

Further to the deliberations of the Governance Committee, which met on January 4, 2011, I should like to offer for consideration the foregoing framework regarding the question of *No chair/Chair/Co-chair*.

I contribute this to the full body for discussion, particularly at such time the report of the Governance Committee is presented at the CWG meeting on January 10, 2011, since it reiterates more specifically what I presented at the committee meeting:

1. Chair & Co-chair: – This option should be considered as the only option, since by its adoption, will imply the standard and universal usage and understanding of the term to mean one, acting as Chair and/or Co-chair, is empowered:
  - To preside at meetings, thereby giving order, coherence and continuity to the important work and deliberations of the CWG,
  - To act as spokespersons for the organization within and outside the CWG; as the one empowered to serve as the spokesperson representing the views and positions that, through consensus, are held by the full CWG, and which consensus is reached through agreed upon parliamentary procedure.

To emphasize anything less than the designation of a *co-chair*, i.e., *facilitator*, *moderator*, *coordinator*, will fail to impart an understanding of the CWG as one being an independent deliberative grass-roots community planning organization, equal to other deliberative bodies (including local community boards) so empowered to put forth community planning proposals. Anything less will tend to diminish the stature of the CWG to one as seemingly informal, loosely structured and one without firm resolve to put forth, to finality, community planning proposals.

2. Adopting in the structure a Community Board representative as *Co-chair* – This option should also be considered by its innovation to relate one of the Co-Chair positions as one limited to any one of the three representatives of the community boards. In adopting this measure it would seem to imply a partnership and/or a joint stewardship in the CWG and the community boards in the community planning process.

At the same time, it will give due recognition that both bodies must collaborate and demonstrate consensus on a final submission, which formally and legally takes place through the community boards. Neither the CWG, nor any one of the community boards should consider that they are the last word in planning and proposing community issues. Both jointly own the procedure and therefore, both must foster an inter-dependent relationship and demonstrate mutual respect of the particular due process both employ if to claim, in the end, that the planning process has drawn into participation as much as the community as possible.

3. Equal & Coterminous Terms - Both co-chairs should be considered equal and obliged to execute their responsibilities in a collaborative manner with regard to the affairs of the CWG and should serve coterminous periods.
4. The ideas of Rotating Co-Chairs – should be eliminated since it would give the impression of an organization distrustful of its leadership and incapacitated to remove leadership at any time it deems that it has failed to reach expectations.

Respectfully Submitted: Victor J. Papa, January 9, 2011