



FORWARD2004!

GREEN NATIONAL CONVENTION

BRPP PROPOSAL

DRAFT

Proposal for change in the procedures of the GPUS as relates to the introduction and adoption of proposals

Submitted by the Bylaws, Rules, Policies, and Procedures Committee

Presenter Greg Gerritt

Preamble, Explanation, and Introduction

The procedures of the GPUS in regard to the creation and passing of resolutions by the Coordinating Committee are constantly evolving, changing in response to changes in the organization. Less rigorous structures work well in small organizations, but may not work as well in larger ones.

We have all seen significantly problematic situations arise using our current discussion and voting procedures, so we are proposing an expanded process that will allow input in a different ways at the several stages of the process for the introduction and passage of resolutions. The BRPP proposes language that will clarify questions of ownership, process, amendment, and voting, is delineating the initiation, sorting, and voting page procedures, as well as presenting a two-step deliberation and decision making process.

The process begins when one of the constituent bodies of the GPUS, State Parties, Caucuses, and Committees, send a proposal to the GPUS for approval. Proposals then either go for further study and discussion before being presented to the CC for formal discussion and decision, or are immediately presented to the CC for its decision making process. These rules delineate how a proposal reaches the floor of the GPUS for formal decision and then focus on the steps of discussion and decision for the floor process.

BRPP PROPOSAL
PROPOSAL FOR CHANGE IN THE PROCEDURE OF THE GPUS





FORWARD2004!

GREEN NATIONAL CONVENTION

BRPP PROPOSAL

BRPP PROPOSAL

PROPOSAL FOR CHANGE IN THE PROCEDURE OF THE GPUS

In the first stage after a proposal is formally presented to the CC Greens shall attempt to reach a consensus with our traditional methodology. The stage-one process described in some detail in the proposal below is driven by the people proposing the resolution, as represented by their chosen presenters. This first stage of the deliberation process is a consensus-building and discussion stage in which the presenters make all decisions as to content and disposition of the proposal. The authors/presenters will be, as now, the 'owners' of the proposal. Discussion, friendly amendments, and rewrites are offered, based on how the people who bring the resolution look at the discussion. If this works, then the proposal smoothly moves through for a decision.

For proposals in rougher weather, there is a second stage. If the presenters believe that further discussion will not achieve consensus, then they may formally place the proposal in the amendment and voting process, or stage two. Presenters betting that though they do not have consensus they have enough votes to win may choose to force a vote here. Those believing they do not have enough votes to pass the current version, but wishing to see the CC take action in a relatively short period of time can present the proposal to the CC for a formal amendment process to be followed by a vote.

The second stage of the deliberation process is an amendment process. A facilitator becomes the primary shepherd of the proposal. Amendments must be sponsored by at least 5 CC members, and the facilitator is responsible for assembling and incorporating amendments into the proposal, assisted by the floor manager. Amendments will be voted on after a discussion period, and the CC will also, when voting on an amendments package, vote on whether to send the entire proposal back for further study and deliberations. When final language is approved, then the proposal as a completed whole is voted on.





FORWARD2004!

GREEN NATIONAL CONVENTION

BRPP PROPOSAL

Rules and Procedures of the GPUS

5) COORDINATING COMMITTEE PROPOSAL ENDORSEMENT PROCESS

Definitions:

Proposal: the document about which a decision is formally sought. All proposals are transmitted to the GPUS via the delegates to the CC representing the State Party, Caucus, or committee that originated it.

A proposal can be a resolution, bylaw amendment, endorsement, or any other form of question that requires a CC decision. The vote needed to pass a resolution, bylaw, or any other type of question shall remain as it is currently in the rules unless specifically changed in this proposal.

Proposer: the original author(s) of the proposal. Often a body such as a state party, caucus, or committee as they have standing to bring a proposal.

Presenter(s): The people designated by the proposers of a proposal to represent their interests with the CC and any of the constituent bodies of the GPUS. Presenters will be the determiners of how a proposal wends its way through the stage one consensus seeking process, with responsibilities including responding to questions, rewriting and amending, accepting or rejecting friendly amendments, and determining when a proposal shall move from one segment of the process to the next. When a proposal moves from Stage One to Stage Two process management is handed to a facilitator.

Facilitator: A Facilitator is a Green trained in the minutia of GPUS process who shall take over from the presenters when a proposal enters Stage Two, the formal amendment and voting stage. The facilitator shall be responsible for collecting amendments, assembling proposal documents for amendment voting, assembling documents for final voting, and presenting them for a vote by the CC. They are assisted by a Floor Manager. The GPUS shall recruit and train a poll of facilitators to work in rotation on proposals. During Stage 1 of the proposal process the facilitator shall assist the presenters in remembering the time line of the process.

BRPP PROPOSAL
PROPOSAL FOR CHANGE IN THE PROCEDURE OF THE GPUS





FORWARD2004!

GREEN NATIONAL CONVENTION

BRPP PROPOSAL

BRPP PROPOSAL
PROPOSAL FOR CHANGE IN THE PROCEDURE OF THE GPUS

Floor Manager: An SC member designated to watch over the mechanics of the process for a particular proposal and working with the facilitator to make sure that the voting page process include the posting of documents, goes smoothly and on the timing of the process.

Body, Constituent Body, Receiving Body: For the purposes of this bylaw amendment a Body or Constituent Body is any Committee, Caucus, Working Group, State Party, network or other segment of the GPUS that has a formal structure within the Green Party, the components that make up the GPUS. A Receiving Body is any of the above Bodies that is asked by the SC to help craft or discuss a proposal before it is formally brought to the floor of the CC.

Voting Page: The Voting Page is the web site where all proposals are posted. A public web page, all proposals on the voting page shall be available to be read by all. It shall also contain a calendar of activity for each proposal. It shall be administered by the Voting Page Administrator who is appointed by the Communications Committee. The Voting Page also contains the web voting site for the GPUS. Any item that is sent to the voting page shall be considered to be on the floor of the GPUS for either a discussion or a vote depending upon where it is in the process.

Voting Page Genie: The Voting Page Genie is the automatic program that sends notices to the CC noting that a proposal is about to or has entered a new phase of the process.

Stage 1: The consensus seeking segment of the GPUS proposal process.

Stage 2: The formal amendment and voting segment of the GPUS proposal process

I) Initiation of Proposals

A) Only State Green Parties affiliated with the GPUS (State Parties), fully accredited GPUS Caucuses (Caucuses) and GPUS Committees (Committees) may present proposals to the GPUS Coordination Committee (CC) for approval.

All such proposals shall be democratically derived in accordance with the written by-laws, rules, policies, and procedures of the constituent body proposing the resolution and the GPUS, and follow the GPUS stylistic guidelines for proposals. Proposals coming





FORWARD2004!

GREEN NATIONAL CONVENTION

BRPP PROPOSAL

from individuals or groups without formal GPUS status shall not be accepted. Proposals that are not written in accordance with the GPUS stylistic guidelines may be rejected by the GPUS Steering Committee or referred to an appropriate Receiving Body for further study/discussion/rewriting.

B) State Parties, Caucuses and Committees originating proposals shall send a copy to the Green Party Secretary who shall immediately (within 48 hrs) acknowledge its receipt to the proposers and send a copy to the Steering Committee (SC), the CC via the national votes list, and the person responsible for the voting page. A notice that the proposal was received and that it will be dealt with at the next SC conference call shall accompany all receipts and official forwards.

II). The initial sorting of proposals.

A) The SC shall do the initial sorting of proposals.

B) The usual process shall be described below, but any proposal requiring an emergency or timely response may be forwarded to the GPUS CC for a decision without waiting for an SC conference call. The SC may make this decision by e-mail or other methods of communication and will promptly notify the CC of any such decisions

C) At the next SC conference call following the receipt of a proposal, in the voting queue section of the conference call, the SC shall discuss which option to take for each proposal and then make a formal decision as to where to send a proposal.

D). The SC shall choose among several options. These include:

1. Immediately placing it on the voting page for discussion and decision.

a. When State Parties and Caucuses attach a note to their proposal stating that they are unwilling to accept referral to a Receiving Body but have voted that the proposal immediately go to the floor and the voting page, the SC must accept their

BRPP PROPOSAL
PROPOSAL FOR CHANGE IN THE PROCEDURE OF THE GPUS





FORWARD2004!

GREEN NATIONAL CONVENTION

BRPP PROPOSAL

BRPP PROPOSAL
PROPOSAL FOR CHANGE IN THE PROCEDURE OF THE GPUS

judgment. State Parties and Caucuses, as sovereign bodies have this prerogative, but only if they actively claim it for a particular proposal.

b. Proposals that have been reviewed by a committee, either as the proposers of the proposal or after a proposal has been referred to committee and the committee has finished its work, shall normally be sent to the voting page for a decision, but the SC shall retain flexibility as to the assignment of a proposal. Committees are not sovereign bodies and can not independently decide that their proposal must go to the CC without further study.

2. Referring it to an appropriate committee or caucus for further discussion.

3. Have a discussion with the proposers about the concerns of the SC and then decide whether to send it to the voting page or refer it for further study.

E). Items being placed on the voting page will then come under the proposal process rules described below.

F). The SC will broadcast its decision on the disposition of proposals within 72 hrs of its conference call and cause it to be sent to the Receiving Body or placed upon the voting page within the same 72 hrs.

G). It is a responsibility of the SC is to insure that any proposal sent to "committee" ends up in a receiving body willing and able to work with the proposers to improve the resolution.

H). The receiving body shall officially acknowledge the receipt of the proposal to the SC, CC, and the original proposers within 72 hrs of its receipt.

1. The Process between the Receiving Body and the Proposers shall begin with a conversation between the original proposers of the resolution and the body receiving it for further study.

2. The goal of the conversation is a consensus on the proposal between those originally presenting it and the body receiving the proposal and the best possible proposal.





FORWARD2004!

GREEN NATIONAL CONVENTION

BRPP PROPOSAL

BRPP PROPOSAL
PROPOSAL FOR CHANGE IN THE PROCEDURE OF THE GPUS

I). If the proposers are unable to reach a consensus with the receiving body, the proposers may send a note to the SC requesting the original proposal be placed on the voting page at the next SC conference call.

J). If the proposers and the receiving body are able to achieve a consensus on a proposal the consensus version shall be formally transmitted to the SC and the SC shall cause it to be placed on the floor and the voting page.

K). Any committee or body of the GPUS is free to examine a proposal on their own, and are encouraged to pay particular attention to any proposals that effect their work. They should be diligent in notifying relevant members and bodies of the GPUS that a proposal has adverse impact on them, and engage in the conversation to improve the proposal from their perspective, and will have opportunity to do so within the framework of the normal CC process.

III). The Voting Page process for formal discussions and decisions.

A). The structure

1. A Floor Manager for each proposal shall be selected by and from the SC and shall be responsible for the administration, tracking and certifying of that proposal.

2. A facilitator shall be selected for each proposal based on the rotation of the facilitators pool.

3. The Voting Page Genie shall automatically send notifications for each change in the status of a proposal including that a proposal has been placed into discussion, that certain consensus building and discussion periods are ending or beginning, that there are 48 hrs left in a discussion phase, that voting has begun, that the voting period has 48hrs left, that voting is over, and the official final results of the vote once they have been certified by the floor manager. Such information will also be posted as a part of the proposal on the voting page and on a voting page calendar.





FORWARD2004!

GREEN NATIONAL CONVENTION

BRPP PROPOSAL

BRPP PROPOSAL
PROPOSAL FOR CHANGE IN THE PROCEDURE OF THE GPUS

4. Proposers of a proposal shall may designate up to two (2) representatives (Presenters) to make the case for the proposal and to lead consultation and negotiation with reviewing committees and the CC during the preliminaries and Stage 1 of the CC approval process.

a. Presenters shall consult with and deliberate upon advice from the receiving body while a proposal is being reviewed prior to its reaching the voting page

b. Make the case for the proposal to the CC , including an introduction to the proposal when it first reaches the floor for discussion.

c. Amend proposals in consultation with the proposers while a proposal is in the consensus seeking stage of discussion.

d. Determine the rate at which a proposal progresses through the stage 1 process.

5. There shall be nothing in these rules to discourage Greens beyond the presenters who are part of the body creating a proposal from participating in any and all discussions of a proposal, though posting to the COO list is restricted to those with normal posting privileges.

B). The Process

1. There shall be two stages of the CC proposal approval process.

a. Consensus Building/Discussion Stage- Stage 1- also known as the Consensus Stage) and

b. Amendment and Voting Stage - Stage 2- (Also known as the Voting Stage)

2. During Stage 1, the authors and their representatives shall be considered to “own” a proposal and shall make any and all decisions as to content and disposition of the proposal unless explicitly expressed otherwise or counter indicated in these rules.





FORWARD2004!

GREEN NATIONAL CONVENTION

BRPP PROPOSAL

BRPP PROPOSAL
PROPOSAL FOR CHANGE IN THE PROCEDURE OF THE GPUS

3. During stage 2, the CC of the GPUS shall make any and all decision as to content and disposition of the proposal unless explicitly expressed otherwise or counter indicated in these rules and shall be said to “own” the proposal. The will of the CC may be expressed in a variety of ways that will be laid out below.

IV) Stage 1- Consensus Building/ Discussion stage.

A) The consensus stage of the GPUS approval process shall be conducted in one week increments.

1. The first week after a proposal enters the floor shall be for the CC to ask questions, raise concerns, and make suggestions. The presenters may respond at any time during the week to any of the commentary, but are required to report back after one week with an official response. The facilitator shall be charged with making sure the presenters provide the one week response. Presenters and the people they represent will have great latitude as to their response. They may reject all suggestions, incorporate all suggestions, incorporate some suggestions, or remove the proposal from discussion for further internal consultation.

a. If the proposal is removed from the floor by the presenters, other greens who believe that the proposal has merit, in whatever form, are able to bring it back without prejudice, as can the original presenters, at whatever time is appropriate.

b. A proposal that has been removed from the floor by the presenters shall go back to the beginning of the process if it is brought back to the CC at a later time.

2. If the proposal remains in discussion following the presenters reply, a second week of discussion ensues. The presenters must make a second reply at the end of the week. Again the presenters may remove a proposal from consideration at this time.

3. If there the presenters believe there is a consensus on the proposal at this time, the presenters may direct that the proposal move to a vote, which would then be conducted using the voting page. A vote shall be conducted if the presenters send a formal





FORWARD2004!

GREEN NATIONAL CONVENTION

BRPP PROPOSAL

note saying they are moving to a vote because they believe they have a consensus to the CC via the COO list.

a. It appears that to check for consensus on line is rather difficult and a vote seems the most expeditious way to make a formal decision under the circumstances.

b. Votes conducted at this stage will last for one week using the voting page.

c. Voting on proposals brought with what is believed to be a consensus shall be conducted using the language the presenters want voted on, and without amendment.

4. If the presenters believe that additional time for discussion would be productive in moving the CC to a consensus, they shall be granted additional time in one week increments upon receipt of a formal note asking for more time.

5. If the presenters do not believe that there is a consensus for the proposal and that further discussion will not achieve it, the presenters may then present the CC with the proposal for a formal amendment and voting process. If the presenters formally place the proposal in the amendment and voting process, the Stage 2 process, the CC becomes the owner of the proposal and the presenters simply become a part of the CC debate with the facilitator managing the formal amendment incorporation process.

6. These rules allow presenters to move a proposal to a vote by sending a formal note to the CC even if a consensus seems distant, but it is recommended that at that time instead of moving to a vote the presenters agree to have the proposal enter the Stage 2 process. This is signified by sending a formal note to the CC as it is done for picking any of the other options at this stage.

V) Stage 2 - Amendment and Voting

A) The facilitator, with the assistance of the Floor manager, shall lead the rest of the process, and the Coordinating Committee as a whole shall determine the fate of proposals.





FORWARD2004!

GREEN NATIONAL CONVENTION

BRPP PROPOSAL

BRPP PROPOSAL

PROPOSAL FOR CHANGE IN THE PROCEDURE OF THE GPUS

B). Formal amendments, with actual language, will be accepted from any CC members for a 2 week period. Amendments must be co sponsored by at least 5 CC members, including the person who sends it to the CC, to be accepted.

C). The facilitator shall assemble these amendments and the language they replace or supplement. The facilitator will lump together all amendments that replace or supplement the same original clauses. The assembled document will then be presented to the CC for one week of study and discussion.

D). The CC will then vote on amendments for each section laying out 3 or more alternatives. In each case the amendment receiving the greatest number of votes will be incorporated into the final document to be voted upon.

E). The alternatives to be presented in amendment voting for each section of the proposal shall include:

1. the original language inherited from the presenters
2. the suggested change(s)
3. none of the above

a. None of the above shall mean that the entire section would be removed from the proposal if none of the above achieves a majority during the vote.

b. If more than one alternative for a particular section is forwarded to the CC the CC shall choose among them in its vote on amendments.

G). Voting on each amendment shall take place simultaneously but separately using ordered transferable votes on the voting page with votes being restricted to the sections with multiple choices rather than the whole of the document. Transferable votes from low finishing choices for each section being amended will be transferred to second, third, and descendingly in order choices until some choice has a majority for that section.





FORWARD2004!

GREEN NATIONAL CONVENTION

BRPP PROPOSAL

H). The CC shall also, when voting on the amendments package, conduct a vote on whether or not the entire proposal shall be sent back for further study

I). The voting on the amendment package will be conducted using the voting page for 4 days with appropriate notices by the Voting Page Genie.

J). The quorum for votes on amendments shall be votes cast by delegates from one half of the state parties accredited.

VI) Post Amendment Vote Actions by the Facilitator

A). Following the vote on amendments the Facilitator shall assemble the document with the original language where there were no amendments and the winning amendments from the votes on each amendment or section.

B). Present the assembled document to the CC for one week of study and discussion.

VII). The Final Vote

A). At the end of a week of discussion and study the CC shall vote on the final language with a one week voting period using the usual method and with the quorums and vote percentages needed for that type of decision consistent with other sections of the Bylaws, Rules, and procedures of the GPUS

VIII) Emergency and timely proposals.

A) Nothing in this proposal shall prevent the GPUS from voting in expedited fashion on any resolution deemed to be an emergency resolution or requiring a timely response.

B) Previous rules including Section 4 of the rules and procedures of the GPUS remain in effect and are supplemented by the rules presented here.

BRPP PROPOSAL
PROPOSAL FOR CHANGE IN THE PROCEDURE OF THE GPUS

