conduct. While it is not strictly necessary for the Charter to mention every policy document as may be enacted by the organization for them to have effect, reinforcing that Code of Conduct violations may constitute unacceptable conduct seems uncontroversial.

The SBC recommends amending this proposal to specify that unacceptable conduct (which may result in removal from the DPCA) may include violations of the DPCA Code of Conduct generally, rather than limiting it to specific sections of the Code of Conduct as in the original text. This also serves to not require a change in the Charter should the Code of Conduct be updated. Subject to this change, the SBC voted unanimously to recommend adoption of Amendment Proposal 1 (Sexual Harassment/ Code of Conduct). The sponsor of Proposition 1 has accepted the amended text proposed by the SBC.

PROPOSITION 2

Super PACs / Conflicts of Interest

OPPOSE: The Standing Bylaws Committee (SBC) shares the author’s concerns that behavior by DA leaders clearly detrimental to Democrats Abroad should not be tolerated, and in extreme cases should constitute grounds for removal from the organization.

However, the SBC also notes that the environment in which we currently operate, DA has a significant number of “ally groups” (many of which may operate as Super PACs), and DPCA members often wear many different hats. Working with certain of these ally groups have additionally given new roles to DA leaders within their countries of residence and allowed us to expand Democrats Abroad’s outreach to American citizens abroad. The SBC does not aim to discourage behavior in which DA leaders are working *with* and *alongside* ally groups, i.e. in activities that further our common goals.

These situations make it difficult to define “conflicts of interest” and “competing” goals. Efforts to clarify the proposal’s wording to be limited only to clearly detrimental acts were unsuccessful. Certain egregious cases were further seen as the exception rather than the rule.

However, the SBC notes that Sections 2.4(c) (*Cessation of Membership*) and 5.8 (*Suspension of a Country Committee Officer*) of the Charter currently provide for enforcement proceedings in the event of unacceptable conduct (within the discretion of the Executive Committee). The SBC further suggests updating the Code of Conduct to specify certain detrimental actions that may constitute grounds for removal.

For these reasons, the SBC does not recommend adoption of Amendment Proposal 2 (Super PACs/ Conflicts of Interest).

PROPOSITION 3 (A & C)

Diversity by Gender vs. Sex

DIVIDED: The SBC had a divided outcome on the gender vs. sex diversity proposals, with some members of the Committee favoring Proposal 3A (Diversity base on Gender rather than Sex) and other members favoring Proposal 3C (Diversity based on a more inclusive definition of Sex).

The views in favor of both proposals are set out below.

3A

Certain members of the committee preferred the word ‘gender’ in Proposal 3A, because it acknowledges the social aspect of sexual identity — that which we “perform” which may be based in part on biological sex, but also that with which we personally identify. ‘Sex’ implies that biological identity (chromosomes, anatomy, or legal definitions) is more important. These Committee members were concerned that combining the terms “gender or sex” (as is done in Proposal 3C) did not provide a clear logical result should two candidates have one identity in common but differ in another.

Prop 3A does not attempt to be definitive or exhaustive -- rather, it allows that as collective understanding of gender/sex identity and the words used to describe it change, non-binary people however they may identify are allowed to run for leadership positions in DA. It allows

non-binary people to run for Chair and Vice Chair and to be considered neutrally on the same footing as those male and female by avoiding the binary altogether: “shall not be the same gender.”

The gender balance requirement itself is a dictum of the DNC -- state parties are required to elect equal numbers of women as men to Chair and Vice Chair positions, in recognition of historical and ongoing social bias against women who make up roughly half of the population but remain under-represented in many important arenas (including politics: there are more GOP Senators named John than there are women.) At the same time, allowing for non-binary identities in Chair and Vice Chair elections would not negatively impact gender balance goals.

The language of 3A allows for non-binary inclusion in leadership with an economy of language, with ease of understanding, and clarity in the result that is achieved.

Concerns arose that appealing to legal definitions of states or other jurisdictions would send people diving into local statutes in order to hold a Chair/Vice Chair election, or might discourage people who mistakenly believe some legal reference or evidence is needed. Furthermore it seems beyond our humble brief: DA are not issuing state IDs, nor trying to better meet medical, legal, and other needs in society with its official categories, although we applaud those efforts. For the Charter, we need language that is adaptive as collective understanding progresses, while allowing our organization to conduct elections for Chair and Vice Chair without confusion and undue complexity. The language of 3A serves this purpose.

3C

Following the discussion at the first public hearing, certain members of the Committee expressed a preference for the term "different sex, as declared by each candidate in advance of the election." Furthermore, the definition of "sex" encompassed any classification of "***sex or gender*** that is legally recognized by any state or federal jurisdiction within the United States of America."

In this view, the terminology was intended to encompass any classification of sex or gender as a candidate may self-identify, and was seen as alleviating the concerns of attempting to differentiate between gender vs. sex. The language was also considered more clearly defined for purposes of the Charter, given (i) the reference to legal recognition and (ii) the current use of the term 'sex' in the Democratic Party Charter and Bylaws.

PROPOSITION 4

One Person, One Vote

AMEND: The majority (5-1) of the SBC voted in favor of recommending this proposal for adoption, subject to the SBC's proposed amendments.

The amendments include (i) changing annual vote allocation to biennial vote allocation, which would occur based on membership certification completed by February 20th of each odd-numbered year; (ii) removing the concepts of sequentially ranked Voting Representatives and Non-Voting Alternate Representatives; and (iii) amending Section 3.6(f) of the Charter to remove the mechanism for distributing votes among Country Committee Chairs, Vice Chairs and Voting Representatives.

The rationale for these changes is to streamline the verification requirements, so that Country Committees can combine contacting members for verification purposes with reaching out for GOTV activities during election years. Biennial allocation and certification also removes the possibility that a Country Committee's number of votes (and therefore the number of voting representatives) could change halfway through a DA election cycle. Expanding Non-Voting Representatives by creating Alternates and specifying their Ranking seems overly complex when any general member of Democrats Abroad can attend a DPCA meeting and be heard, if not carry a proxy vote. Finally, the mechanism for distributing votes among Country Committee Chairs, Vice Chairs and Voting Representatives would no longer be necessary if one person, one vote is adopted (by definition, only one vote may be allocated to each DPCA member).

Majority Position

The majority of the SBC supports the adoption of this proposal, as it achieves the fundamental democratic principle of one person, one vote, ensuring that no individual DPCA member's vote is worth more than that of any other member. A one person, one vote system would also simplify the DPCA's voting procedures and bring them into alignment with the DNC's stated position against weighted voting. This proposal is workable for the organization, and it has no impact on the Charter's current proxy rules. Furthermore, many large country committees have already begun voluntarily adopting one person, one vote for their own delegations.

Minority Position

The minority agrees with the principle of one person, one vote, but would wait to adopt it together with a wider reform to the DPCA's voting allocation system (which may also include a

limit to the overall number of voting members). Based on the DPCA's current voting allocation, this proposal would require larger Country Committees to double (or in some cases quadruple) the size of their voting delegations.

If adopted, this proposal would increase the DPCA from its current size of approximately 145 voting members, to a total of up to 247 voting members: 222 Country Committee votes, plus 11 additional members from the smallest Country Committees with half votes for each of the Chair and Vice Chair, plus 8 ExCom members and 6 DNC members. Increasing the overall size of the DPCA would (i) require larger meeting venues and (ii) make the travel fund more competitive (and/or require additional resources).

PROPOSITION 5 (A & B)

Voting Allocation

REFER: The SBC agrees that reforms to the DPCA voting allocation system may be warranted. However, given that the DNC is expected to adopt certain reforms this autumn as a result of the Unity Reform Commission's recommendations, the SBC believes it would be prudent to wait until after the DNC's changes have been adopted before reforming the DPCA's voting allocation system.

The SBC therefore recommends restyling Proposal 5C as a Motion to Refer to a Global Committee (to be determined), which would consider the principles outlined in the recitals. The Global Committee would also consider the merits of each of the current voting allocation proposals (5A, 5B and the Addendum to 5C), along with any others that may be put forward.

PROPOSITION 6

Electronic Voting

ADOPT: Section 3.8 of the Democrats Abroad Charter establishes a practice for taking a DPCA vote without a meeting. Proposition 6 asserts that this practice deviates from the principle of proportionality by overriding the DPCA vote allocation formula of Section 3.6 of the Charter, replacing it instead with an allocation system that grants one vote to each Country Committee, DPCA officer, and DNC member.

A majority of the SBC recommends adoption of Proposition 6. While the “one country, one vote” system established in the Charter has appropriate applications in regional voting, the majority finds that Section 3.8’s lack of proportionality in voting at the global level lacks any rational basis. Section 3.8 is an archaic provision of the Charter adopted when electronic participation was less established and less reliable.

To ensure that electronic participation is as firmly entrenched in our Charter as it is in current practice, Proposition 6 also seeks to amend Section 3.1 to clarify that all DPCA meetings may be held either exclusively, or in conjunction with, electronic participation; however, it preserves and clarifies the Charter’s existing requirement for in-person attendance at the annual Democrats Abroad Global Meeting.

A concern was raised during the public hearing and by the minority that Section 3.8 may yet have some practical use. However, it was countered during the public hearing—and the majority agrees—that the written consent provisions of Section 3.9 provide a sufficient mechanism to allow the DPCA to take action in cases under which a DPCA meeting cannot be held.

PROPOSITION 7

Non-Country Committee DA Members

REFER: The SBC agrees with the principle behind this proposal, but raised certain concerns surrounding the following issues:

- 1) the logistics of determining and achieving quorum and holding elections for Non-Country Committee Voting Representatives;
- 2) the duties, responsibilities and privileges associated with such a position vis-a-vis those of RVCs; and
- 3) the discretion afforded to the respective Regional Vice Chairs to determine how (or whether) to elect such representatives in their respective regions.

The SBC therefore moves to refer this proposal to a Global Committee (to be determined), which would consider the proposal in light of these issues.

PROPOSITION 8 (A & B)

ExCom Expansion

REFER: The SBC notes (and concurs with) the authors' appreciation of the heavy workload assumed by the international Executive Committee, especially with the recent and likely future growth of DA.

The SBC also notes that various global committees and caucuses have been developed over the past several years, whose chairs already share global leadership responsibilities. The leaders of these global teams seem well integrated into the work of the ExCom.

It is expected that DA will continue to grow, especially in upcoming critical election years. For these reasons – responsibility-sharing already happening and predicted organizational growth surges – the SBC unanimously recommends that these proposals on ExCom expansion be referred to a Global Committee (to be determined).

Members of the SBC suggest that this Global Committee also study and report on other schemes for expanding the ExCom, including adding Regional Vice Chairs. More than half of our Country Committees and DA members are in the EMEA region and the advisability of splitting EMEA into two regions, each with an RVC should be studied. Since the other two regions stretch over vast geography and several time zones, splitting the Americas and Asia/Pacific regions should also be considered.

PROPOSITION 9

ExCom Diversity

SUPPORT: In SBC discussions, it was noted that gender balance and inclusivity remain a priority for the Democratic Party and for DA.

This proposal would preclude there ever being a 7-1 gender imbalance on the ExCom, which is possible under current Charter rules. This proposal would allow for a 6-2, 5-3, or 4-4 split among “opposite” genders, and would allow for any configuration of non-binary genders or sex, except for 7 of the 8 ExCom members being of one gender or sex.

Concerns were raised in SBC discussions and at the first Public Hearing including: that the best-qualified candidates could possibly not be able to stand for election in the last round of elections, and the system could be gamed depending on the order of the elections. Also that DA has never had a female majority on its ExCom, but often has male majorities.

The SBC noted that passing this amendment and not allowing gross imbalance (7-1) would mean that DA would do more inclusive and diverse recruiting of candidates and that, in our growing organization, many are qualified and willing to serve. Elections could be conducted in random order so that gaming could be prevented, or in rotating order so that gender-balancing would not always fall to the same officer position.

The SBC voted 4-2 to recommend that Proposal 9 be adopted, if an amendment were added stipulating that the elections of the International Treasurer, International Secretary and International Counsel be held in random order, to be determined on election day.

PROPOSITION 10

RVC Vacancies

AMEND: The sponsors of Proposition 10 seek to clarify, expedite, and simplify the process for holding regional confirmation votes to fill RVC vacancies. If the proposition is adopted, RVCs will be replaced as follows: (i) the Executive Committee of the DPCA will nominate a replacement; (ii) the applicable region will hold a meeting to confirm the nominated replacement within 90 days of the nomination; (iii) voting members (per the existing Charter, country committee chairs and vice chairs are entitled to cast one vote per country committee) must be given 30 days' notice of the meeting; (iv) the meeting may be held exclusively or in conjunction with electronic participation; (v) proxies are prohibited because the chair or vice chair may participate electronically to cast their country committee's one vote; and (vi) if the nominated replacement is not confirmed, nominations will be taken from the floor and an immediate election will be held. The proposition also clarifies that RVCs must be members of Democrats Abroad.

The SBC unanimously supports the proposal but offered several non-substantive amendments to the recitals (the "whereas" clauses) for clarification. These recommendations have been accepted by the sponsors.

PROPOSITION 11

Global Housekeeping

DIVIDE THE QUESTION INTO PROPOSITIONS 11A-E: With respect to this proposal, the SBC considered (i) the four substantive riders as individual amendments (stylized as Amendment Proposals 11A-11D), and (ii) the remaining marked up version of the DA Charter (aside from the four riders) as a whole (stylized as Amendment Proposal 11E).

The SBC's recommendations are set out below:

Rider 11A - Foreign Policy / Host Country Politics

OPPOSE: The Code of Conduct already includes restrictions on DA leaders' public statements regarding foreign policy and host country politics. The SBC's view is that the Code of Conduct is a more appropriate place for these guidelines, as they may change periodically. Accordingly, the SBC does not recommend adoption of this proposal.

Rider 11B - Removal of DPCA Reps vs. Country Committee Leaders

AMEND: To mitigate the risk of liability for DPCA officers, it is important to maintain clear separation between the DPCA and individual Country Committees (which are separate legal entities, often subject to requirements of domestic law in each host country).

The SBC recommends adoption of this proposal, subject to the SBC proposed amendments, which aim to clarify that removal of a DPCA voting member will result only in removal of that member's voting rights in the DPCA.

Rider 11C - Subdelegation of Proxies

OPPOSE: The SBC considered this proposal to pose significant logistical challenges due to the unique nature of Democrats Abroad. Given the time zone differences and travel schedules of DPCA members, a wide-ranging proxy policy (including with transferable proxies) was seen as preferable for situations in which the original DPCA voting member may be unavailable to approve a transfer or sub-proxy. Accordingly, the SBC does not recommend adoption of this proposal.

Rider 11D - Rotation of Regional Vice Chairs

OPPOSE: The SBC considered that this proposal, while well-intentioned, could lead to certain unintended negative consequences. For instance, if one Country Committee has held the RVC position for two consecutive terms, a highly qualified candidate from that country could be disqualified from running against a much less qualified candidate from another Country Committee. This was seen as a particularly problematic outcome in the Americas and Asia-Pacific regions, which have a smaller membership base of potential candidates. Accordingly, the SBC does not recommend adoption of this proposal.

11E - Remaining Charter Mark-Up

OPPOSE: The SBC viewed this large-scale proposal as problematic from a procedural perspective, because certain of its sub-proposals address issues raised by other Charter Amendment Proposals that will come before the DPCA, such as proxies and Regional Vice Chair vacancies. If the Charter Markup is considered by the DPCA, and the DPCA rejects the entire proposal, it raises a procedural question as to whether these other Charter Amendment Propositions can be considered during the same meeting under Robert's Rules of Order.

Accordingly, the SBC recommends that this proposal be considered last (once all other proposals are considered), and that the DPCA divide the question to consider each sub-proposal separately.

PROPOSITION 12

Parliamentary Authority

ADOPT: The SBC agrees that Robert's Rules of Order is a part of the DPCA culture and how it conducts its business. References to certain editions of RRO had been included in earlier versions of the DA Charter in the past. The SBC therefore voted unanimously to recommend adoption of this proposal.

PROPOSITION 13

Standing Committees

REFER: The SBC was undecided on the question of whether standing committees should be formalized in the Charter. Currently, standing committees may be formed and their chairs appointed by the International Chair, (there are currently some 20 global committees or caucuses actively working on behalf of DA under the direction of the Chair and ExCom,) and certain members of the SBC expressed the view that the status quo appears to work well.

However, other members of the SBC agreed that it may be worth considering to specify certain permanent standing committees in the Charter, and queried whether the international ExCom should have the power to offer its “advice and consent” to the appointments of global committee chairs, and not simply “consult” on or be informed of their appointments. The concern was expressed that while the International Chair should have the power to nominate committee chairs, the ExCom may consider whether such nominees are suitable and/or representative of the DPCA.

The SBC therefore supports referring this proposal to a Global Committee (to be determined), which would consider (i) whether permanent standing committees are advisable, and if so, which; (ii) to consider and report on the advisability of ExCom consent for global committee chairs; (iii) whether replicating global committees at regional and country committee levels would be advisable; and (iv) developing guidelines for forming committees and their composition, and where these guidelines might best be formalized, if not in the Charter.

PROPOSITION 14

Country Committee AGMs by March 31st

OPPOSE: The SBC noted the sponsor’s concerns regarding the possibility of a DPCA Global Meeting being held before all Country Committees had elected their new leadership. However, certain members of the SBC expressed the view that it was in fact a strength for the DPCA International ExCom to be elected with a mix of outgoing and incoming voting members, and others expressed significant logistical concerns for certain Country Committees to hold AGMs before the proposed March 31st deadline (e.g., Asia Pacific countries that celebrate Lunar New Year, which may make it difficult to organize an AGM during March). It was additionally noted that the current deadline of June 30th was adopted in Berlin in 2016 (not Seoul in 2011) to

alleviate the need for Country Committees to submit waiver request to hold meetings after the then-March 31st deadline. (Each election year, several to many Country Committees had submitted such waivers.) The SBC therefore does not recommend adoption of this proposal.

PROPOSITION 15

DPCA AGM in May / DC in Odd-Numbered Years

OPPOSE: The SBC does not recommend the proposal of requiring the DPCA Global Meeting to be held in May. It was noted that certain venues may only be available at certain times, and a certain level of flexibility was desirable from an organizing perspective (while noting that the Global Meeting is traditionally held in Spring).

On the question of whether to stipulate that the Global Meeting being held in Washington, DC in odd-numbered years, the SBC did not adopt a formal recommendation. Certain members would prefer to hold the Global Meeting in DC every year; others were concerned that setting DC as a default venue in the event that Global Meeting location bids by Country Committees do not receive a majority of votes, which is what this proposition will do in effect, will favor those in geographies for whom this will be more convenient, and disfavor those living in geographies for whom this will be less convenient, to the detriment of the organization. However, the following pros and cons of holding the Global Meeting in DC were noted for the DPCA's consideration:

Pros:

- The fundamental business of Democrats Abroad is centered in DC;
- Wide variety of guest speakers;
- Opportunities for door-knocking, activism training and coordination with the DNC;
- “Neutral” location to mitigate the regional bias within the organization;
- Consistency in terms of cost and predictability in organizing logistics (particularly if we were become accustomed to holding it in the same location);
- Turn-out for meetings held in DC is generally high (and consistent);
- Higher visibility with national Democratic Party groups;
- Variety of venues convenient to airports; and
- Any member of Democrats Abroad can attend the Global Meetings, including at DC meetings where door knocks etc. take place.

Cons:

- The membership base of Democrats Abroad is not centered in DC nor are they necessarily motivated by DC as a geographic location;
- We already have elected officials and others who represent our interests in DC and at the DNC regularly — the International ExCom, DNC Reps, and those working on committees such as Tax;
- The DPCA already voted to set the venue to DC every two years at the Berlin Global Meeting.
- Previously, the DPCA had voted to rotate the locations of the Global Meetings in order to better and more fairly distribute the burden and cost of travel and the benefits of visibility, voice and representation;
- Setting the default Global Meeting location to DC in the event there are not enough votes to agree on a location outside of DC is the same as voting to permanently favor some geographies over others and disfavoring some geographies over others;
- No “host committee” in DC since by definition no DA or DPCA members live there; and
- More significant organizing logistics than relying on Country Committees to plan and host.

Although the SBC did not formally adopt a recommendation on this proposal, the following suggestion was put forward to amend the proposal in full:

"The annual Global Meeting of the DPCA shall be held in the Washington DC area. The [Executive Committee] (by two-thirds) or the [DPCA] (by majority) may vote to change the date, time, or place of the Global Meeting for any reason."

PROPOSITION 16 (A, B & C)

Gender Balance / Diversity

OPPOSE: The SBC understands the issues faced in Canada with respect to gender balance of its DPCA Voting Representatives. Moreover, the SBC agrees with the need for inclusion of non-binary gender identities within the DPCA’s commitment to gender balance. However, the Committee views gender balance not only as a way to ensure that opportunities for participation and engagement of women in leadership positions are balanced, but also as a way to ensure that the DPCA membership is reflective of the organization as a whole.

The concerns were also raised as to (i) whether allowing all-female/non-male delegations and requiring female majorities in every instance of an odd number of delegates (e.g., in every instance of a delegation of three, for example, you would never be allowed to have two men and one woman) could really be viewed as corrective for gender bias; and (ii) whether permitting imbalance in this direction may create other imbalances across the organization.

Gender balance has become a core value within the DPCA and within the Democratic Party as a whole. It was also noted that some of the challenges Canada faces have been resolved by other large Country Committees taking different approaches — perhaps these issues may be addressed in other ways besides Charter changes.

The SBC therefore does not support adoption of Amendment Proposals 16A, 16B or 16C.

PROPOSITION 17

Fresh Start CC Compliance

AMEND: At the DPCA meeting held in July 2017 via electronic participation, the Charter was amended by adding a new Section 5.10 (Removal of Out of Compliance Country Committees). This new section does not take effect until January 1, 2019, and it provides a Charter-based mechanism to automatically remove country committees from the DPCA in the event that they are (i) out of compliance, or (ii) suspended pursuant to Section 5.9 of the Charter, for a period of four years.

Proposition 17 seeks to amend current Section 5.10 by reducing the period during which a country committee must take action to return to compliance or lift the suspension. A country committee would not be removed under Proposition 17 if it becomes compliant or has its suspension lifted within three years. The SBC agreed that the four-year removal period should be reduced, though there was disagreement about whether it should be reduced to three or to two years..

The majority prefers setting this period at three years. One of the arguments in favor of the three-year period was that a Country Committee could not be removed by a compliance/suspension decision of only one Executive Committee. By extending the period to three years, a new Executive Committee would need to determine that the country committee remained out of compliance or suspended. One committee member preferred a two-year removal period taking effect the day after the second anniversary of non-compliance.

For reasons stated above and to clarify the text of Proposition 17, the SBC recommends amending the text as follows: (i) ensuring that relevant time periods in the proposition refer to “three (3) years”; (ii) striking “on the third year of failing to comply with Section 5.4, or failure to resolve their suspension, . . . “ and inserting “...then on the third anniversary of the Country Committee's non-compliance as determined by the Executive Committee or suspension. . . .”

Accordingly, the SBC unanimously recommends that Proposition 17 be amended as stated above.

PROPOSITION 18

Proxies

ADOPT: Section 3.7(g) of the Charter currently prohibits any eligible proxy holder from holding more than four proxies. Proposition 18 seeks to achieve three key changes to Democrats Abroad’s proxy rules: (i) reduce the number of proxies that can be held from four to one; (ii) add language clarifying that proxies may be either “transferable or nontransferable”; and (iii) expand the pool of possible proxy holders by allowing Country Committee Chairs, Vice Chairs, and Voting Representatives to proxy their votes to “any DPCA member” rather than only being permitted to proxy to DPCA members of the same region.

A majority of the SBC recommends adoption of Proposition 18. The proposed changes—particularly the reduction of the number of allowable proxies—would align the proxy rules of Democrats Abroad with those of the Democratic National Committee. The majority is aware of concerns that reducing the number of proxies may make it more difficult for large Country Committees to fully participate in DPCA meetings due to extreme time zone differences. However, the majority feels that these concerns are overcome by (i) confirming that proxies may be transferable, (ii) permitting a member to proxy his or her vote to any other DPCA member, and (iii) the enhanced use of video-conferencing tools.

The minority notes the unique nature of Democrats Abroad, operating across time zones around the world. The DNC has never taken issue with the DPCA’s proxy rules. Particularly for Voting Representatives who may become less active within the organization after winning election, this proposal may also have the effect of depriving Country Committees of their allocated votes until the Voting Representative is inactive long enough to be deemed to resign from the organization.

PROPOSITION 19

Extend Time for Voting

OPPOSE: The SBC sympathizes with the issues faced by members attending DPCA Global Meetings remotely, often in time zones that do not correspond to ordinary waking hours. However, Robert's Rules of Order and effective deliberation are premised on the principle of participating in debate prior to casting votes, so it seems important for voters to be online for the period of time leading up to the vote. Furthermore, the DPCA's proxy system facilitates voting by members unable to attend meetings for whatever reason. The SBC therefore does not recommend adoption of this proposal.